

SHSBC TAPES 101-200

Black/White Version (suitable for print) (BW, Black/White)
Compiled 4. February 2015

a) Table of Contents, in Checksheet order:

1.	62-01-09	TWENTY-TEN, 3D CRISS CROSS	1
2.	62-01-09	TWENTY-TEN, 3D CRISS CROSS	25
3.	62-01-10	SEC CHECKS, WITHHOLDS	31
4.	62-01-11	HOW TO AUDIT.....	59
5.	62-01-16	NATURE OF WITHHOLDS.....	85
6.	62-01-17	3D CRISS CROSS AND GPM ANATOMY	111
7.	62-01-18	HOW TO DO 3D CRISS CROSS.....	137
8.	62-01-23	BASICS OF AUDITING.....	163
9.	62-01-24	TRAINING: DUPLICATION.....	191
10.	62-01-25	WHOLE TRACK.....	216
11.	62-01-30	IN-SESSIONNESS.....	242
12.	62-01-31	USAGES OF 3D CRISS CROSS.....	268
13.	62-02-01	FLOWS	290
14.	62-02-06	WITHHOLDS.....	312
15.	62-02-07	MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	336
16.	62-02-08	ASSESSMENT.....	352
17.	62-02-13	PREPCLEARING	372
18.	62-02-14	DIRECTING ATTENTION.....	394
19.	62-02-15	PREPCHECKING	416
20.	62-02-20	WHAT IS A WITHHOLD?.....	432
21.	62-02-21	USE OF PREPCHECKING	448
22.	62-02-22	PREPCLEARING AND RUDIMENTS	464
23.	62-02-27	PREPCHECKING AND BASICS.....	484
24.	62-02-27	AUDITOR'S CODE	498
25.	62-03-01	MODEL SESSION, PART I.....	512
26.	62-03-01	MODEL SESSION, PART II.....	530
27.	62-03-19	THE BAD "AUDITOR".....	548
28.	62-03-19	MECHANICS OF SUPPRESSION.....	566
29.	62-03-20	TV DEMO: 3D CRISS CROSS ASSESSMENT, PART I.....	584
30.	62-03-20	TV DEMO: 3D CRISS CROSS ASSESSMENT, PART II.....	612
31.	62-03-21	OBJECT OF PREPCHECKING	626
32.	62-03-21	PREPCHECKING, ZERO QUESTION.....	642
33.	62-03-27	PREPCHECKING DATA.....	654
34.	62-03-29	CCHS.....	678
35.	62-03-29	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: CCHS, 3D CRISS CROSS	692
36.	62-04-03	THE OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE	708
37.	62-04-05	SACREDNESS OF CASES DETERMINISM	730
38.	62-04-05	AS-ISNESS: PEOPLE WHO CAN AND CAN'T AS-IS	746
39.	62-04-17	AUDITING.....	758

40.	62-04-17	HOW AND WHY AUDITING WORKS.....	774
41.	62-04-19	GROSS AUDITING ERRORS.....	792
42.	62-04-19	DETERMINING WHAT TO RUN.....	808
43.	62-04-24	RUNDOWN ON 3D CRISS CROSS, PART I.....	822
44.	62-04-24	RUNDOWN ON 3D CRISS CROSS, PART II.....	836
45.	62-04-25	TV DEMO: CHECKING LINE PLOTS.....	854
46.	62-04-26	RUNDOWN ON PREPCHECKING PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE.....	880
47.	62-04-26	RUNDOWN ON ROUTINE 3: ROUTINE 3A CRISS CROSS.....	896
48.	62-05-01	ARC BREAKS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	912
49.	62-05-01	ROUTINE 3G (EXPERIMENTAL) PREVIEW OF A CLEARING PROCESS.....	930
50.	62-05-02	TV DEMO: PREPCHECKING, PART I.....	944
51.	62-05-02	TV DEMO: PREPCHECKING, PART II.....	970
52.	62-05-03	CRAFTSMANSHIP, FUNDAMENTALS.....	1004
53.	62-05-03	PREPCHECKING.....	1018
54.	62-05-15	NEW TRAINING SECTIONS.....	1032
55.	62-05-15	NEW TRS.....	1049
56.	62-05-16	TV DEMO: PATCHING UP 3D CRISS CROSS CASES.....	1067
57.	62-05-17	AUDITING ERRORS.....	1099
58.	62-05-17	PREPCHECKING AND ITS PURPOSES.....	1115
59.	62-05-22	ADMINISTRATION OF COURSES.....	1131
60.	62-05-22	MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	1147
61.	62-05-23	TV DEMO: CHECK ON "WHAT" QUESTIONS AND HAVINGNESS PROBE.....	1165
62.	62-05-23	TV DEMO: FISH & FUMBLE CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES.....	1187
63.	62-05-24	E-METER DATA: INSTANT READS, PART I.....	1219
64.	62-05-24	E-METER DATA: INSTANT READS, PART II.....	1235
65.	62-05-29	Q AND A PERIOD: GOALS ASSESSMENT, HAVINGNESS.....	1253
66.	62-05-29	SECURITY CHECK PREPCHECKING.....	1273
67.	62-05-30	TV DEMO: GETTING RUDIMENTS IN, PART I.....	1294
68.	62-05-30	TV DEMO: GETTING RUDIMENTS IN, PART II.....	1311
69.	62-05-31	VALUE OF RUDIMENTS.....	1331
70.	62-05-31	MIDDLE RUDIMENTS.....	1347
71.	62-06-12	HOW TO DO A GOALS ASSESSMENT.....	1363
72.	62-06-12	MORE ON MIDDLE RUDIMENTS.....	1379
73.	62-06-13	TV DEMO: CHECKING OUT A GOAL, PART I.....	1395
74.	62-06-13	TV DEMO: CHECKING OUT A GOAL, PART II.....	1421
75.	62-06-14	FUTURE TECHNOLOGY.....	1439
76.	62-06-14	LISTING.....	1455
77.	62-06-19	DO'S AND DON'TS OF R3.....	1469
78.	62-06-19	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: GPMS, RELEASE.....	1485
79.	62-06-20	TV DEMO: NEW MODEL SESSION.....	1503
80.	62-06-21	MODEL SESSION REVISED.....	1531

81.	62-06-21	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: TR 4, MODEL SESSION	1549
82.	62-06-26	E-METER QUALITY.....	1569
83.	62-06-26	PREPCHECKING AND THE TIME TRACK.....	1585
84.	62-06-28	RUDIMENTS.....	1602
85.	62-06-28	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: CCHS, NULLING GOALS.....	1618
86.	62-07-10	REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING, PART I.....	1638
87.	62-07-10	REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING, PART II.....	1652
88.	62-07-12	METER READING.....	1672
89.	62-07-12	METER TRAINING.....	1688
90.	62-07-17	E-METER READS AND ARC BREAKS.....	1704
91.	62-07-17	ANATOMY OF ARC BREAKS.....	1720
92.	62-07-19	THE E-METER.....	1738
93.	62-07-19	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: GOALS LISTS, FIELD AUDITORS.....	1754
94.	62-07-24	ROUTINE 3GA, PART I.....	1768
95.	62-07-24	ROUTINE 3GA, PART II.....	1783
96.	62-07-26	ROUTINE 3GA DATA.....	1799
97.	62-07-26	PREPCHECKING WITH MID RUD BUTTONS.....	1815
98.	62-08-07	ROUTINE 3GA DATA.....	1831
99.	62-08-07	ROUTINE 3GA DATA ON GOALS PART II.....	1845
100.	62-08-08	TV DEMO: ROUTINE 3GA, NULLING GOALS.....	1863
101.	62-08-09	CLEARING.....	1887

b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

1.	62-01-09	TWENTY-TEN, 3D CRISS CROSS	1
2.	62-01-09	TWENTY-TEN, 3D CRISS CROSS	25
3.	62-01-10	SEC CHECKS, WITHHOLDS	31
4.	62-01-11	HOW TO AUDIT.....	59
5.	62-01-16	NATURE OF WITHHOLDS.....	85
6.	62-01-17	3D CRISS CROSS AND GPM ANATOMY	111
7.	62-01-18	HOW TO DO 3D CRISS CROSS.....	137
8.	62-01-23	BASICS OF AUDITING.....	163
9.	62-01-24	TRAINING: DUPLICATION.....	191
10.	62-01-25	WHOLE TRACK.....	216
11.	62-01-30	IN-SESSIONNESS.....	242
12.	62-01-31	USAGES OF 3D CRISS CROSS.....	268
13.	62-02-01	FLOWS	290
14.	62-02-06	WITHHOLDS.....	312
15.	62-02-07	MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	336
16.	62-02-08	ASSESSMENT.....	352
17.	62-02-13	PREPCLEARING	372
18.	62-02-14	DIRECTING ATTENTION.....	394
19.	62-02-15	PREPCHECKING	416
20.	62-02-20	WHAT IS A WITHHOLD?.....	432
21.	62-02-21	USE OF PREPCHECKING	448
22.	62-02-22	PREPCLEARING AND RUDIMENTS	464
23.	62-02-27	AUDITOR'S CODE	498
24.	62-02-27	PREPCHECKING AND BASICS.....	484
25.	62-03-01	MODEL SESSION, PART I.....	512
26.	62-03-01	MODEL SESSION, PART II.....	530
27.	62-03-19	MECHANICS OF SUPPRESSION.....	566
28.	62-03-19	THE BAD "AUDITOR".....	548
29.	62-03-20	TV DEMO: 3D CRISS CROSS ASSESSMENT, PART I.....	584
30.	62-03-20	TV DEMO: 3D CRISS CROSS ASSESSMENT, PART II.....	612
31.	62-03-21	OBJECT OF PREPCHECKING	626
32.	62-03-21	PREPCHECKING, ZERO QUESTION.....	642
33.	62-03-27	PREPCHECKING DATA.....	654
34.	62-03-29	CCHS.....	678
35.	62-03-29	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: CCHS, 3D CRISS CROSS	692
36.	62-04-03	THE OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE	708
37.	62-04-05	AS-ISNESS: PEOPLE WHO CAN AND CAN'T AS-IS	746
38.	62-04-05	SACREDNESS OF CASES DETERMINISM	730
39.	62-04-17	AUDITING.....	758

40.	62-04-17	HOW AND WHY AUDITING WORKS.....	774
41.	62-04-19	DETERMINING WHAT TO RUN.....	808
42.	62-04-19	GROSS AUDITING ERRORS.....	792
43.	62-04-24	RUNDOWN ON 3D CRISS CROSS, PART II.....	836
44.	62-04-24	RUNDOWN ON 3D CRISS CROSS, PART I.....	822
45.	62-04-25	TV DEMO: CHECKING LINE PLOTS	854
46.	62-04-26	RUNDOWN ON PREPCHECKING PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE.....	880
47.	62-04-26	RUNDOWN ON ROUTINE 3: ROUTINE 3A CRISS CROSS	896
48.	62-05-01	ARC BREAKS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS	912
49.	62-05-01	ROUTINE 3G (EXPERIMENTAL) PREVIEW OF A CLEARING PROCESS.....	930
50.	62-05-02	TV DEMO: PREPCHECKING, PART I.....	944
51.	62-05-02	TV DEMO: PREPCHECKING, PART II.....	970
52.	62-05-03	CRAFTSMANSHIP, FUNDAMENTALS	1004
53.	62-05-03	PREPCHECKING	1018
54.	62-05-15	NEW TRAINING SECTIONS	1032
55.	62-05-15	NEW TRS	1049
56.	62-05-16	TV DEMO: PATCHING UP 3D CRISS CROSS CASES	1067
57.	62-05-17	AUDITING ERRORS.....	1099
58.	62-05-17	PREPCHECKING AND ITS PURPOSES	1115
59.	62-05-22	ADMINISTRATION OF COURSES.....	1131
60.	62-05-22	MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	1147
61.	62-05-23	TV DEMO: CHECK ON "WHAT" QUESTIONS AND HAVINGNESS PROBE	1165
62.	62-05-23	TV DEMO: FISH & FUMBLE CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES	1187
63.	62-05-24	E-METER DATA: INSTANT READS, PART I	1219
64.	62-05-24	E-METER DATA: INSTANT READS, PART II	1235
65.	62-05-29	Q AND A PERIOD: GOALS ASSESSMENT, HAVINGNESS	1253
66.	62-05-29	SECURITY CHECK PREPCHECKING.....	1273
67.	62-05-30	TV DEMO: GETTING RUDIMENTS IN, PART I	1294
68.	62-05-30	TV DEMO: GETTING RUDIMENTS IN, PART II	1311
69.	62-05-31	MIDDLE RUDIMENTS	1347
70.	62-05-31	VALUE OF RUDIMENTS	1331
71.	62-06-12	HOW TO DO A GOALS ASSESSMENT.....	1363
72.	62-06-12	MORE ON MIDDLE RUDIMENTS	1379
73.	62-06-13	TV DEMO: CHECKING OUT A GOAL, PART I	1395
74.	62-06-13	TV DEMO: CHECKING OUT A GOAL, PART II	1421
75.	62-06-14	FUTURE TECHNOLOGY	1439
76.	62-06-14	LISTING	1455
77.	62-06-19	DO'S AND DON'TS OF R3	1469
78.	62-06-19	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: GPMS, RELEASE	1485
79.	62-06-20	TV DEMO: NEW MODEL SESSION.....	1503
80.	62-06-21	MODEL SESSION REVISED.....	1531

81.	62-06-21	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: TR 4, MODEL SESSION	1549
82.	62-06-26	E-METER QUALITY.....	1569
83.	62-06-26	PREPCHECKING AND THE TIME TRACK.....	1585
84.	62-06-28	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: CCHS, NULLING GOALS.....	1618
85.	62-06-28	RUDIMENTS.....	1602
86.	62-07-10	REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING, PART I	1638
87.	62-07-10	REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING, PART II	1652
88.	62-07-12	METER READING	1672
89.	62-07-12	METER TRAINING	1688
90.	62-07-17	ANATOMY OF ARC BREAKS	1720
91.	62-07-17	E-METER READS AND ARC BREAKS	1704
92.	62-07-19	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: GOALS LISTS, FIELD AUDITORS.....	1754
93.	62-07-19	THE E-METER.....	1738
94.	62-07-24	ROUTINE 3GA, PART I	1768
95.	62-07-24	ROUTINE 3GA, PART II	1783
96.	62-07-26	PREPCHECKING WITH MID RUD BUTTONS.....	1815
97.	62-07-26	ROUTINE 3GA DATA	1799
98.	62-08-07	ROUTINE 3GA DATA ON GOALS PART II.....	1845
99.	62-08-07	ROUTINE 3GA DATA	1831
100.	62-08-08	TV DEMO: ROUTINE 3GA, NULLING GOALS.....	1863
101.	62-08-09	CLEARING.....	1887

c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

1.	62-01-17	3D CRISS CROSS AND GPM ANATOMY	111
2.	62-05-22	ADMINISTRATION OF COURSES.....	1131
3.	62-07-17	ANATOMY OF ARC BREAKS	1720
4.	62-05-01	ARC BREAKS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS	912
5.	62-04-05	AS-ISNESS: PEOPLE WHO CAN AND CAN'T AS-IS	746
6.	62-02-08	ASSESSMENT.....	352
7.	62-05-17	AUDITING ERRORS.....	1099
8.	62-04-17	AUDITING.....	758
9.	62-02-27	AUDITOR'S CODE	498
10.	62-01-23	BASICS OF AUDITING.....	163
11.	62-03-29	CCHS.....	678
12.	62-08-09	CLEARING.....	1887
13.	62-05-03	CRAFTSMANSHIP, FUNDAMENTALS	1004
14.	62-04-19	DETERMINING WHAT TO RUN.....	808
15.	62-02-14	DIRECTING ATTENTION.....	394
16.	62-06-19	DO'S AND DON'TS OF R3	1469
17.	62-05-24	E-METER DATA: INSTANT READS, PART I.....	1219
18.	62-05-24	E-METER DATA: INSTANT READS, PART II.....	1235
19.	62-06-26	E-METER QUALITY.....	1569
20.	62-07-17	E-METER READS AND ARC BREAKS	1704
21.	62-02-01	FLOWS	290
22.	62-06-14	FUTURE TECHNOLOGY	1439
23.	62-04-19	GROSS AUDITING ERRORS.....	792
24.	62-04-17	HOW AND WHY AUDITING WORKS.....	774
25.	62-01-11	HOW TO AUDIT.....	59
26.	62-01-18	HOW TO DO 3D CRISS CROSS.....	137
27.	62-06-12	HOW TO DO A GOALS ASSESSMENT.....	1363
28.	62-01-30	IN-SESSIONNESS.....	242
29.	62-06-14	LISTING	1455
30.	62-03-19	MECHANICS OF SUPPRESSION.....	566
31.	62-07-12	METER READING	1672
32.	62-07-12	METER TRAINING	1688
33.	62-05-31	MIDDLE RUDIMENTS	1347
34.	62-05-22	MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	1147
35.	62-02-07	MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	336
36.	62-06-21	MODEL SESSION REVISED.....	1531
37.	62-03-01	MODEL SESSION, PART I.....	512
38.	62-03-01	MODEL SESSION, PART II.....	530
39.	62-06-12	MORE ON MIDDLE RUDIMENTS	1379

40.	62-01-16	NATURE OF WITHHOLDS.....	85
41.	62-05-15	NEW TRAINING SECTIONS	1032
42.	62-05-15	NEW TRS	1049
43.	62-03-21	OBJECT OF PREPCHECKING	626
44.	62-02-27	PREPCHECKING AND BASICS.....	484
45.	62-05-17	PREPCHECKING AND ITS PURPOSES	1115
46.	62-06-26	PREPCHECKING AND THE TIME TRACK.....	1585
47.	62-03-27	PREPCHECKING DATA.....	654
48.	62-07-26	PREPCHECKING WITH MID RUD BUTTONS.....	1815
49.	62-05-03	PREPCHECKING	1018
50.	62-02-15	PREPCHECKING	416
51.	62-03-21	PREPCHECKING, ZERO QUESTION.....	642
52.	62-02-22	PREPCLEARING AND RUDIMENTS	464
53.	62-02-13	PREPCLEARING.....	372
54.	62-05-29	Q AND A PERIOD: GOALS ASSESSMENT, HAVINGNESS	1253
55.	62-03-29	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: CCHS, 3D CRISS CROSS	692
56.	62-06-28	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: CCHS, NULLING GOALS.....	1618
57.	62-07-19	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: GOALS LISTS, FIELD AUDITORS.....	1754
58.	62-06-19	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: GPMS, RELEASE	1485
59.	62-06-21	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: TR 4, MODEL SESSION	1549
60.	62-07-10	REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING, PART I	1638
61.	62-07-10	REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING, PART II	1652
62.	62-05-01	ROUTINE 3G (EXPERIMENTAL) PREVIEW OF A CLEARING PROCESS.....	930
63.	62-08-07	ROUTINE 3GA DATA ON GOALS PART II.....	1845
64.	62-07-26	ROUTINE 3GA DATA	1799
65.	62-08-07	ROUTINE 3GA DATA	1831
66.	62-07-24	ROUTINE 3GA, PART I	1768
67.	62-07-24	ROUTINE 3GA, PART II	1783
68.	62-06-28	RUDIMENTS.....	1602
69.	62-04-24	RUNDOWN ON 3D CRISS CROSS, PART II.....	836
70.	62-04-24	RUNDOWN ON 3D CRISS CROSS, PART I.....	822
71.	62-04-26	RUNDOWN ON PREPCHECKING PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE.....	880
72.	62-04-26	RUNDOWN ON ROUTINE 3: ROUTINE 3A CRISS CROSS	896
73.	62-04-05	SACREDNESS OF CASES DETERMINISM	730
74.	62-01-10	SEC CHECKS, WITHHOLDS	31
75.	62-05-29	SECURITY CHECK PREPCHECKING.....	1273
76.	62-03-19	THE BAD "AUDITOR".....	548
77.	62-07-19	THE E-METER.....	1738
78.	62-04-03	THE OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE	708
79.	62-01-24	TRAINING: DUPLICATION.....	191
80.	62-05-02	TV DEMO: PREPCHECKING, PART I.....	944

81.	62-05-02	TV DEMO: PREPCHECKING, PART II.....	970
82.	62-03-20	TV DEMO: 3D CRISS CROSS ASSESSMENT, PART I.....	584
83.	62-03-20	TV DEMO: 3D CRISS CROSS ASSESSMENT, PART II.....	612
84.	62-05-23	TV DEMO: CHECK ON "WHAT" QUESTIONS AND HAVINGNESS PROBE	1165
85.	62-04-25	TV DEMO: CHECKING LINE PLOTS	854
86.	62-06-13	TV DEMO: CHECKING OUT A GOAL, PART I	1395
87.	62-06-13	TV DEMO: CHECKING OUT A GOAL, PART II	1421
88.	62-05-23	TV DEMO: FISH & FUMBLE CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES	1187
89.	62-05-30	TV DEMO: GETTING RUDIMENTS IN, PART I	1294
90.	62-05-30	TV DEMO: GETTING RUDIMENTS IN, PART II	1311
91.	62-06-20	TV DEMO: NEW MODEL SESSION.....	1503
92.	62-05-16	TV DEMO: PATCHING UP 3D CRISS CROSS CASES	1067
93.	62-08-08	TV DEMO: ROUTINE 3GA, NULLING GOALS.....	1863
94.	62-01-09	TWENTY-TEN, 3D CRISS CROSS	1
95.	62-01-09	TWENTY-TEN, 3D CRISS CROSS	25
96.	62-01-31	USAGES OF 3D CRISS CROSS	268
97.	62-02-21	USE OF PREPCHECKING	448
98.	62-05-31	VALUE OF RUDIMENTS	1331
99.	62-02-20	WHAT IS A WITHHOLD?.....	432
100.	62-01-25	WHOLE TRACK.....	216
101.	62-02-06	WITHHOLDS.....	312

Twenty-Ten, 3D Criss Cross

A lecture given on 9 January 1962

Thank you.

Well, you look different. You do, you know.

[part missing]

We had a bit of water under the dam, over the bridge, since I've been gone. I had a wonderful congress, absolutely fabulous congress in DC. People thought it was wonderful. Almost ruined me, but probably saved Scientology United States without much trouble. They were running on American meters which had been manufactured, God help us. If any of you've got American meters, there's a garbage can out there. Because these things were built, you know, without any consultation with me, and across – over my dead body, practically, on circuit changes, and so forth.

And this is not propaganda, but by George, you know, they don't pick up withholds. And that left practically all the Scientologists in the United States with missed withholds. Just like that. Bang! And that was what was the matter.

And the first day of that congress, I had to just scrape them up off the floor. It was the hardest show to get on the road you ever wanted to see.

Got to talking to them about withholds, told them what was wrong, and so forth, and they came right along with it. Laid into the organization along about Tuesday. They had by that time three British meters, and they all of a sudden had been finding that there was practically one missed withhold per question on the Joburg, and things like this. And their morale started going up. Everything started moving along very well in the field, and so forth. A lot of excitement about this.

Very funny. The people came to the congress with big plans on how to rewire and salvage American meters. And they took a look at the British Mark IV and saw the thing in operation and just scrapped the American meters. Actually, it was all over the floor that they should scrap American meters. Just skip them.

But Reg gave a demonstration, very ably done, and had an American meter element of all things in the projector, and we got a pc, a field auditor's pc, and he ran her there on the stage, and the withholds were pretty juicy. [laughter] And they were all missed across the boards, and Reg glancing back at me in the wings because it was an American meter, you know, should he pull more, you know, and I told him I thought there were probably two more. So although they weren't showing on the meter, he went right ahead and pulled two more. [laughter]

And then, of course, I stepped on and told people, "Well, you see what withhelds do." This girl, by the way, started looking very bright and so forth, after she had been looking rather gloomy at first. And I gave the auditor who audited her – I didn't even know his name, you see – I gave him hell and Maria and mischief, and said people shouldn't do that sort of thing, you know, and really cut it up. His mother wrote me a congratulatory letter saying it was about time somebody took him apart. [laughter, laughs]

But anyway, anyway, it was a great congress, and things are really rolling very nice.

But there was a great deal of technical data suddenly swung into place while I was gone. Had some time to think and consolidate a few things. Got a look at havingness amongst other things, and havingness in its relationship to withhelds. That was the main thing

And out of this you get Twenty-Ten on which you have just had a bulletin. And I think you'll find Twenty-Ten really makes a pc soar. If it doesn't, you haven't got his withhelds off or you haven't got his Havingness Process. But in view of the fact that a withhold cuts down havingness – that's all you can say about that, a withhold cuts down havingness – and when you get the withhold off, all you have is potential new havingness.

I better start at the beginning. This is the 9th of January, [*female voice: Yes.*] and this is the mystic month. The mystic month, 9 Jan. You know what a jann is, don't you? It's a ghost from Arabia. And this is the mystic month. This is month of mystic mystics. We're going to cure them this month.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

This business about havingness, now, this is very important. Havingness had as many as forty-three different reasons why it worked. And you'd be very interested that it came down to a child's definition. The sixth lecture of that Washington congress, by the way – January 52 [62] congress – one whole hour is devoted to this, and so forth. And a very concise rundown, if I say so myself. I'm going to give it to you in about thirty seconds. That is to say, that havingness is best understood by no-havingness. And I had this in the bull pen for, oh, I don't know, seven years, trying to get the common denominator of what havingness was so that it could then be applied to auditing, and so on.

And all of a sudden, Reg ran some havingness on me, and I kind of took a look at it, and we had an error going in the session, and all of a sudden boom! Why, I suddenly realized what havingness was. It's best understood by the reverse definition. What is no-havingness?

No-havingness is the concept that one cannot reach. I know this is so elementary it's going to take you twenty-four hours for it to dawn on you. Anybody knows this, you know. Everybody always knew this except nobody knew it until the other day.

No-havingness is prevented reach, in other words. Concept of no reach, no-havingness. All right. And then havingness is simply the concept that one is able to reach, and that is all havingness is. One merely has to have the idea that he can reach something in order to have it. You see, you don't have to reach it in order to have it. You merely have to have the concept that you can reach it. And that is havingness. And out of forty-three chances in which this definition did not occur, we all of a sudden have a common denominator to havingness.

Now, this is of tremendous value to you as an auditor. We're back, of course, on Reach and Withdraw. And we're back into the common denominators of communication and all these old-time proven truths. And we're right there, you see. And that is, Havingness fits right into the bracket at once.

So now I'll give it to you with the twelve-inch-gauge barrel. On the other hand, a person with a withhold, of course, has the concept that he can't reach. So withholds reduce havingness. I mean, that's... And therefore running withholds improves havingness. It is so elementary. There is nothing really to it, except it is one of these sweeping truths like the world is round. I mean, it'll make that much difference.

All right. Now, let's look at this. Let's look at this a little bit further.

This tells you that the moment when a pc has released a withhold, he has a potential reach. And if you don't capitalize on it in the very near future, of course, he doesn't realize that anything new or strange has happened to him, very often. He gets off a withhold and it doesn't do him any good.

You've seen that happen, you know? The fellow gives up a withhold and all of a sudden it doesn't seem to do him any good. Well, the reason it doesn't seem to do him any good is he hasn't practiced reaching since. You're waiting for the accidental: Three or four days from now he all of a sudden finds out he can reach in that particular quarter, don't you see?

Well, instead of leaving it on automatic and just letting him find out about it suddenly, well, straight away, why, after you've pulled a few withholds run some Havingness, that's all. And you run the withholds, and you run the Havingness, and you run the withholds, and you run the Havingness.

And the reason I tried to figure out some reasonable ratio – and that auditors can remember it is the better reason for the exact ratio than any other reason – call it Twenty-Ten, and that's twenty minutes of withholds pulled and ten minutes of Havingness, no matter where you're sitting in the withholds, see? No matter what part of the question you've gotten, whether you've gotten a question flat or not flat, it doesn't matter because you're going to come back to that question anyway.

I had to do some experimental workouts on this to smooth it out, and that apparently is the way it sits. So it doesn't matter then, you just say, "Well, we'll come back to this question later," or anything you care to say to the pc, and, "Right now we're going to run some Havingness."

And just do that on the twenty-minute mark, and you'll find that you're – if you run the Havingness ten minutes, why, you're all set. Now, the rule of Havingness is you should run Havingness until the pc can have large objects in the room. But you know very well that a lot of Havingness Processes out of the thirty-six don't tell you whether the pc can have large objects or not.

Now, Havingness will run to a rise in the needle and then a blowdown. You'll get a rise, rise, rise, rise, rise, rise. You watch the needle, and the tone arm keeps following it on up, on up, on up, on up, and all of a sudden the tone arm blows down.

Well, it would be optimum to run it to blowdown if some pcs didn't wait for two or three sessions to blow down. So that's why we don't use blowdown as a criteria when to stop running Havingness. Just run it ten minutes. That's good enough, and you'll find out that will do a lot of good.

Now, test the havingness after the first eight or ten commands. After the first eight or ten commands, get the second can squeeze.

In other words, when you start to run the Havingness, get the can squeeze. You get your needle set, you see, so that you'll get a third-of-a-dial drop or something like that. Just make a crude estimate of it. Swing your sensitivity back down, don't you see, from where it's been while you were security checking.

And get him to squeeze the cans and watch the degree of squeeze. Well, that's fine. Run eight or ten commands and ask for a second squeeze. And if it drops more, the needle drops more, and it is looser, you're all right, see? You're okay.

And if it doesn't loosen up at that point, of course, your rudiments could be badly out or something like this could happen, but the point is the Havingness Process should put the rudiments in.

In other words, you should get a loosening needle even – if the pc is doing it at all, you should get a loosening needle on the Havingness Process. So although some wisdom will occasionally monitor this and you will do something else like ask him if he has an ARC break or something like that, you ordinarily – and this practice would not go wrong at all – you would ordinarily get another Havingness Process. And you just keep testing for Havingness Processes. And that does not go on the Twenty-Ten. You see, that time stands alongside of the Twenty-Ten. If you have to find a new Havingness Process, you don't count that into the Twenty-Ten. And then you find it finally, and you run ten minutes of that, and you go back to your withholds.

Now, you're going to find out that a pc – the more intricate or oddball the Havingness Process you find for the pc is, the more – higher probability is that it's going to wear out. And you usually come down to something like "Point out something." That will last a long time. "Look around here and find something you can have." When you finally get on to that and it's running smoothly, it generally will run practically forever.

But "What is the emotion of that room object?" you see? Oh, man, I mean, that thing can wear out, clang! By the way, that is a remark that is seldom made about Havingness Processes. That particular one, you know, is a changed process. After a little while the emotion runs out, and their Havingness Process changes – and you might not have known this – but changes to "What is the condition of that room object?" What is the condition of it instead of what is its emotion. But you realize that that thing changed. I don't think it's written down anyplace. I don't think it's written down anywhere. Might be. It might be in a lecture someplace. But there is that point about it. That one goofball thing

Now, getting back to Twenty-Ten, I would advise you, at this time, not to security check any other way because it capitalizes on your withholds. And you'll find out it should work like a hot bomb.

Now, if this is working properly and you are actually pulling withholds on the pc, and all is going along splendidly, and you're not missing withholds at every turn, and so on, and the Havingness Process is working, you actually – running this on some character off the street, something like that – should produce some interesting miracles. I mean, some interesting things should happen to the case just as a result of this.

Now, there's another mechanic that I haven't told anybody, and that's this: The oldest test of circuits shows that when you run Havingness, when you run Havingness, the circuits key out and move out of the person's perimeter and out of his head. These black-mass circuits, that are mentioned in Book One, they key out and move out of the person's head.

Now, let's move right on into 3D here. The Goals Problem Mass with terminal, oppterm, terminal, oppterm, terminal, oppterm going on up the line, tremendous number of terminals and opposition terminals could make – if you drew them as circles opposite each other; a long series of circles vertically, one opposite each other, one representing the terminal, the other representing the oppterm – they would represent what you might call the main chance, the main line. Those are the terminals, and those are the opposition terminals as the person has deteriorated down the track until he finally became human here.

And that is the main chance. That's the main track. And when you're trying to get a 3D package, what you want is the main chance. You don't want a whole lot of locks.

Now, if you'd consider that as these two circles facing each other, see, and then below that two circles facing each other and two circles facing each other below that, and so on, as it went on down the line... Now, as you get down lower and lower and lower, you're getting more and more to present time. Let's plot it that way. All right.

Now, back there about the middle of the patch or toward the beginning of track or middle of track, or something like that, just as an example, you have a whole bunch of lock valences. Now, they depend on the main terminal and the main opposition terminal for that particular period of the track, but they are locks. And they confront each other, and they face each other, and they are just little offbeat valences.

And there are so many of these that a pc almost has one for every type of personality there has ever been. I don't know if you're aware of the tremendous multitude of these lock valences. It's something like trying to count the stars in the Milky Way.

Now, what we're interested in is the main chance, the 3D package. There aren't very many of those, you see, and that's what holds all the rest of the bank together.

Well, if you've got the terminal and the opposition terminal for any given period, these will run. These will run very nicely. But – but you could get your hands on literally any one of thousands of subsidiary lock packages. And some of them run, oddly enough. Some of them look so close to something. They look so near in and they register so nicely for a while that you actually could put your hands on a false 3D package if you were assessing people who were very bad off and very keyed-in. Why?

Well, let's say that one million years ago he had some kind of a game going and – he was a waterbuck and – oh, now you know I'm back, huh? [laughter] And the other valence was a tiger, and you've got – now, hanging on to a waterbuck, you have a school of fish. See,

water and water and there's a school of fish. You know, he got mixed up, and he was a fish for a lifetime or two, you know.

And then hanging on to this was a school. For some reason or other, there was a school where they taught waterbucks to be waterbucks or something of the sort. And hanging on to this a totally false valence – if you were going to try to run it as a 3D package; it's nevertheless there – we have schoolteacher. See, it's just a piece of this school. But that's hanging on to a school of fish, so that's hanging on to something else. In other words, some silly concatenation of this character, you see, all related in some wild, idiotic way, you see?

And over on the tiger's side of the thing, over on the tiger's side of the thing was, of course, another valence, tigress, is associated with that valence. And then for some reason or other, women who have tigerish habits, you see, is associated with that. And then a girl student, you see, hangs on to that in some mysterious way because she liked to lick her chops or something like that, you know. And she's hung over there on that side of the thing, you see?

Now, unfortunately, he has led a very enturbulated present time life, unfortunately. He's in a very much of an enturbulated state, and he's a schoolteacher in a ladies' seminar.

Well, now, that valence doesn't separate off the school for waterbucks – school of fish – waterbuck, you see, package way back there.

They're so inseparable, short of auditing, that that whole package pulls up into present time, and it makes the Goals Problem Mass have a great big curve on it into present time.

And on the other side, the oppterm, unfortunately, was matched at that point, so the oppterm curves into present time. And in present time, he would read schoolteacher versus girl student. If you were just asking for it, just off the bat, you'd get schoolteacher versus girl student. And it'd look like a 3D package. As a matter of fact, it'd stay in for a little while, a very little while. It'd read kind of sporadically and stupidly, and so forth.

Of course, it's been restimulated so the Goals Problem Mass is warped into present time. If you can get the idea of the mass ever having been straight, you see, which it probably hasn't been – but it has the potential of being straight; it has the potential of being a plotted time track.

And instead of being straight, of just being bent over from a hundred trillion years ago, let us say, down into now, on both sides – you see, it'd look like quite a snarl because it brings along with it a school of fish. And as a schoolteacher, he has always been deathly afraid of fish. This is inexplicable to him. And there's all kinds of other things in there. And if a woman were to look a little tigerish, why, he would either marry her or kill her. You know, sometimes there isn't much choice. [laughs]

And so there is a Goals Problem Mass which will give you a scratchy needle. Gives you a dirty needle, scratchy. You can't read past it. He's got a horrible present time problem. He's a schoolteacher versus girl students. This is keyed in perpetually in session, has nothing to do with the first available terminal and oppterminal that you're going to run.

You're not about to find a waterbuck, and you're not about to find a tiger. You see, you're not going to get anything here but a big mess.

And you try to audit past this and you try to assess past this, and you're in difficulties perpetually. You can't quite figure out what's going on here. You know the pc has present time problems and yet he doesn't assess and all this kind of thing, and it's just all kind of hay-wire. Do you see, what's happened there is that the present enturbulence has caused one of these myriad of valences to match up in some kind of a pair up in present time, and they've got no business being in present time. And that makes unavailable other packages, so therefore the pc is more or less unassessable.

Now, your Havingness runs out circuits and runs out valences. And as a matter of fact, if you've ever been audited on some of the old skills, you may very well yourself subjectively have seen one of these things leave while you were running Havingness, seen it peel off.

Actually, you can do a really interesting clinical experiment. You can run a pc's havingness down by making him talk against strain, and you can see one of these things move in, and run some Havingness on him and see it move out. And it's peculiarly noticeable when it is a talking valence, you know – when it's a valence that actually talks – chattering valence. Because the pc at first will notice that it is speaking, and he will be speaking a certain way himself. And if you're very clever on the observation, what will happen next is the pc will start telling you what it is saying as the answers. And then the pc himself will not distinguish between himself and the circuit, but will merely dramatize the circuit that has just been keyed in.

And then you run some Havingness and it moves out, and the pc will again be telling you what it is saying, and then it goes on out, and the pc is not paying any attention to it and talking like himself.

This dramatization type of action can be keyed in and out, and sometimes in auditing you may have seen, actually, a black mass depart from you.

Well, now what holds a black mass in? Havingness, you see, is intimately associated with withhold. So as havingness drops, of course, one withholds harder so as not to lose anything so therefore, when a pc has withholds, he holds the circuits in, and his havingness remains low.

Now, you may have had this experience. You may have taken somebody and audited him for seventy-five hours on Havingness – I'd say some auditors here have done just that – and watch the fellow polish up to the nines – actually just look marvelous, you know? Everything is fine. Everything is going *beautifully*, and so forth. And he walks out about three feet off the floor. And twenty-four hours goes by and he still feels pretty good. And thirty-six hours and forty-eight hours and he's still alive. And sixty hours goes by and two weeks goes by, and where was your seventy-five hours? He has gone completely back to the original state. Well, how interesting. But I'm sure a lot of auditors here have seen just that thing happen. Now, what made him relapse?

You ran the havingness up in spite of the withholds. And the presence of the withholds pulled it back down again. So havingness, apparently, cannot remain stable in the presence of withholds. And when you get the withholds off and build the havingness up, you then are removing – as you take off the withholds – you are removing the reasons the havingness would drop again. Now, this is theoretical, but I think you will find it working out.

So in other words, this offers you an opportunity to be able to run Havingness without having it sag. And you know, that would be wonderful because pcs get all polished up at the end of a Havingness run and fall on their heads. All right. Supposing they got all polished up at the end of a Havingness run and didn't fall on their heads?

Well, the way to prevent their falling on their heads, of course, is get their withholds off. Hence, Twenty-Ten. And that is the design of Twenty-Ten.

Now, why should you run Twenty-Ten at all on a pc if I can give you such a thing as Criss Cross – which we'll take up in a moment. I might as well shoot you with 16-gauge, 12-gauge, 10-gauge, and 8-gauge loaded with buckshot and solid rounds, because I haven't been able to talk to you for some time. And I thought, "Well, I'll plot this out. And this week I will give you a nice lecture today, and I will take up the congress or something of this sort, and tomorrow I will take up perhaps Havingness, you see, and Twenty-Ten. And then Thursday I will take up Criss Cross, and so forth." But you know how it is. You have to get it all done at once, and so on. And I don't think I could withhold from you that hard on this much good news. It would be an actual withhold, so I said, "Well, I'll just let them have it with a grape and canister."

All right. Well, that wraps up Twenty-Ten. That's all you'll hear about Twenty-Ten except being scolded for not running it right. But this goes much further.

Let's take this seventy-five hours of preparation the pc should do, minimum, before he is assessed. Let's take this up, and let's see, now, that if the pc had keyed in to present time a schoolteacher and a girl student, and actually the waterbuck and a tiger weren't even available as part of the package, and these things would get some kind of a weird registry, and then the pc wouldn't go anyplace. And actually, he'd probably beef up the Prehav Scale and all sorts of things would happen if they were grabbed by some auditor in Cape Town or Sydney.

So some auditor just grabs these things, you know. He says, "Hey! It twitched. It twitched. Been sitting here for days waiting for it to twitch," you know. And see, "So, well, that's the terminal. We got it now. Got the 3D package. Didn't clear him though. 3D can't be much good. He spun in. Of course, the thing didn't register when it was checked out. And it was checked out after we'd run it 125 hours. Funny thing though. I didn't have any trouble with the Prehav Scale. You know, everybody talks about bad Prehav assessments and difficulty with the Prehav assessment. I could take anything on the whole scale that was all alive the whole time." [laughter, laughs]

Well, that kind of nonsense could immediately result, you see, from having a pc who was unassessable. Well, why would he be unassessable? He'd have these valences keyed in to present time, and every time you ask him for anything, they would simply bang. He'd bang on a present time problem, don't you see? He'd keep banging on this present time problem, the terminals resulting to it, and they're attached to the Goals Problem Mass at some tremendously early period on the track. And they're very beefy, you know, schoolteacher – schoolteacher in the days where the child didn't get his arithmetic, and they hanged him, you know. I mean, real vicious, you know? Something like the teacher at Saint Hill. And they – but totally unsuitable, and you can't assess past it.

Now, you run Twenty-Ten, the probability is that you will knock both of those out, and the Goals Problem Mass under Twenty-Ten should tend to straighten out, thus making available to you the main chance – the actual terminals and the actual opposition terminals of the pc on the whole track.

In other words, you've knocked these little button lock valences off like warts on an apple. You peeled the apple, and you found yourself a good apple and you ate it. But that's the way that would look. You see how that would be? Kind of interesting. So you could run Twenty-Ten, straighten it out, and the pc could be assessed. All right. Providing it were done right. All right. So much for that.

We move right straight in, then, into 3D Criss Cross as a logical sequence. Why is it called Criss Cross? It's because you go from the right to the left and the left to the right, upgrading each time you go, and it makes Xes, till you get a whole series of Xes out of it so it looks like a criss-cross, and I thought that would be a good name for it.

The liabilities of assessment are great. Misassessment is very easy to obtain. It's one of the easier things to obtain. Some people hardly have to try at all, and they get a misassessment.

Now, in view of the fact that these little valences, as locks – actual little circuits and things like that – they won't look little to the pc, but they're little in comparison to the Goals Problem Mass. In view of the fact that these things can exist left and right, and as long as they are the only thing you've got, they'll continue to run.

In other words, you'll continue to get a knock on them somehow, although you haven't got the right one, see? And it won't be the right one at all, but it'll continue to knock, usually sporadically, but it can come in and out, and you'll keep getting a reaction on something like this, you know, like schoolteacher. Actually, the terminal was waterbuck, and it was a long way between a schoolteacher and a waterbuck, but the pc made it.

Now, if you don't deintensify that area of the package, you're liable to get the schoolteacher, not the waterbuck. His attention is on waterbuck via the schoolteacher, and you get him to look no further than schoolteacher, and there you land. Do you see how that could be? You're trying to get his attention on waterbuck, and yet you only get his attention on schoolteacher unless you get some kind of a stupid, sporadic read.

Now, the pc does not have to be in bad condition for this error to be made. Now, this accounts for a mystery which students have had here for some time, and that is how they can find an item, and the checker doesn't prove it out. And I have heard more students grinding their teeth, you see. It's the small, petulant sound you hear, grind, grind, grind. It's different than sound of chewing gum. [laughs] It goes slightly different. And you hear it out here in the hall, occasionally, when the pc has just been not checked out or the checker has gone ahead and found the – another terminal entirely. Well, what happened? What happened?

It isn't really that the student was wrong, and it isn't really that the student was right. The student didn't null the whole list. When you get a wrong item, the checker always finds that there are several other items on the list still alive. Well, why is this?

They might have seemed null, but they could have all gone null because the rudiments went out at one time or another, and as you walk by them, you X them out, because the rudiments were out. And then you got the rudiments in and completed your assessment on some other part of the list and never went back and read that earlier part of the list, you see, with the rudiments in. So you didn't notice they were still knocking.

Well, in other words, those things haven't been knocked out. Assessment by Elimination actually is pulling innumerable locks off the actual item. And while you've still got a half a dozen of these locks still alive, you've got enough charge on the situation that you can get a lock. You get a lock valence, and it isn't quite the right one.

Now, the checker takes it and works with it for a while. He finds out it goes out. It was probably almost ready to go at the moment you turned the pc in. Maybe you turned the pc in hastily, hoping he'd be checked fast so that it would stay in. But the checker going over this checks against the list items, don't you see, and goes down the list items, and actually releases the remaining valences, and then finds he's got the 3D item. It's a highly mechanical proposition. It shouldn't be considered very esoterically, because if you haven't nulled completely anything that was on the list, you'll for sure have some valences left.

You see, the pc has just called on valences when he's given you the list. He hasn't just dreamed up a bunch of wrong things. He sort of counted the warts on the frog, you know? You were looking for the frog, and he counted warts. And he counted and he said there was a – there were all kinds of kittens and cats, and there were lions, and there were circuses, and there were circus performers, and there were flags with stripes in them, and there were clotheslines, and there were old men with whiskers, and there were cages, and tigers, and men with whiskers, and that's all.

And you've gone off down the line, and of course all these things are associated with a tiger in his mind, you see? These circuses and circus performers and cages and whiskers and all kinds of wild things, you see? So you just keep knocking these things off, you know, and you'll eventually find the frog.

Well, if you've got several of those alive, his attention can still be stuck on the locks. He has never given you a free list. Don't ever think that a pc ever does. A pc does not think thoughts of his own while dealing with the Goals Problem Mass.

And when you get to be an old, 'oary-'eaded veteran like myself, you never believe the pc in relationship to any part of the Goals Problem Mass because he's always talking to you *as* the Goals Problem Mass until you get an item nulled. It's quite remarkable. The pc that rises superior to his bank *does* exist, of course, and you do all the time when you audit.

You've just been finished off in a session, and they didn't finish anything off, and they didn't check the item out, and nothing occurred, nothing occurred, nothing occurred, you see. You didn't get the item. You're still in a big question mark as to what the item is, and our next stop is end of session.

And you go right into your next session and audit, see? And you audit somebody, and you do a creditable job. So you can rise superior to a Goals Problem Mass.

But a pc who has no necessity level or any reason whatsoever – any pc has no reason to rise above the Goals Problem Mass in any way, shape or form. There is no reason for the pc to do so, is there? He's just sitting there, isn't he? So if he says anything at all, I can assure you it has nothing to do with anything but the Goals Problem Mass.

That's why you don't believe a pc about his own case, particularly in session. The pc will say, "Oh, yes, yes, I'm a wart. Yes, oh, that's me all right. Yes, yes. Oh, oh, yeah, sure. Circus performer. That's awfully good. Yes, circus performer. I'm an old man with whiskers. That's right. Because you see, I'm – actually been always afraid of cages. So really I'm a cage, except I'm a high wire performer, except I'm a flag with candy stripes." And he tells you he's all these things because his attention, of course, has been put by you on the Goals Problem Mass, and he expresses himself very thoroughly in this particular direction.

You see, his attention is on them and there is no reason for his attention to be on anything else. So you actually never find a pc actually being audited in the vicinity of a Goals Problem Mass who ever tells you anything but the contents of the Goals Problem Mass. Just make up your mind to that.

Now, you characters who occasionally believe a pc and take the pc's choice about some matter make me wonder sometimes because he's just running off like several phonograph records.

He says, "*Rrrrowr*," and he gets there, and he says, "Circus performer." And he says, "Well, I've always been on high wires. I've always been deathly afraid of them, and that's why I am, and so forth. And this is me."

And it's absolutely true. Because he's in a valence, you see?

You think, at first glance, that there is only this type of valence. You think that there is only the type of valence which exists wholly as itself, and that you are looking for it, and it's not any other valences around it, see?

Examine your thinking on this subject and I think you will agree with me that you more or less have looked at this thing as it was one rock in the middle of the ocean, and you were looking for this one rock.

No, that's not true. The ocean is full of rocks. You're just looking for a big rock, that's all. And when you first start looking, all the rocks look the same size, and then you finally find one is bigger than the other, and it's on the main chance. Don't you see?

So that whenever the pc's attention is on one of these lock valences, he's talking to you squarely out of a lock valence. You put his attention on it thoroughly, so therefore you must never take his judgment because as a circus performer, he's even start – he'll even start using circus lingo. He kind of thinks that way.

And that's the way he tours through the bank. Lock valences. Think of a bag of raisins with an apple in it. And do you know, he can thoroughly dramatize any one of those raisins. And it derives its whole force and power from the apple, but because the apple is invisible, why, of course, you don't know what the apple is, and the pc usually can't quite describe the apple.

He starts to describe the apple and he tells you about another raisin, and he thinks about the apple, but he describes another raisin, don't you see? And it isn't until you've got a tremendous number of these raisins discharged or eaten or something – nulled out – that the pc says, "Well, how silly. How silly. Tiger. Tiger. Knew it all the time. Couldn't think of it. I don't know why I couldn't think of it, but couldn't think of it. *Rrroooowr.*"

Well, if you understand those characteristics of the Goals Problem Mass, and if you've got that taped, that it's a mass of goo, but it is goo which has molecular composition, you see. Any one of these valences will look as big as your head. They will. They don't – they aren't small. They aren't microscopic. Any one of them can be drifting around or appear to be drifting around while thoroughly tied to the Goals Problem Mass, so that your way through all this is a treacherous way.

You see, a pc doesn't give you much help. Of course, he does try to help you. Very often the pc rises spectacularly above the bank, even in a session. He rises spectacularly and he says, "Well," he says, "this is all fine, and it's so-and-so and so-and-so." And we've checked off so-and-so and so-and-so, and it's fine. But that could also be the valence of a judge that has suddenly come up, you see. And as an auditor, you just can't take that chance. Well, it's a judge, so he of course, he can adjudicate at that point.

If he slips a little bit, he'll say, "Well, off with their heads," too. It will sort of slip into the sentence structure.

So you're walking a very tough road, because although there may be just a relatively few vital combinations which are hanging gorgeously suspended in space, gorgeously suspended in time – absolutely fantastic how they could continue to balance themselves this intricately so as never to discharge down through the trillennia – they have accumulated under themselves the most fantastic number of fellow travelers you ever cared to mention.

See, he's got a valence for everything he's ever been, and it gets hooked over onto the Goals Problem Mass. As long as the Goals Problem Mass is charged up, these things are liable to stick together and cross-associate, and so forth.

So the way to find one, of course – the most reliable way to find an actual part of the 3D package is with the goal. Let's find a real goal for the pc and a goal the pc has had, and it'll lead you straight into the main chance. That's 3D which is formal or standard assessment. You find the goal, you find the opposition terminal, you find the opposition goal, and you get the modifier, and you get the terminal, and so forth, and that's it.

And if the case is assessable, of course, that's perfectly workable. And the case could be put into an assessable state by enough preparation, and then you could go ahead and handle it on its standard way, just as you have been doing it.

All right. Is there another way to enter all this? Let me tell you now some of the liabilities of all this. One is, auditors have lost pc's goals lists. You know, that's one of your greatest liabilities. Pc then, when he writes up the goals list, doesn't ever give you the goal. You know? Because it was ticked and stressed, and then rejected in some way, in some fashion, he doesn't come up with it. It's so often true that if you can find the pc's original list, you

can find the pc's goal. And if you can't find the original list, you've had it. You get the goal by bleeding down the meter and by doing all kinds of odd things.

And it makes a very tough, long assessment, and you're usually trying to find the goal anyway before the pc is any shape to be assessed, and it takes six weeks to no goal, you know. Rough deal.

Well, is there any way this can be short-circuited? Is there any way this could be short-circuited? Is there anything else we could do about this? And yes, there is. There's 3D Criss Cross.

Let's supposing the pc has had some preparation. Let's say the pc can be kept in session. Those as requisites. And let's say that some auditor has lost the pc's goals list after finding the wrong one and the pc's kind of ARC broke and it's all invalidated, and we don't know which goal was invalidated, so we don't know quite how to straighten out the invalidation, and it's all sort of rough. Is there any other way to go about it?

Well, the first and foremost method of going about it is to run General O/W on the pc, self – General O/W on self – and make a list of his answers: "What have you done to yourself? What have you withheld from yourself?" And make a list of his answers. This is a real slippery action here.

And then you up and say to him in this many words – you say to him, "Who would you treat like that, mate?"

And of course, this takes him by storm because he hasn't thought of this as an activity. He just thought of this as life. This was him, you see.

"Well, who would you treat like that?" you know. "What have you done to yourself?"

"Well, I've kept myself up late at night."

"Well, what have you withheld from yourself?"

"Bad news."

"What have you done to yourself?"

"Well, I've put myself in the hospital every time I've been feeling bad."

"Well, what have you withheld from yourself?"

"Well, I withheld from myself certain beverages such as coffee."

Goes on like this, and you say, "Well, who would you treat like that?"

And he says, "Gor, a sick person."

And you say, "Who else would you treat like this?"

And he gives you a very nice, neat list. You assess that list and you'll find some part of the 3D package. It's quite an interesting thing.

Be prepared, however, to also not find a part of the pc – of the 3D package because this one can slip to this degree – that you again find only a lock. See, that's not a sure-fire method. A sure-fire method is goal and standard, see?

But that gives you a starting point, and that is a thing which is perfectly usable and perfectly assessable. And if the thing does prove out, and if it does match up properly into a package, of course, you've got a 3D item. Of course, all 3D items are susceptible to test, and that is a way of entering a case because it gives you an item, bang!

All right. Now, let's take up a more specialized case. You may not have been aware of the fact that in this running of Routine 3D, one of your greatest liabilities is clearing the character. Yes, you can come up along the line and take your finger off your number and run a piece of free track. You know, there's free track outside the Goals Problem Mass, and you've had a long lot of look at free track. Most of the engrams you've run are actually pc's free track. This lifetime, in most cases, is free track except where this lifetime has been a total dramatization and a restimulation in an enturbulative area so that the person has had the Goals Problem Mass all his lifetime. Ordinarily, it'd be free track.

So you have free track and then you have the Goals Problem Mass, and these things are two different things.

All right. You got the Goals Problem Mass. Here it is.

Free track. You run the pc down this, and you can find a valence floating free, utterly and completely free, and audit it, and have it slope off to the side, sort of at right angles to the Goals Problem Mass, raise the pc's determinism like mad, everything goes along dandy, everything is beautiful, and the pc will clear without having taken apart the Goals Problem Mass, and this can happen to you running 3D. And you all of a sudden find yourself sitting there looking at a floating needle.

Well, having taught you how to make Clears in some cases, I now have to have the dismal pleasure of teaching you how to wreck them. How do you wreck a Clear? Well, it's very simple.

You take any goal on which the person was run and simply find its modifier, and he will no longer be free of the Goals Problem Mass. That is it. Hell make a head-on collision. So all you have to do is make a – actually just start groping in the direction of the modifier, and you've spoiled a Clear. And they spoil that easily. You can spoil them in auditing far more easily than you can spoil them in life. So you should know this about that because if you did ever accidentally make a Clear, you, of course, are up against it if you didn't know this other trick because nothing will read on the meter.

Yeah, a person feels fine. They don't think they need any auditing yet. Everything's wonderful. A few twitches here and there occasionally, but fine with them, you see. They're Clear. But they're only keyed-out as Clear.

So the trick is just find a goal they have run – or find a goal in any event – and get its modifier. And when you get the modifier, of course, that was still a sleeper, and it was contained in the Goals Problem Mass if it was found in the first place, and it pulls the whole Goals Problem Mass in on the pc with a *clunk*, and it is a pc again, not a C.

You should know this. You should also know why life can key in an oldtime Clear, and why, since 3D came out, we have had a general – any time anybody was indifferently

assessed in the direction of his Goals Problem Mass, don't you see, even though he had been Clear before, he caves in as a Clear rather rapidly. You should know that. All right.

Now, it's a liability doing this because this can make a Clear. And that is about the only thing wrong with 3D Criss Cross, because you don't have a goal to key in the Goals Problem Mass if you accidentally made a Clear.

Because Criss Cross is getting a package without a goal, see. And then after you've got the terminal and opposition terminal, then you find the goal and the modifier and the opposition goal.

So you could go the whole distance here and wind up at the end with a terminal and an opposition terminal of some kind, but these things just by inspection just sort of went *phsssst*. So early in the game, for heaven's sakes, find a goal for one of the items that you find. And I don't think that's in this bulletin. Just find a goal. Just take a moment out and find a goal. You've got an item, it's sitting there, it's banging good and hard. You're going to go on and find some more items. You're going to do some more Criss Cross on the thing, but this is early in the game, find a goal for that item. This item of the pc's – it's this kind of an item is, "Well, that's me. That's me. That certainly is me. I always... If I ever ran across one of them, I'd kill them, and so forth. I won't have anything to do with them personally, you see. That's me," and so forth.

He's in a kind of a mixed state with regard to this item.

And this item is reading beautifully on the meter, and so forth. Everything is going along gorgeously. Well, just let's find out what kind of a goal that person or that thing would have, and then find out what kind of a modifier it might have.

But you don't have to find the modifier right then. You don't have to find it because you can leave that off till later if the pc went Clear. Now all you'd have to do is remember you found a goal for this item. See, I'm talking about a fresh pc from someplace or another, you know, and you haven't got a goal yet. If you've got the goal, why, find a modifier for that goal, and your Goals Problem Mass will come right back in with a clang, and you can go on with your Criss Cross. Okay?

It does have this liability that a person will go Clear on it. Now, we're warning you against clearing people, you see? [laughter] Life is tough.

Now, let's take a Clear – somebody who has been run through to Clear – and let's get an application of Criss Cross. Let's get the person to remember, this Clear to remember, the first goal, preferably, on which he was run. And let's find the modifier to it. Now, that spoils the Clear. That's the end of that.

And let's take the first terminal that was found. Now, he's only got one item, oddly enough. Just a terminal, see. There's no opposition terminal. Must have been the right one, however. And let's take that terminal and let's list: "Who or what would oppose that terminal?" Let's make a list, a long list of these things. And then, having made a long list, bleed the meter, make sure that you got all items. No more needle reaction on asking for further items, and eliminate by assessment until you are left with one item.

And then, having been left with one item, be sure it is the right item out of that list, and check it over just as carefully as you check over anything, but don't take forever about it.

"Who or what would oppose *that* item?" That new item. Do the new item in the same way. Now you get this. Get a list, "Who or what would oppose that?" and so on and etc., and so on and so on.

Well, this is rather unsatisfactory because it gives us a single track, and we're not getting a crisscross. We're getting a sort of a cross-stitch that has just got one side of the X each time, don't you see? And we're missing one half of all of this as we go. See, there's some more things mixed up in all this, and we know there are, and we will be missing them, and we will wind up with only one item. And we want two items. So let's find out, before he was cleared, let's do half of this this way, just as I've told you, you see.

We'll treat that first terminal he found as one of the items, and let's find out, before he was Clear, did he like or dislike that item that was first run on him to clear him. Before he was Clear, did he like or dislike it. And really make him remember this because it's quite important.

If he liked it, you now run the dislike list. If he disliked it, you now run a like list for your second item. And I'll go into that a little more fully in a moment, but that will give you two. Remember, then, that in a person who has had a 3D package already ass – I mean a 3, Routine 3 package already assessed, which is proven out, that you have one item already found. But it requires that you find the other item, another item, at the same time. And you are thinking, of course, "Who or what would oppose that?" gives you the other item, and it doesn't.

There are two tracks. A crisscross of two tracks runs through a Goals Problem Mass. This is what is difficult about it all. And you'll get a skip. You'll skip half of it. If I drew a picture here, you would see it very easily.

You've got your terminal, oppterm, each one represented as a circle. And you've got these two circles. Two circles, two circles, two circles, two circles, see?

Well, you're getting every other circle as you go up on a single side, and you need the X. You need everything connected to everything with a cross-slant, see? And you only got half of this thing if you're just assessing from a single terminal, see? You got the idea?

And it gives you a much more definitive look at the bank to have two sides to this thing.

So remember you have half of this done if a person has ever been assessed on Routine 3. You already have an item. Now, that's dandy. That's dandy, and just leave it at that.

But get the other side with a like or dislike test item. Now, this will all be very, very clean, clear and beautifully understood in about two seconds, so you can stop looking blank. Because let me tell you, now, what a Criss Cross would be from scratch. And this is from scratch.

One: You ask the pc, "What kind of person or being haven't you liked?" Probably better to get the dislike off first. People dislike easier than otherwise.

Now, that's the burning question. "What kind of person or being haven't you liked?"

Now, if you said, "What person" or "Who or what," you see, he would give you "Aunt Agnes" and "Mabeline," and "George Bernard Shaw," and so forth. And these things are relatively useless to you. They're not sufficiently generalized, so you snake him into giving a generalized term, and you put yourself right up on top right away. And you make a *long* list of this thing.

Well, I frankly don't care whether you bleed this list or not. Just make sure it's a nice long list. Don't let it go to fifteen hundred items or something like that. Any one of these – I would consider a hundred an unusually long list. A hundred items, *aaaah*, that's pretty long. Be perfectly prepared to go to that and if the pc gives it to you, well, take them. But this is getting awfully lengthy at a hundred, you see. Eighty. Eighty would probably be more natural. Average list might very well be no more than fifteen or twenty, see? So that's why I say a hundred would be awfully long.

All right. "Who or what haven't you liked, mate?" would produce "Aunt Agatha," "Mabeline," "Uncle Bill," and so forth, and we want "a disagreeable bum," see, "a cockeyed marine," "a parachutist." See? We want burning items that will go backtrack and "Aunt Mabeline" will not go backtrack. [laughter]

So we have this. Now, it doesn't give us the pluralities that we might get. And you could vary the question so that you got plural answers, like "criminals." And you can say, "What kind of people or beings haven't you liked?" if you wanted to go into that. However, this doesn't require all that precision.

I tell you that on 3D Criss Cross, you can blow your brains out with precision that is not necessary. You would remind me of the ensign, who, having taken a sight with a sextant he left out all night and sat on and dropped on the deck, and had its prism missing, and besides didn't get the North Star but shot the truck light [laughter], then goes in and by the hour calculates with the greatest, neatest, mathematical precision that he is within six and a quarter millimeters of a certain drop of water in the ocean, you see? Calculation is terrific, you see, and the data from which he is taking it is the roughest kind of a shotgun shot that anybody ever had, see?

Because this is a real shotgun shot, you see? The possibility of his actually coming up with a 3D item with his test list is quite remote. Because you're not asking him against any goal. You're not asking him against any stable data. He doesn't even really know what you're asking him for.

But you get a nice, long list. And then number two, you null that list and locate one item that remains or was last in.

That means you would actually be allowed to go down the line and have them all null except "a machine." And "a machine" was the last one in. So the machine was the last one in. Well, it had something to do with something.

Now, supposing you had the terrific misfortune of being left with three alive that you couldn't get rid of. Well, you either have three powerful locks or maybe even three 3D items. Well, it doesn't mention it in this bulletin, but all the time you're working with this, you keep

a data sheet over here. And every time you find an item or something on the pc, mark it independently of the lists. In other words, keep all the lists, too, and keep them circled, and do anything you want with that, but you find you wind up with an item, you also write it over here on this data list, see, and any other data that you want to write with it so you can identify that item.

All right. We take off, then, with this as a *test item*. We call that a test item, the item we found resulting from this list.

See, that's a very simple operation. Anybody could do this. You can do this on almost anybody. You could actually do it on somebody who was relatively unassessable, which is quite interesting – which makes it very interesting to you, extremely interesting.

Now, you come over here and write that item in, whatever it was, anything you want to write about it. Now, the one thing I want you to remark on such an item list is what gave the pc somatics. That I want you to remark on. Any time the pc said *ouch* or he had a pain – an actual pain, not a sensation – why, write it down. Somatic. And any time he had a *gloozle* of energy going through his *goozlum*, and it was giving him a sensation, you write down *that* as part of that item. And also when listing, and he calls any of this to your attention. It was Buffalo Bill he passed by, and you're nulling Buffalo Bill, and he suddenly looks at you, and you say, "What's the matter?"

And he says, "Well, I had an awful pain of an arrow going through my back at that moment."

And you say, "Well, that's very interesting," and write opposite "Buffalo Bill" – on the nulling list, not on the main list – write "somatic," see?

You see what we're doing. We're being very smart. We're tracing so that we can identify the terminal when we finally wind up, see? And we can finally look back through and scout down and find the terminal right on the button. So this is a neat way of going about it. All right. So much for that.

We have now nulled one list, and we have wound up with one test item. We've written it over here on a separate sheet of paper, and we have clearly marked it a test item. That doesn't mean that it's a 3D item.

All right. Now, we turn around and we ask the pc, "What kind of person or being have you liked?"

Now, I don't care how strong you make this. Some pcs are stronger than others, and some pcs would much better respond to "Whom have you absolutely, completely, detestably, despised with hatred?"

And the pc smiles, you see, and he thinks that is very nice because it includes everybody he ever ran into. [laughter]

And on the other one, you'll find pcs that incline in the other direction, and you have to say to them – not "What kind of a person have you liked?" You see – you'll have to say, "Whom have you desperately adored?" [laughter] Don't you see? "Whom have you loved?" You see? That sort of thing.

You can make these as strong as it seems to appeal to the pc. You know, you say, "Well, what kind of person have you liked?"

And the pc looks at you rather tepidly, you see, and says, "Well, well, just people, just people."

"Yeah, well, whom have you – what kind of person have you loved?" you see?

"Oh, men, men. Usually men."

Well, shift your question around: "What kind of person have you absolutely, thrillingly adored?"

And he says, "Well, there's just schoolteachers, uh, schoolteachers, librarians, uh, railroad engineers, uh, professional men, yes," you see?

You ask them the question that gets them the list. But remember that it's the love-hate duo that you're using here. You've already assessed for hate or dislike, and you're not going to assess for like or love. And you're going to make another list, and you're going to ask the pc that. And then you're going to null the list and locate one item as in two. And that again is a test item, and you put it over here.

And when you've got the first test item, you had better write whether or not it produced a somatic or didn't produce a somatic, and you had better also say "liked" or "disliked" on those two items to identify the list. Okay?

If it was the liked list, you write "liked," and if it was the dislike list, you write "disliked" on it. That gives you a little further clue, you see?

All right. Now, you're off to the races. You've got two points located in nowhere but which are, nevertheless, takeoff points. And these are just test items. They're not 3D items at all.

Now. Now, you play the old game which you know so very, very well. On each one of these, you're going to run: "Who or what would oppose that (blank)?"

So you take a piece of paper and you write across the top of it: "Who or what would oppose a schoolteacher?" – what you wound up with, see. And you get a long list of whatever it is, and you proceed on through. You bleed it down if you can, and then null the whole list.

One of the ways of bleeding down is asking the pc, "Well, are you satisfied that any of those items are it?" And it sometimes will produce a search for some additional items. That's almost as good as bleeding the meter. That's just a little side trick I've used. "Are you satisfied that any of the items you've given me are it?"

And then he has to inspect this thing, you know, and he says, "What was the question again?"

"Well, the question was, 'Who or what would oppose a schoolteacher?'"

"Well, have we written down inkwells?"

And "Well, all right." You see, and that's just the same as bleeding the meter.

Then if finally you null the remainder, and so forth, he says, "Well, that's it. That's it. It is inkwells. Yeah. I got it. That's why the mass is black. I know now. I understand that." He even has a cognition on it, see?

Now, that is your first possible 3D item. The remaining item. Now, that's highly probably a 3D item. But you write it down whether it had a somatic or not and whether it proceeded from the other item or not. In other words, this was an item which proceeded from a "Who or what (so on)?" But we don't really care whether these two match up or the list is kept that neatly straight because this thing has run to collision, is what it has run to.

You're taking two different tracks, and they're going to come on to a head-on collision eventually.

Then we take the second item, the second test item, we do the same thing with it – identically the same thing with it. And we run that on down. And we get another potential 3D item, and that will probably either be the term or oppterm. And you've got a package there that possibly you could do something with, but that we don't do anything with it.

We use those two items now, and we take a new sheet of paper, and we write on top of it one of them, and we make a list of who or what would oppose it, and we bleed it down, and we null that whole thing, and we write that over here on the list, you see?

And then we take the second one that we actually found, we write that on a sheet of paper, and we write a list for that, and then we bleed it down, and we null the whole thing, and that gives us another item.

And we just keep on collecting items. And we just go on and on and on and on collecting items until we can't collect anything else.

And we say, "All right. Who or what would oppose a waterbuck?"

And he says, "A tiger."

And we say – we'd say, "Well, that ended that list." And we try to bleed it down, and we get nothing but a rock slam, see.

All right. "Who or what would oppose a tiger?"

"A waterbuck."

All right. And you'll find out those two lists will eventually collide. Even though they started rather far apart and went through tremendous vicissitudes, and you found lots of items, you now have guaranteed that you've got 3D items. You couldn't have anything else.

See, that is just assessment by *kwam!* You also have walked well upgrade while you were doing this. And you have also blown several sacks of raisins. They're now went. So there you go. You'll wind up then with a package. It becomes impossible to get any other package. See?

Now, you go ahead at that point and find your goal, and you find your opposition goal, and you find the modifier to the package, and you get the package all taped out. And that's the package, and that's the way it is.

Now, make fairly sure, make pretty darn sure that as you get these items, they're not wrong items because that can throw you a curve and walk you back out of the Goals Problem Mass, you see? Let's make sure that that item hung fire. Let's make sure that item stayed in. Let's make sure this thing didn't go astray. Let's do it with the rudiments in, and let's be careful as we proceed.

All right. There's one further note to make on this because, of course, if you get the wrong item, you're taking off from a lock, and you are not likely to travel the same course as you were taking off from an actual item each time.

Number 1, This cuts down restimulation.

Number 2, It has fantastic therapeutic repercussions on the pc. In spite of himself, he feels much better. He can't argue about this one. He's blowing them in all directions.

And Number 3. It cuts down the amount of error which you might make because even if you missed on one of the curves, your possibility is that you just lengthened the number of assessments you had to do. You've just given – you've had to do some additional assessments before you got back into the mass again.

And number 4, Gives us a method of upgrading which runs like this: A pc got a package. Pc already got a package. Pc now running package. Pc very happy with package. Pc all set with package. Everything going beautifully with package. You can crisscross it. You take the package the pc has got and you crisscross it.

The funny part of the thing is, you will go on a grand tour, and the probability is that if he was running a center track package or a rather early track package, he'll walk back into the same package again, but this time with terrific clarity. He'll feel wonderful about this package, you see. And this also runs very quickly and will discharge very rapidly.

In other words, you can go on the complete excursion of Criss Cross and get back to the package again, which is rather startling. And you will have blown off all the locks that were making it hang fire. You know, it would have run anyhow, but you can just blow all these locks perforce by recognition and he knows what they were surrounded by and how it all links up together now, and so forth, and he's in better shape.

We were trying this a little bit earlier. I was telling you an upgrade, and all you did was go ahead and find a new package of some kind or another, and the pc became considerably depressed because he didn't think he was going to get a chance to run his old package. And the new package didn't appeal to him as much as the old package did, or something like this, see?

Well, in this particular way, if that was the package he should have been running, believe me, he'll come right on back and run it. And if it's not the package he should have been running, then he would have been on it much longer, and he will come into the package he is running. But he will now know what package he is in the middle of and how.

Now, there's nothing wrong with continuing to run a pc on a package he is running well on. Nobody is asking you to do otherwise than this. But also part of running that very package would be to do a Criss Cross on it. You could just start out. Now, you take his termi-

nal and run "Who or what would oppose that?" Pay no attention to the oppterm he's already got, you see? You don't keep that on the list.

By the way, don't keep any old items on. Don't carry an item forward on the list.

Well, you got a Criss Cross from "a waterbuck," see? And it wound up with "a tiger," see? And then – you null down and you've got "a tiger." And now you do a new list of "Who or what would oppose a tiger?" Don't perforce put "waterbuck" on it, see? Put only on each list each time what the *pc* has given you. See, don't carry your old item over. You'd have a tendency to do this because all it does is start hanging the *pc* with what he already has. If it's right he will move right on back to it anyhow anyway, and there you'll be at. Very simply. Okay?

In other words, you can take any package a *pc* is running and go on a conducted Cook's tour of the Goals Problem Mass, blow off locks in all directions, soften the whole thing up, blow a tremendous number of cognitions, and you will either walk back to the exact one he is running or an upgrade that will run better. And it's quite amusing that it will go back to the same package again after turning all the way around through a tour of the bank – if it is a middle track package. It's quite funny. It's quite funny.

But having done this, you will find you come back to running the package, and he will now have pictures when he wasn't running with good pictures before. In other words, it takes that much charge off of it.

Now, your next action with this: You can take a *pc* who is having present time problems all the time and run a Criss Cross on him without even intending to get a 3D package, and you will produce some of the wildest changes he ever cared to have. Quite interesting.

You're not even interested in getting a 3D package. In other words, you've got a day or two to audit this *pc*, and you want to produce a remarkable change on the *pc*, and you can read his needle, and you can keep him in session. Well, you could go ahead and do the first few steps of a Criss Cross, and it'll land right squarely in the middle of the present time problem he's sitting in. That's the first thing it hits.

See, and he feels wonderful about this sort of thing. So it stands as a totally independent operation, if anything else, which I think is quite amusing

Well, now, that is quite a package, and that's quite a bag of tricks all by itself. And it has many uses. As I've studied it over, I've seen tremendous numbers of uses to this thing.

One of the uses is prove up a package. Well, you got the package on a standard run. You had the *pc*'s goal, so you went ahead and found the rest of the package, and so forth, and you found the opposition terminal and there it sits. And you say this is all fine, and this is ready to run. Good. Run a Criss Cross on it and run it until it can't be anything else, and then for sure you have the package, don't you see?

The other thing is, it is an excellent way of finding out which is the terminal because as you run down the list every time the *pc* says ouch, you mark what made him say ouch. And you will rapidly find out which side of this stuff the *pc* is normally on. Is the *pc* on the no change side of the ledger, always?

You look at it, you know. You say, "Well, what do you know."

You can finally wind up at the other end and you will always hit it right on the button. In other words, you never have to do a test run, one side, then the other side, or make the pc dizzy or uncomfortable or anything like that because he's already been saying *ouch*.

Just every time he said ouch, you looked at what you were nulling at that time or looked at the item that you were putting down as the "ouch" item, and this "ouch" item will be the terminal every time. Very interesting. And that every time he got dizzy and foggy and upset in some fashion or other, or had electronic sensations going madly across the fields in front of him – in other words, he had sensation that didn't add up to any change or somatic – you were probably running the oppterm at that time.

In other words, you were nulling the oppterm. So you quickly find out that "people who change everything around" is inevitably the oppterm, and "people who never change anything" is inevitably the term. And you'll find out that's the way he's sitting. And that's the attack line he's always been on.

And you'll find some other pc, he quite likely has as change... You see, then, not all games are change-no change. I'm just giving the idea they could be any kind of a – well, any of your Scientology combinations can make up one of these games. He's always the create side of the ledger, see. *Ouch*, you know.

You say, "Well, a design engineer."

"Ouch," you see.

And you're going over it, and he says so on and so on and so on. And he says, "A pain at the back of my neck and so forth," and you've got it all set. And you scratch it all out, and you just mark in – "somatic," see? You'll find these things get studded with somatics, you know.

And then over here on your final recapitulation list, you'll have "somatic" marked in here. Design engineer, painter, sculptor – somatic, somatic, somatic, somatic. Town builder, planet designer. You know, they're all *ouch, ouch, ouch*. And destructive types who insist on no creation of any kind whatsoever – they're always *dzzzzzz*, you know, *dzzoo-wuug*, you know, or *zzzzzz*. In other words, the winds of space, that kind of phenomena.

And you'll get it as you run down the bank. And you – of course, after you've done a lot of these things, you can spot them, and you will know which side is which. You can hit it right there. Put the commands together; the pc will run like a shot duck.

All right. Now, you've got something to learn then, haven't you, because some of you I've seen take... This was much earlier of course, and doesn't apply to now for the older students, but applies definitely to those people who are here recently. If they have an idea that it takes two or three sessions, or preferably two or three weeks, to write down a – I'm sorry to get sarcastic like this, but I have to do that. I ran a lock off of "a sarcastic professor" the other day, so I have to take advantage of this because I'm free to do it now, you see? And I used to just writhe under this. This made me wince because it was defeating everything in the shop.

Two or three weeks to write down twenty labels or items, you see, or test items, and then assess them and null them all. This didn't seem to me to be optimum.

I would consider that if you could not find three or four test items in a session, you were slipping. Just raise your sights. Of course, that's impossible. I have a hard time auditing that fast myself. Oh, I'll give you something to shoot at.

I will settle for an item per session. I'll settle for an item per session, because that's what it's been taking me. But that is not too difficult, an item per session. But don't you go dragging out two sessions with no item. Not on Criss Cross.

On standard 3D package – oh, yes, by all means. Getting them checked out, proving them up, all that kind of thing – oh, yes, that's a different proposition entirely, but not on this.

First place, they're very easy to find; in the second place, they're very available; in the third place, the pc gives them out; the fourth place, the pc is in-session just *obsessively*. You start running these things, of course, he's in one valence, then he's in another valence and he's another valence and he's another valence and he starts to look like a raisin. [laughter] Just one right after the other, *bangety-bangety-bangety-bang*. And he gets – he's really in there tight.

All right. Well, that is Criss Cross. That is Havingness. That is Twenty-Ten. And of course, there are a lot of other things I could tell you, but at the present moment, you haven't got the time, so well have to take it up later. All right?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you.

TWENTY-TEN, 3D CRISS CROSS

A lecture given on 9 January 1962

Thank you.

Well, you look different. You do, you know.

We had a bit of water under the dam, over the bridge, since I've been gone. I had a wonderful congress, absolutely fabulous congress in DC. People thought it was wonderful. Almost ruined me, but probably saved Scientology United States without much trouble. They were running on American meters which had been manufactured, God help us. If any of you've got American meters, there's a garbage can out there. Because these things were built, you know, without any consultation with me, and across – over my dead body, practically, on circuit changes, and so forth.

And this is not propaganda, but by George, you know, they don't pick up withholds. And that left practically all the Scientologists in the United States with missed withholds. Just like that. Bang! And that was what was the matter.

And the first day of that congress, I had to just scrape them up off the floor. It was the hardest show to get on the road you ever wanted to see.

Got to talking to them about withholds, told them what was wrong, and so forth, and they came right along with it. Laid into the organization along about Tuesday. They had by that time three British meters, and they all of a sudden had been finding that there was practically one missed withhold per question on the Joburg, and things like this. And their morale started going up. Everything started moving along very well in the field, and so forth. A lot of excitement about this.

Very funny. The people came to the congress with big plans on how to rewire and salvage American meters. And they took a look at the British Mark IV and saw the thing in operation and just scrapped the American meters. Actually, it was all over the floor that they should scrap American meters. Just skip them.

But Reg gave a demonstration, very ably done, and had an American meter element of all things in the projector, and we got a pc, a field auditor's pc, and he ran her there on the stage, and the withholds were pretty juicy. [laughter] And they were all missed across the boards, and Reg glancing back at me in the wings because it was an American meter, you know, should he pull more, you know, and I told him I thought there were probably two more.

So although they weren't showing on the meter, he went right ahead and pulled two more. [laughter]

And then, of course, I stepped on and told people, "Well, you see what missed withholds do." This girl, by the way, started looking very bright and so forth, after she had been looking rather gloomy at first. And I gave the auditor who audited her – I didn't even know his name, you see – I gave him hell and Maria and mischief, and said people shouldn't do that sort of thing, you know, and really cut it up. His mother wrote me a congratulatory letter saying it was about time somebody took him apart. [laughter, laughs]

But anyway, anyway, it was a great congress, and things are really rolling very nice.

But there was a great deal of technical data suddenly swung into place while I was gone. Had some time to think and consolidate a few things. Got a look at havingness amongst other things, and havingness in its relationship to withholds. That was the main thing

And out of this you get Twenty-Ten on which you have just had a bulletin. And I think you'll find Twenty-Ten really makes a pc soar. If it doesn't, you haven't got his withholds off or you haven't got his Havingness Process. But in view of the fact that a withhold cuts down havingness – that's all you can say about that, a withhold cuts down havingness – and when you get the withhold off, all you have is potential new havingness.

I better start at the beginning. This is the 9th of January, [*female voice: Yes.*] and this is the mystic month. The mystic month, 9 Jan. You know what a jann is, don't you? It's a ghost from Arabia. And this is the mystic month. This is month of mystic mystics. We're going to cure them this month.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

This business about havingness, now, this is very important. Havingness had as many as forty-three different reasons why it worked. And you'd be very interested that it came down to a child's definition. The sixth lecture of that Washington congress, by the way – January 52 [62] congress – one whole hour is devoted to this, and so forth. And a very concise rundown, if I say so myself. I'm going to give it to you in about thirty seconds. That is to say, that havingness is best understood by no-havingness. And I had this in the bull pen for, oh, I don't know, seven years, trying to get the common denominator of what havingness was so that it could then be applied to auditing, and so on.

And all of a sudden, Reg ran some havingness on me, and I kind of took a look at it, and we had an error going in the session, and all of a sudden boom! Why, I suddenly realized what havingness was. It's best understood by the reverse definition. What is no-havingness?

No-havingness is the concept that one cannot reach. I know this is so elementary it's going to take you twenty-four hours for it to dawn on you. Anybody knows this, you know. Everybody always knew this except nobody knew it until the other day.

No-havingness is prevented reach, in other words. Concept of no reach, no-havingness. All right. And then havingness is simply the concept that one is able to reach, and that is all havingness is. One merely has to have the idea that he can reach something in order to have it. You see, you don't have to reach it in order to have it. You merely have to have the

concept that you can reach it. And that is havingness. And out of forty-three chances in which this definition did not occur, we all of a sudden have a common denominator to havingness.

Now, this is of tremendous value to you as an auditor. We're back, of course, on Reach and Withdraw. And we're back into the common denominators of communication and all these old-time proven truths. And we're right there, you see. And that is, Havingness fits right into the bracket at once.

So now I'll give it to you with the twelve-inch-gauge barrel. On the other hand, a person with a withhold, of course, has the concept that he can't reach. So withholds reduce havingness. I mean, that's... And therefore running withholds improves havingness. It is so elementary. There is nothing really to it, except it is one of these sweeping truths like the world is round. I mean, it'll make that much difference.

All right. Now, let's look at this. Let's look at this a little bit further.

This tells you that the moment when a pc has released a withhold, he has a potential reach. And if you don't capitalize on it in the very near future, of course, he doesn't realize that anything new or strange has happened to him, very often. He gets off a withhold and it doesn't do him any good.

You've seen that happen, you know? The fellow gives up a withhold and all of a sudden it doesn't seem to do him any good. Well, the reason it doesn't seem to do him any good is he hasn't practiced reaching since. You're waiting for the accidental: Three or four days from now he all of a sudden finds out he can reach in that particular quarter, don't you see?

Well, instead of leaving it on automatic and just letting him find out about it suddenly, well, straight away, why, after you've pulled a few withholds run some Havingness, that's all. And you run the withholds, and you run the Havingness, and you run the withholds, and you run the Havingness.

And the reason I tried to figure out some reasonable ratio – and that auditors can remember it is the better reason for the exact ratio than any other reason – call it Twenty-Ten, and that's twenty minutes of withholds pulled and ten minutes of Havingness, no matter where you're sitting in the withholds, see? No matter what part of the question you've gotten, whether you've gotten a question flat or not flat, it doesn't matter because you're going to come back to that question anyway.

I had to do some experimental workouts on this to smooth it out, and that apparently is the way it sits. So it doesn't matter then, you just say, "Well, we'll come back to this question later," or anything you care to say to the pc, and, "Right now we're going to run some Havingness."

And just do that on the twenty-minute mark, and you'll find that you're – if you run the Havingness ten minutes, why, you're all set. Now, the rule of Havingness is you should run Havingness until the pc can have large objects in the room. But you know very well that a lot of Havingness Processes out of the thirty-six don't tell you whether the pc can have large objects or not.

Now, Havingness will run to a rise in the needle and then a blowdown. You'll get a rise, rise, rise, rise, rise, rise. You watch the needle, and the tone arm keeps following it on up, on up, on up, on up, and all of a sudden the tone arm blows down.

Well, it would be optimum to run it to blowdown if some pcs didn't wait for two or three sessions to blow down. So that's why we don't use blowdown as a criteria when to stop running Havingness. Just run it ten minutes. That's good enough, and you'll find out that will do a lot of good.

Now, test the havingness after the first eight or ten commands. After the first eight or ten commands, get the second can squeeze.

In other words, when you start to run the Havingness, get the can squeeze. You get your needle set, you see, so that you'll get a third-of-a-dial drop or something like that. Just make a crude estimate of it. Swing your sensitivity back down, don't you see, from where it's been while you were security checking.

And get him to squeeze the cans and watch the degree of squeeze. Well, that's fine. Run eight or ten commands and ask for a second squeeze. And if it drops more, the needle drops more, and it is looser, you're all right, see? You're okay.

And if it doesn't loosen up at that point, of course, your rudiments could be badly out or something like this could happen, but the point is the Havingness Process should put the rudiments in.

In other words, you should get a loosening needle even – if the pc is doing it at all, you should get a loosening needle on the Havingness Process. So although some wisdom will occasionally monitor this and you will do something else like ask him if he has an ARC break or something like that, you ordinarily – and this practice would not go wrong at all – you would ordinarily get another Havingness Process. And you just keep testing for Havingness Processes. And that does not go on the Twenty-Ten. You see, that time stands alongside of the Twenty-Ten. If you have to find a new Havingness Process, you don't count that into the Twenty-Ten. And then you find it finally, and you run ten minutes of that, and you go back to your withholds.

Now, you're going to find out that a pc – the more intricate or oddball the Havingness Process you find for the pc is, the more – higher probability is that it's going to wear out. And you usually come down to something like "Point out something." That will last a long time. "Look around here and find something you can have." When you finally get on to that and it's running smoothly, it generally will run practically forever.

But "What is the emotion of that room object?" you see? Oh, man, I mean, that thing can wear out, clang! By the way, that is a remark that is seldom made about Havingness Processes. That particular one, you know, is a changed process. After a little while the emotion runs out, and their Havingness Process changes – and you might not have known this – but changes to "What is the condition of that room object?" What is the condition of it instead of what is its emotion. But you realize that that thing changed. I don't think it's written down anyplace. I don't think it's written down anywhere. Might be. It might be in a lecture someplace. But there is that point about it. That one goofball thing

Now, getting back to Twenty-Ten, I would advise you, at this time, not to security check any other way because it capitalizes on your withholds. And you'll find out it should work like a hot bomb.

Now, if this is working properly and you are actually pulling withholds on the pc, and all is going along splendidly, and you're not missing withholds at every turn, and so on, and the Havingness Process is working, you actually – running this on some character off the street, something like that – should produce some interesting miracles. I mean, some interesting things should happen to the case just as a result of this.

Now, there's another mechanic that I haven't told anybody, and that's this: The oldest test of circuits shows that when you run Havingness, when you run Havingness, the circuits key out and move out of the person's perimeter and out of his head. These black-mass circuits, that are mentioned in Book One, they key out and move out of the person's head.

(...)

SEC CHECKS, WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on 10 January 1962

Thank you.

Oh, you like me today. [laughter]

All right. Good enough. This is what?

Audience: 10th.

Is this the 10th? No kidding. 10 Jan. 6-2, AD 12, planet Earth – I guess. I guess.

Now, we have a terrific amount of ground to cover because you're way behind. [laughter]

You've got the nasty problem of having to confront effectiveness. And this is a summary of 3D Criss Cross, being the latest and the most. And you're in the very, very nasty position of having to confront effectiveness. And this is a wicked position for you to be in because I know what the processes can do if they are properly used. And it's now pretty easy to do these things providing you are perfect. That's all that's required.

Absolutes are unobtainable, as many of you will quote at me on occasion. And you'll say, therefore, we cannot have a perfect score because absolutes are unobtainable. I just say, "Well, I said that." [laughter]

What you've got to face up to is that people, because you've been here, will expect the impossible from you, and all you've got to go – do is go ahead and do the impossible.

And the advent of the impossible occurs with Twenty-Ten and 3D Criss Cross.

Now, you haven't yet, right here, seen these things in full, flamboyant action, and it's quite interesting. That's why I say you've got to catch up. Because I know where these things sit and I know what they are about and I know what they're capable of. And you have already seen very excellent Security Checking do some interesting things with cases, haven't you? Yeah, you've seen people brighten up and all that sort of thing.

All right. Now, what if you were able to take Security Checking and without any unusual questions – no unusual questions or no unusual action on your part but just doing what you exactly could do – produce some fantastic results just on standard Security Checks and so forth, on a case that has some psychosomatic difficulty. Some nice, tough, rough, psychosomatic difficulty.

Well, all you have to know is your Class II skills and be highly standard and it would be no strain on you of any kind whatsoever.

In other words, there's the case. And he's moaning and groaning and screaming that he's got lumbosis up to his ears, and there he is. And wouldn't it be very nice if you, simply by

auditing this case directly with your routine actions and so forth, made him snap and pop and come out of it, and the lumbosis vanished, and so forth. That would be very nice, wouldn't it? Be very nice.

Well, you have that, potentially, in this Twenty-Ten. There you have it, but you should know the basics of Security Checking. The basics of Security Checking

If you know the basics and fundamentals of Security Checking, then you check with the basics and fundamentals of it, and therefore you can produce some interesting reactions and actions in cases.

And this is quite, quite pertinent, then, that you shouldn't be going around security checking by ritual. There's a considerable danger in your just sitting there security checking by ritual. You should security check by fundamentals. And if you security check by definition or fundamental, then you'll have the most relaxed time of it you ever had and you won't be worrying so much about ritual. Because here's what happens to you.

Because you don't quite grasp a fundamental, the next thing you know, somebody stiffens up the ritual. See, that's rather inevitable. And then because you don't quite grasp the fundamentals, then they again stiffen up the ritual. And the next thing you know, you're a ritualist. You're just doing everything by the count and you don't understand quite what you're doing, and so forth.

And you – therefore you can depart a considerable distance from effective auditing in auditing by ritual only, you see?

The thing to do is to get the job done, do you see? In the first place, auditing is what you can get away with. And that is what auditing is. What you can get away with, with the pc. Sounds almost criminal, but it's a fact. I have sat down with no Model Session, rudiments, or anything else with a pc who has withholds from here to Halifax, and taken his lumbosis and thrown it in the nearest ashcan.

And years later he's writing me a letter saying, "Well, Ron, I'll just never forget that auditing session you gave me."

And you would have stood there with your hair on end wondering what the devil I was doing. Well, I was doing nothing but auditing the pc. And it was what I got away with, see? It was what I got away with.

Now, because you can't get away with everything, why, a ritual gets laid down circumscribing what you should try to get away with. But remember that within that ritual or within that rote, you still have an enormous amount of things that you can get away with. You see what I'm talking about here?

Now, let's say we run a good Model Session. Well, I use Model Session because it's a good thing, not because it's a ritual. But because it covers those points *bang, bang, bang*, that are liable to give you trouble.

But let me tell you this about Model Session: Some pcs can't be audited in Model Session. Isn't that an interesting thing to know? They can't be audited in Model Session. Now,

why can't they be audited in Model Session? Because you'd never get past about the third question in the beginning rudiments.

Let's take a pc with a bank that is absolutely *crawling*, see, with withholds of some kind or another, present time problems all over the spot, and so forth. And instead of going into session, he goes out of session because these aren't the things that have to be hit.

In other words, you could imagine a case that is so critically poised – he is not a case which is being audited, don't you see, routinely and regularly. He is a case that has just come to you; he's critically poised in that you have to find out what the mind is doing in order to parallel it. And because you have to find out what the mind is doing in order to parallel it, if you did a Model Session – now I'm talking about neurotic and psychotic cases, you understand – if you did a Model Session, or tried to do a Model Session, you would immediately find yourself in a cul-de-sac because the case is not that much concentrated or in communication.

Now, let's take an extreme case. Let's take a madman in a cell, and he's spinning around like mad, you see. You're going to run Model Session on this madman, are you? Oh, hell you are. But oddly enough, oddly enough, Scientology could handle him as it exists today, see? Just that. This is fascinating. And under the exact definitions of Security Checking, Scientology could handle him.

Well, you can't even get him to hold on to an E-Meter, you understand? He couldn't concentrate that far. Well, you say, "What the devil kind of Security Checking is Ron talking about now?"

Well, I'm talking about basic and fundamental Security Checking. Why is he insane?

Well, he's insane because he's keyed in an insane valence. Well, how did he key it in? Well, he keyed it in, obviously, by withholding. He's got withholds.

All right. So just by definition, we know a 3D Goals Problem Mass – see, we know that the thing exists. We know if this fellow's insane, it isn't something that happened to him in this lifetime. You may not have thought this thought all the way through in your auditing and assessing, but it – *nothing* has ever happened to anybody in this lifetime which was capable of driving them even faintly worried. See, nothing. Why, just wash it out.

People come around, and they tell you, "Well, my mother and father left me at a very early age, and I was on the streets by myself. And I learned to steal from garbage cans, and so forth, and that's why I am what I am today."

I generally ask them, "What was the author of that sociology textbook?" You see, because it doesn't have anything to do with them or their case or anything else, you see?

Well, answer this one. The fellows who have run into the mental field and run out again hurriedly and taken up psychiatry – something else distantly removed from the mind – they've consistently made this kind of an error, that they've tried to attribute all difficulties to this lifetime, you see? And then they've hung themselves. That's why you mustn't let somebody push you into saying, "Well, really, past lives is just a theory." Theory, hell. You can't make anybody well if you audit this lifetime only. You should know that. A lot of you here

have tried it and nothing very spectacular happened. You got rid of some somatics for the pc, and so forth. But the pc was still back in there, his old, grubby self very shortly afterwards. You ever notice how consistently that occurred? All right.

This one boy, his father and his mother leaves him, and he leaves him on the street, and he has to eat out of garbage cans, and he goes bad and becomes a big-bad-wolf gangster or something of the sort, and there we have it.

And the next one's father and mother left him and he had to eat out of garbage cans and he went to the – in the orphans' home and he just had all of the reasons why he should have had just as dreadful a time. And we meet him and talk to him and he's fairly successful these days. He's a salesman or something.

Well, you can't find the cause in this lifetime. So people then can say, "Well, of course, there's no answer to the human mind because you can't find the cause for difficulties in this lifetime." Do you see how that would be?

Well, they confuse this lifetime with the fundamentals of the mind, and they make mistakes on this line ever since. They've been doing it ever since they've tried to do this, you see?

Because this fellow is insane. He's keyed-in from Arcturus, Arslucus, to hell and gone back someplace or another, and he probably went nuts by processing invader troops as they came in through the spaceport, you see. Only he processed them, not the way we're doing it, he processed them with a little copper skullcap, see. And they'd blast these birds down, you see, and they'd throw this copper skullcap on them, and they'd give them the *zzzzurb-byut*. Because they knew what would happen, you see. The fellow would just exit out of the body he was in, go back and pick up another body, he'd pick up another rocket ship, and now he knew where you were, and come in and shoot hell out of you, you see? That was the way it used to be.

So, of course, you *had* to give him some processing of some kind or another or he'd really mess you up. I mean, that was the way they thought about it.

And after he'd done about ten thousand of them, and a lot of them had gone insane, you see, and spinning, and so forth, why, he himself, you see, got this all associated with the Goals Problem Mass. And after he'd been at it fifteen, twenty, thirty thousand years, you see, he eventually began to get the idea that he was a little shaky in his wits.

And then one day he went overboard in some fashion. He did some particularly outrageous thing like they had just bombed a town, and all the inmates of the insane asylum were running out in the streets. So he sat there back of the zap gun, and for no good reason at all, since he merely could have corralled them, he just shot them down one by one to see them squirm and scream. And then he occasionally wasn't himself after this, you see?

After a few more minor incidents of this particular character on the whole track, he has eventually developed a circuit package which is an insane person. He's got a good one now.

All right. We find this madman in the insane asylum. What's he doing in the insane asylum? How did he get there? What duress did it take to put him there? What overts did he have to commit to put him there? Well, they're all packaged up in a valence and he's sitting in the valence and there he is.

It's quite fascinating that crazy people can be clicked through valences just as fast as you can snap your fingers. You can click them into almost any valence you can think of.

In other words, they're susceptible to valences. Very. They go through the barrier and you can just go click, click, click. I've had an insane person being a dog, being a girl, being a boy, being a woman, being a dog, almost as fast as you could count.

"Oh, you'd like to see me be a dog, huh? *Woof; woof; woof*" And she'd be jumping all over the floor, and so forth.

Only she thought this was a sincere activity, and she thought she was a dog while she was doing that. Quite interesting.

But anyway, what do we find here, then?

Well, we find a madman in a cell who has a keyed-in valence. Now, you for sure are not going to run out all the times he's gunned down insane people. That's for sure. Not the way he is. And yet you've got to start somewhere.

And we come right back to the basics and fundamentals of Security Checking. It is the not-know they have run on other people that results in a withhold on themselves.

So what basic and fundamental question could you ask this fellow and get him to answer that would start keying out this package called insanity? You could simply ask him, "What don't people know about you?"

And you know, he'd answer it? It's so fundamental he couldn't help but answer it.

You could actually spring that valence. In other words, move that valence off of him, and he'd turn sane.

Girl up in a hospital up here not too long ago, estranged from her family, very upset and dying. Nasty situation withal.

I tried to get an auditor to go up and process her. I didn't make the grade on this particular activity, mostly because, when the auditor went up, the medicos had this girl on a cot out in a corridor or something of the sort or parked in the laundry room or something because the hospital was overcrowded and there wasn't any way anybody could do it, and nobody would let the auditor come near the patient. You know, standard hospital procedure.

And in overcrowded hospital conditions today, it's nothing for an accident victim to lie six hours on a stretcher someplace without attention in a hospital. If I had anybody smashed up in an automobile accident, I wouldn't take them to a hospital. I'd do something else.

But anyway, this girl was in very bad condition. She was lying there and she was about to pass in her chips. And I didn't get her processed, but the only thing I would have done if I *had* gotten near her is, "What doesn't your family know?" See, "What doesn't your family know about you? What have you been doing your family doesn't know about?" Now,

she had a dreadful, incurable disease and you would have seen this thing gradually blow away. Because she was a young girl, and she was only worried about her family. So obviously her family didn't know something about her, see? Get the fundamental? Now, how fundamental can you get?

Now, if you'd gotten to process her before she died – because she did die in two or three days – if you'd gotten to her, if the hospital had let you and so forth and you had gotten to her, you would have been faced with this question: What to run on her? What to do?

Well, of course, you're not going to run a Model Session on her. You're going to get involved in was it all right to audit in this laundry room?

No, it's not all right to audit in the laundry room. Now, what are you going to do, see?

Ain't no shape to run rudiments. Rudiments process is too light. Person's mind's so intensely concentrated upon their own difficulties that, actually, to get the rudiments in would be to take their mind off their case, don't you see?

In other words, the case, as far as you're concerned, is in-session to a marked degree, already rolling.

I did an interesting thing one time. A guy collapsed in the middle of a restaurant – a big public restaurant of one kind or another, a rather nice restaurant. So therefore, the nicer the restaurant, the quicker they try to dispose of the bodies.

You can always tell, you can always tell a nice restaurant because they're very anxious to get rid of people who collapse and you can always tell a bad restaurant because they don't care. They just keep stumbling over the person in the middle of the room. It's one way of classifying restaurants. Anyway ... And so I saw this fellow collapse, so I got up from the table where I'd finished up dinner. I was about to leave anyway. And I kneeled down alongside of him, and asked him where he was on the track. This was back in Dianetic days, you know? I asked him what he was stuck in, you know? And pushed him on through what he was stuck in, and already, why, they'd been calling for his doctor, and so on. And they hauled him out into a pantry, so I stood by him in the pantry and ran him through the rest of the engram just as sort of passing by, you know, still wiping my hands on a napkin. That casually, you know.

And the doctor got there and the fellow was very much alive and was looking up and was much brighter. Well, I possibly underestimate or overestimate the condition the person was in as a result of this, but the doctor was quite startled, you know? His patient wasn't supposed to be breathing that way. After all, he was a patient.

And he wanted to know who I was. And I told him, "Well, I'm ..." (paraphrase) "I'm just me," and walked out, you know? And left a mystery forevermore. Anyhow, done that fairly often.

But the point is there was no time to get any rudiments in on that person. This person is gasping for breath and is in asphyxiation and is strangling to death and probably hasn't got but four more breaths to draw. You got no time to ask him if he has any withholds. [laughs]

And it'd certainly be an insult to anybody's intelligence to ask him if he had a present time problem. [laughter]

Well, now, you get the idea. There's a point where Model Session must be done and should be done, but there are these emergency conditions, and so forth, where it'd be nonsense to do a Model Session, see? You have to decide that.

But here is a condition where a person's mind is very badly deranged and you couldn't get him to concentrate on anything anyhow, but you can ask him the question necessary to resolve the case. That question will normally – could be considered to lie most effectively – and the one that he will answer the fastest – somewhere in the vicinity of a Security Check. It'll be something other people don't know, you see? It'll be something he is withholding, something he hasn't let others in on.

Now, you see, the question "don't know" crosscuts and short-circuits this other question which is "What have you done?" and "What have you withheld?" or "What are you withholding." Now, this withholding kick, that's all very well for somebody that considers it a withhold. But as you're security checking in general, you'll find that most cases answer up very nicely to "What have you done?" and that sort of thing.

But when a case does not consider this – you don't only use "don't know" on this case. You could use "don't know" on many other types of cases, too, you see? It doesn't mean that because you're using "don't know" this person hasn't got what a withhold is, he's too far south to know what a withhold is or an overt is, don't you see? It isn't necessarily true.

People get worried sometimes because they think a process assigns level of case, and they refuse to run them sometimes. And it'd be a shame to avoid that one on that grounds because it isn't true. But it is true that a person who considers it an overt or doesn't consider it an overt – doesn't matter whether he does or doesn't or consider he is withholding or isn't withholding – certainly he will answer up to other people not knowing about it because that is factual.

And then, having answered that a few times, he will begin to consider that he has a withhold on the subject.

In other words, by getting off the "don't know" you get him up to enough responsibility to have an overt and a withhold, see? But up to that point, he's boosted, you see, by this "don't know." So it's an undercutting mechanism. So therefore, if you could communicate in any way with an insane person or a very sick person, and so on, it, of course, is the key question. And if you just ask somebody, "Well, what don't I know about you?" – if you just ask them that much, you know, or if you ask them, "What don't you know about your condition?" I mean, that's really coming into a total introversion area by, "What don't you know about your condition?" God help us. Anybody will answer that.

"Well, I don't know this, and I don't know that, and I don't know the other thing."

But present time is to these people an engram, and you're sort of running an engram as a not-know. But you ask anybody who is having any difficulty what others don't know about him or about his condition or about what he's been doing, and you're going to get some very fruitful replies. They will just rattle out left and right. And it's interesting to put it down at that level of an assist.

Now, any auditing, of course, that is done outside Model Session, except the CCHs, would – could only be regarded in the nature of an assist. So don't be too amazed if after you've done this patch-up type of auditing your pc falls on his head. They do routinely. They don't fall downstairs as far as you've picked them up. But very often after you've patched somebody's broken leg up or something of the sort with an assist, you see, a couple of days later his leg hurts like hell and he's complaining about it. Because the effects of an assist are not very lasting unless *all* of the withholds are pulled and a lot of Havingness is run in on top of it. Then an assist would be fairly lasting.

We had an example right here in the house. The children's teacher came in Tuesday, but only because the Tech Sec and so forth, had processed her a bit on Monday night. She had a slipped disk, and of course she came in, she was all right because of the very minor assist. And I assure you it probably wasn't very much of an assist because, naturally, she slumped. She felt wonderful and then she went downhill. Well, that is characteristic of an assist. That is just what you expect out of it. Because to have done anything for this particular case would have required hours of auditing and should have been done months ago or years ago or something of that sort, you see?

This business of waiting until somebody goes mad before you audit them is sort of a dull way to go about it anyhow. We've got a boy right out here on the grounds and one of these fine days he's going to take another motor car – which he just got through doing – and throw it through a brick wall, and they'll scrape him off the brickwork and bury what's left. Because just today he saw a big curtain we were putting up in front of a garage area out here. And I was standing around and everybody was working very peacefully and getting along too well, so I interfered with them. And – wanted to show that I was important to the situation, too. And this kid came up helping it out, and all of a sudden he looked at that curtain and that was too much for him. It was flopping around. How were they going to drive in and out of a garage with a curtain across it. Well, he had the solution.

"I'd drive straight through it," he says. "I would, you know. I would."

And I said to myself, "I'll bet you would, too." [laughter] That's the way he operates.

Of course, the time to process him is now. The time to process him is now. And the Tech Sec should actually get him by the nape of the neck and straighten him up a little bit on this kind of thing because he's a very good workman, a very good boy. But he just gets that way around cars. There's something about cars.

Anyway, that is an example of a case, of a case level, a case action, and so on, where the case should have been audited a long time ago and all of a sudden is sick and then you're going to do everything with an assist that you should have done with high grade processing a long time ago.

Well, of course, you can't do that much with an assist, so don't expect too much out of a Security Check. Just expect the person who is insane to go up to a point where they are only a bit neurotic, see? You can bring an insane person up. It's very hard for a person to stay on being insane, anyhow. Takes a lot of doing. Neurotic tendencies, and so forth, are very hard to keep in place. I mean, an auditor just shakes them a little bit with Reach and Withdraw, and the person can sit up all night trying to put them back, and they won't.

And you would not expect too much. And after they were in fair condition, you would have to give them some decent auditing. But while they're in that condition, this is no time to use a Model Session – getting back to what I'm talking about. But auditing which is done outside and not with a Model Session should simply be regarded in the light of an assist and should be handled on the light that you're going to pick it up later anyway. And then go ahead and pick it up or not as the case may be.

Well now, auditing by fundamental, then, would be to restore the person's communication with society or with that group to which he is most intimately connected. Therefore, you could expect a person who is ill and very worried about their family or very angry with their family to, of course, have withholds from their family.

See, these are the fundamentals of Security Checking.

A person who is being very angry at the society or is having a hard time with the social structure he's surrounded with, and so forth, has withholds from that social structure, and so it goes.

Now, that's just the fundamental Security Checking.

Now, you see this in vignette all the time. You see a little tiny, microscopic example of this. I wonder if this has happened to each and every one of you. If it hasn't yet, why, be alert for it. It possibly has happened, yet you haven't noticed it. That you missed a withhold and the pc got upset with you. Have you seen that yet? Have you got a reality on that?

You missed a withhold, and the pc had an ARC break. Let me put it that way. Or you found the pc sitting in an ARC break and when you put it together again, it didn't go together well until you get off a withhold. You get the idea?

Well, it's a severed communication line. I see that it hasn't happened to some of you or you haven't noticed it, so you just better get enthusiastic with your observation. Get your obnosis going because you've never had any trouble with a pc unless you missed a withhold. You've never had any trouble with a pc and you never *will* have any trouble with a pc until you miss a withhold. That is all there is to it.

Just reduce it all down to then because look-a-here. An ARC break, of course, what is that? That's severed communication. Well, you didn't sever the communication so somebody did. Well, it – the only other person present is the pc so he must have. Well, how did he sever the communication? By having a withhold that he didn't give you. That's the only way he could sever the communication line.

Now, we move out into this perimeter just a little bit further, and we find that a present time problem is because he has withholds from people. You go along with that, don't you? He has withholds from people so he has a present time problem with the people, of course. We don't care how antique the withholds are from the particular valences he's having a present time problem with. They're nevertheless withholds.

And the pc, then, in any rudiment in the beginning rudiments, of course, has fundamentally severed communications. Well, how has he severed communication? He severed communication with a withhold. There is something people don't know. And because people

don't know, why, then he's severed communication with them. And that is all there is to that. So naturally, the common denominator of all beginning rudiments out is a withhold missed. That's all.

Now, let me tell you, you will see at once what I am talking about. I see that this is causing a little bit of consternation with you, but let me assure you of this, that it's very, very easy to follow.

You shut the window rather noisily at the beginning of session, and the pc thinks it is rather noisy and doesn't mention it to you. Now, you try to get the rudiments in and you find out that the room isn't all right and they have an ARC break and they got a present time problem. And you're just a knucklehead if you go on running an ARC break and running a present time problem, and so forth. Just ask them directly.

"Well, what's your withhold?"

And the pc, "Well, I don't have any withhold."

Well, you clear it on a meter. Maybe it doesn't even register on the meter because they don't consider it a withhold. You see, a withhold is a withhold whether the pc considers it a withhold or not.

You know, there are laudable withholds. Laudable withholds. Have you ever not lost your temper with somebody? Well, that's a laudable withhold. You should be patted on the back, but you got a withhold.

You know, you can get awful mad at people you don't dare lose your temper with? Form 19 is either out or just out or will be in your hands shortly, and it covers all this. The Know to Mystery Security Check. And those are all laudable withholds.

Anyway, you've got a condition here of the pc didn't consider that he had a withhold from you but he was withholding something so you have to follow it up – you have to clarify this. "Well, did you think something you didn't tell me?"

"Oh, well, yes."

And your meter will fall off the pin.

"Oh, yes, yes. I did. I did. When you closed the window, you slammed it very loudly and I didn't tell you."

And all of a sudden he doesn't have an ARC break and doesn't have a present time problem and the room is all right and your rudiments are all in. From what? From just that crazy, tiny, little impulse, he broke his communication line with you. He severed it right at that point.

Now, if you're not looking for that type of withhold on your pc as an actual withhold and if you're not asking questions which get off that type of withhold at the beginning and during a session, you, of course, are having the devil's own time keeping rudiments in. Because a pc is a busy, busy, busy little beaver. Figure, figure, figure, think, think, think, think, think. And you get some pcs that just have an avalanche like a critical circuit going all the time. And they're just sitting there natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter.

And they're looking at you, and of course they're getting madder and madder at you because of all the nasty things they're thinking about you. Well, logical, isn't it? Perfectly – the most logical thing in the world. What's more logical to get mad at somebody because you're mad at them? You see, that's the best reason in the world to get mad at somebody.

But of course, you won't get mad at somebody unless you're not being mad at them or you're carefully not being mad at them or you're carefully not offending them or you're carefully not. And if you get sufficiently "carefully not", believe me, you've got no ARC in all directions.

So, all right, now, I'll give you an example. This is an actual example of a session.

I was getting withholds in, in this session – I mean, getting the withholds pulled and getting them in view in this session – at the rate of two or three every five minutes. And this person had been audited quite a bit, but the package kept stopped – it stopped reading, so I'd say "All right. Now, what have – what are you – what have you been busy thinking now? What have you invalidated now?"

"What are you withholding" in other words, I was also asking, although I apparently was asking, "What are you invalidating? What were you thinking?", you know? "What reservation did you have about this?" and so forth. And they'd all of a sudden give me a withhold. And then I would vary this by asking for actual withholds; "Well, have you withheld anything from me during this session?" and so forth.

And the pc would think, you know, and the meter would go bang. And the pc would say, "Oh, nothing. Except – except right at the beginning of session ..." or something stupid like this, you know.

They weren't really thinking critical thoughts about me. That was what was appalling about this. It was knocking the whole package out, but the person was actually not thinking anything that anybody would have ever considered a crime.

I've been meaning to tell you this for some time, that withholds are not confined to crimes. The amount of crime involved in the withhold does not establish the magnitude of the withhold. The amount of crime which you think the withhold has in it does not mean it has a magnitude of withhold. Do you follow me?

The quality of the withhold does not establish the magnitude of the withhold. And you might as well get that very plainly. It's the force with which they are withholding. That is all. It's the amount that they are not informing, not the quality of what they are informing about.

All right. Now, I'll give you an example. A little kid sitting there; little kid wants you to like them, is rather dependent on you, wants something from you, and so forth. And all of a sudden the little kid has this appalling thought that you look awfully fat these days or something, you see? But the little kid says right away, "I mustn't say such a thing," don't you see?

And he's partially appalled at himself for thinking such a thought. And it occurred right then, you see, and he goes *nyaa-uggg*, you know? You can practically smell the rubber smoking, you know? And it makes quite a withhold. Get the idea? It's just the ferocity of the withhold, not the quality of it.

Now, a lot of people on Security Checking think if you can turn up some nice, juicy, antisocial crimes of some character or another in the pc – you can turn up some nice, juicy ones – why, you're all set, and the pc will get better. And then you find out that the pc raped the banker's daughter and hung her body in a tree and then hung it off on his best friend who got hanged as a result of it.

And you say now, of course, we've solved the case because look at the quality of this withhold. And he's sitting right there, and so forth, and it doesn't seem to bother him a bit. So we get appalled at this and we say, "Well, he ..." Therefore, we explain it by saying this person must be awfully antisocial or terribly irresponsible. You see, it's not the quality of the withhold at all, because we're liable to find – if we think that this is what constitutes a withhold, is the amount of crime or social reprehensibility contained in the withhold, then we're going to miss, miss, miss, miss, miss. Because he very well at some time on the track might have belonged to a society where the biggest crime you could have possibly committed against this particular society of girl rapers and murderers was to have let a girl stay alive. And that's the only thing they would have considered a crime, you see?

Like a thuggee in India. He doesn't kill his proper quota of people in any given month. And this would be a terrible thing, and he would be withholding this. And you would say, "What horrible crime have you committed?"

And he would look at you and he would say, "Well, there was a traveler rode down the road and there was a whole party of them following and they had not a gun amongst them. They had no protection of any kind. And I and three of my friends were standing there, and they went into camp and we went into camp, and we talked to them and we went away without killing them."

And he's liable to spill a grief charge. All kinds of misemotion is liable to come off of this thing. It's the omission of doing what – a now-I'm-supposed-to, you see.

So any time they omit doing a now-I'm-supposed-to, they consider themselves in trouble because that's against the mores of the society of thuggees, with Kali herself ready to take them apart as they step into the underworld, you see?

"And that's a pretty bum thing to do. And one of the merchants there was very affluent, and we didn't kill him and disembowel him."

That doesn't sound like the magnitude of the crime. That's the magnitude of the crime in reverse, isn't it?

So you cannot say with any pc, since the pc could just well be in the valence of a thuggee... Let's say he's a bank clerk, but let's say, as in many cases of countries that have conquered other countries, you get a bunch of people in the other country who are very anxious to get even with the conqueror. And the way to get even with a conqueror is go pick up a body and raise hell in that country. See?

I wouldn't go so far as to say that some of the upper-class English officials have occasionally been picked up by thetans of this character, but I would say that on a minor level it has happened, and so forth, like the secretary of the Treasury or something like that.

But it has happened. In any country which has been active in creating an empire and making any conquests, and so forth, can expect this as a normal course of human affairs. The people got awfully mad in the conquered country and they had no recourse at all but to – when they kicked off next time – to go over and pick up one in the conquering country. You can eventually wind up with an army which is almost totally composed of enemy soldiers. [laughter] It's quite remarkable. It requires a considerable amount of study. The society doesn't realize what it's doing to itself with some of the unusual punishments which it undertakes.

And countries conquering other countries never realize what they're doing either. And if they make no provision for this kind of thing in their conquest and no provision in their reeducation and reorientation in the home country, of course, they're in trouble all the time.

This has been so bad on the whole track that factually people have – whenever a thetan was killed, he was supposed to come back and pick up a body, you see, at the base. That kind of thing, it's quite common. That's quite ordinary. And they used to have identifications and passwords. If somebody came back and picked up one of the bodies at base and didn't know the password, well, they got rid of him fast. That would sometimes give some of you an anxiety about recovering your memory.

One of the things you're trying to recover, of course, is the password. "This is X49C. The password today is 'spacecraft'. " Otherwise, of course, why, they'd just zap you out of existence. Your own folks, you know.

But anyway, not to make a long story out of it, it is not the quality of the withhold that you're in contest with at all. It is simply the degree that the pc is withholding it. And therefore, anything a pc is withholding constitutes a withhold, no matter if it's very laudable.

Now, you got a pc who is customarily trying to sock his auditor in the jaw, something like this, you can ask him, "Well, during this session, have you had any impulse to sock me in the jaw?"

"Yes, I did."

All right. You clear up eight of them and get the rudiments in. You get the idea? It is what the pc is not communicating that is the withhold. As soon as you can learn that as a fundamental definition of withholds and rudiments, and so forth, you will be security checking by definition and you will find some marvelous things start occurring.

You'll get sessions in – *clank!* And all of a sudden, the pc will be running. I was assessing an unassessable pc just on this basis right over in Washington, but every three, four minutes, I was sitting there getting off the withholds. And the pc was withholding the fact that it might be an overt for me to audit her because I was probably tired after the congress, you see?

And the pc thought and the pc thought and the pc thought, and a busy, busy, busy little pc. You see, they were all good, good deeds, you see. They were all kind things this pc was thinking and withholding them like crazy and would withhold one and knock the package out so that nothing would read and you couldn't null anything.

And then I'd get the withhold off and then for a – oh, I could get in there for about three, four minutes of nulling before all of a sudden I would say, "Well, something else has happened because the character of the needle pattern." And I asked the pc what they were withho- what she was withholding, and she would give me the withhold again, you got this? That's the way it was, I mean, it just went that way: one, two, three, four.

So you see, you're probably – if you're having any trouble security checking – you're probably looking for some quality of withhold. You're probably saying, "Well, if we could just find a good, slimy, solid rape-murder here, then this pc would recover."

Well now, if you think that's the case, then Security Checking is going to fail you. And it's going to fail you on this basis: because your expectancy was the quality of the withhold would give you the magnitude of the recovery.

You could say, "Well, if this pc got off a withhold of that tremendous magnitude, why, therefore, he should make a magnitudinous recovery," see? And therefore, your observation of the whole thing is completely unreliable. To you it's not comparable. So you think that Security Checking doesn't work or it's failing you, see? Because you think, well, if he got off this huge withhold and buried the body, and so forth, and never told anybody, got this withhold off, he ought to be sitting there mopping his forehead with a handkerchief, you see, and saying, "*Wheeew*. I feel so much better getting it off," and all of this kind of thing.

And you say, "Well, obviously."

Well, look. He'd only be doing that if he were worried about it. And you often get treated with this level of expectancy. You often get treated to another spectacle entirely.

"Yeah, well, I raped the girl and put her body in a culvert."

No handkerchief, no sweat on the forehead, no recovery, no reduction of the tone arm.

Oh, yes, the person was even withholding it, but not very much. So there was no magnitude of *withholding*. There was only quality of crime in your mind. And here you're processing this fellow from upper Manchester, and you're saying, "Well, now, withhold, withhold, withhold. And did you withhold, withhold, withhold?"

And you're getting off withholds and they're not going anyplace. And you finally ask him – it finally comes through to you that you're not getting off anything that the pc is withholding. The pc isn't withholding any of this. And it suddenly comes through to you, so of course, what's the difference?

Well, you still have to get it off – if the needle starts knocking, why, you have to get them off. But let's get smart about this time and find out what this pc considers a withhold, you know?

Well, one of the ways of doing that is, "What doesn't (eight dynamics) know about you?" See, that's the phrase question. "What doesn't (any one of the eight dynamics or any part thereof) know about you?" see? Or "What have you done," you see, "that God doesn't know about?"

And you could say this to the archbishop and he'd flip his wig, man. He'd have a ball right about that time. Probably find out the poor man has never – ever since he was made

archbishop, he's never gone to bed on top of the bed. He's always had to go to bed under the bed because God could see what he was doing. [laughter, laughs] Quite remarkable, you know.

You take somebody that's been deeply immersed in spiritualism on the seventh dynamic, and so forth. "What don't the spirits know about you?" And they get pretty shaken up. And they have taken some unusual measures to secure a small amount of privacy.

And you will ask some guy who is about three-quarters wogged in on electronics, or something like that, "What doesn't space know about you?" and the thing will fall off the pin. See? And you say, "Well, how could that be a withhold?"

Well, you find out he won't go out into space. He won't have anything to do with space, and he's withholding himself from space crazily. And as a matter of fact, the interesting part of it is, is the only way you have any gravity is by withholding yourself from space. It's quite amusing.

If you ran off a person's – all of a person's withholds on the sixth, they'd float, man. If you want to do a Houdini, why, just – or make a Houdini out of some pc, why, just roll up your sleeves and get a Security Check on "don't knows" and "withholds from," and so forth, on all the elements of the sixth dynamic, you see?

If you want to make a very fine spiritualist, why, get it all cleaned up on the seventh. Very simple.

If you want somebody to do a Saint Francis of Assisi, why, clear him up on the subject of birds, you know?

And you could almost call your shots, you know. Once in a while you really miss on the fourth because you're so monomaniac on the subject of being a human being that you don't realize that you're very often processing an ex-duck. [laughter, laughs] And you'll find out that he has some very peculiar withholds on the subject. And, of course, an ex-seagull would have even more peculiar withholds.

But anyway, the person is doing what the person was, don't you see? So the fourth dynamic would be what specie a person had been most closely associated with rather than mankind because, you see, the fourth dynamic is simply a whole species of something, not mankind. Most people read it differently, you see?

You go back into the early descriptions of the fourth dynamic, well, it's ants or it's camels or it's palm trees or whatever unlikely thing the person might have had anything to do with.

And of course, the third. Now, we open up the ball. Now, we open up the ball because there are more groups than anything else. There have been more groups and more types of groups and more types of societies, and so on, that you could easily count. And every one of them has entirely different mores.

I imagine the Christian Science church of Boston would be shocked to discover that practically every Christian Science church in the world has a slightly different mores. See, they don't even all have the same mores, don't you see? But the one in Los Angeles, I'm sure,

does not follow the mother church in Boston. I have no acquaintance whatsoever with Christian Science and the Christian Science church, but I have a large acquaintance with Los Angeles. I understand that Sydney and Cape Town share these honors in their respective continents. It always seems to be one of these cities.

Anyway, when you get into the third dynamic, you can't even say the goals, and so forth, of the thuggee because I imagine the thuggees of northern India and the thuggees of southern India – maybe it's Delhi that's the Los Angeles, or Calcutta. No, let's see. I don't know. Bombay is probably the Los Angeles of India. It would probably be entirely different, you see, in Bombay. There it's really an overt act to not let the corpses rot for a day or two before you bury them, you see? Up in the north country, why, it's merely a crime to not kill them, you see? It's gotten more complicated in Bombay, perhaps.

But you take the group after group after group after group as you go down the line, you are going to find uniformly and routinely that these groups are all different in their mores. So the moral codes by which they operate are not even constant from group to group.

Well, I imagine the Puritans of Holland and the Puritans of America were widely divergent in their mores although they were by label the same group.

So you get into a lot of randomness on the third dynamic. In fact, that is the greatest randomness known – is on the third dynamic. And there's where most of your Security Checking is done. So much so, and you get so concentrated on it and it's so complicated, that you forget the other seven dynamics. But they're – they exist and they're very fruitful sources of Security Checking.

Now, your second dynamic, well of course, that defies all imagination – the amount of moral codes or immoral codes that can exist on the second dynamic! I was reading some books one time on the subject of the moral codes and sexual practices of some zone or area, and I think it was Zanzibar, and some psychiatrist, you know, knows that he will get all right if he goes out, you know, and collects enough obscene acts, you know, and catalogs them properly, he knows he'll be blessed in the insane asylum. So they always are doing this. And this – Freud, of course; old papa Freud rather, set the example, and so the boys can check these things off left, right and center, you know. And they've got all of these immoralities so well cataloged.

Well, of course, they followed this through – because psychiatry's a rather religious activity – they followed this through from the church. And the church, of course, has been death on creativeness, of course. Like in Ireland, you can't even get a PE course – in Ireland you can't get anybody in that course to give you a definition for "create." It's one of the harder jobs you would ever have. And that's just because the church has lain all over the top of them for so long.

So that any overt, perforce, must have been a second dynamic action. I mean, it gets to that volume and violence, that an overt must, must have been on the second dynamic. If a person did anything to anybody anywhere, it must have been on the second dynamic. And you'll find an awful lot of people think that way.

I know it seems quite strange to your thinking, but that is – they couldn't think of any other type of overt. You could kill and slay and burn, but if it weren't with a sexual intent, it wouldn't be an overt, see?

As a matter of fact, matter of fact, some squirrel branches of psychoanalysis define overts all back into the second dynamic. If a person murders, it's because of sexual restimulation, see? If a person hangs somebody, well, it's because of a sexual bang of some kind or another, you know? It has nothing whatsoever to do – they're just – they got stuck on this one dynamic. So all overts and withholds must occur on that one dynamic.

Imagine a psychoanalyst beating his chops and his brains out, and so forth, in an office, and there's the pc on the couch, you see, and he's trying to find the pc's second dynamic withholds, you know? And he's just working at it. Just sweating, you know. And just – the perspiration running off of his brow. The pc only has withholds on the eighth dynamic. They didn't pray. The only type of withhold available on the whole case.

Yet they keep saying, "All right, now. Give me a detailed account of the amount of incest. Give me a detailed account of the amount of rape. What childhood activities didn't you engage in that you should have?"

And you get all this rolling along very nicely, only nothing happens. Case makes no recovery, keeps going this way. Psychoanalyst gets a total lose. Well, why does a psychoanalyst get a lose? He gets a lose only for one reason. Just one reason. He isn't asking for withholds in the zone where the pc has withholds. It's too glibly phrased to say he isn't asking for withholds that the pc considers withholds because, you see, I've already shown you the pc can have laudable withholds.

Pc doesn't consider them withholds. Doesn't consider anything wrong with them at all, but they're withholds. So you see, it's the zone of withholding. If you want to consider it on the dynamics, why, you'll have a very good picture of it, don't you see?

And in Form 19, you've got it on the Know to Mystery Scale. And the Know to Mystery Scale gives you other fruitful zones of withholding.

All of this is quite interesting to follow down. But these are the fundamentals of Security Checking. It is what the pc is withholding. And you can just redefine this from what the pc considers a withhold is because that doesn't work too well as a definition and this other works beautifully as a definition. And I've done quite a bit of work on it lately, which is what I'm trying to get you to catch up to. And that quite a bit of work demonstrates this one fact very conclusively: that a withhold is what the pc is withholding and it does not have to include what the pc considers is a withhold.

So, therefore, the fellow who glibly tells you, "Oh, yes, I murdered her and threw her body in the culvert." He wasn't withholding it, was he? So it wasn't a withhold, see, by definition.

Well, if it knocks on the E-Meter needle, it's a withhold; plus if you can get it to knock on the E-Meter needle, it is a withhold; plus if the pc gained relief from telling you, it was a withhold. See, all those things are true.

Now, what do you mean when you say *withhold* ? Well, let's broaden the whole idea of withhold out as I've been doing lately and just say it is restraining self from communicating, and you've got it made. So you get a much better definition of a withhold. Do you realize you've never had a definition of a withhold? It's restraining self from communicating

Now, the overt that goes immediately and directly with a withhold is restraining another from communicating. Of course, that will stack up to a withhold whether a person thinks it's a withhold or not.

Now, for instance, this fellow might have had a very good notion that the best way in the world to have gotten somewhere in the world was to have shot every policeman he saw. Every time he saw a policeman, shoot him. See, that's a natural course of human events. See a policeman, shoot him. And he was getting along well this way. Went along many lifetimes, all very successful, you see?

Then this valence dropped out and stayed out for many a millennia and eventually came in again. Only nowadays it is frowned on by his mother. In the old days his mother was made of stronger stuff, you see, brawnier mental material, and she used to pat him on the back and give him his porridge *only* if he had shot a policeman that day, you see? Something like that.

But this mother, this mother was raised in a different church, you see, and has different ideas about it, you see. And after all, things are sort of going down scale. And every time he has mentioned shooting a policeman, she has said, "*Tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk. Mm-mm.*"

And the guy goes around all the time withholding shooting policemen. And the more he withholds shooting policemen, the more he gets into the valence that shoots policemen. And there's the mechanics of the situation. And when you look at the basics of withholding, it doesn't matter *what* he is withholding, it is that he *is* withholding that counts.

Now, you see, mores, moral codes, all of these things add up into it, but to moral codes, you had better add patterns of behavior. So the moral codes are patterns of behavior of individuals or groups; or moral codes or patterns of behavior on all eight dynamics. And that takes in the whole confounded universe. And it means simply this: that you are triggering those moments when the pc was not communicating performe, see?

He should have been singing and he was saying nothing. That's the way it all adds up. He should be talking and he wasn't. That's what it amounts to. And that in essence is the ne plus ultra definition of a withhold.

Now, the ability of a thetan in this universe is expressed on the lines of reach and withdraw. Reach and withdraw. He is reached and withdrawn from and he reaches and withdraws from. There are four basic actions. There is another being who reaches toward him and withdraws from him, and then there is himself reaching toward another and withdrawing from another. And you have four actions.

Now, if you wanted to get real complicated, you go on right up into a five bracket and you can see the numbers of reaches and withdraws. And now if you want to get very, very complex about the thing, you can push it up into a fifteen-way bracket and now you can push

it up to a thirty-way bracket and you can probably push it up, if you wanted to, into, oh, I don't know, a sixty-four bracket? I don't know how many ...

Somebody was counting these up one time here in England, and I think he got tired. I've forgotten how high he got. But it was a high level.

Now, each one of those is a direction of a reach and a withdraw. See, that's a direction, and so forth.

Now, when the person should be reaching and is withdrawing, that's a withhold. Simple? That's a rough one. And that will come off with velocity.

Then you get the withholds of omission and he should be reaching and he's not. And that's just a withhold of omission and is not really of the same value as the one when he should be reaching and he is withdrawing.

I'll give you an idea. This individual will really bang on it. Let's find some war. Let's take almost any pc and let's find some war in which they were a soldier. And let's find an incident where they should have been – they received orders to attack, and they ran like hell. Well, armies consider this sufficiently important that they always shoot them when they do this kind of thing, although I always thought it was rather interesting.

Studies of tactics include having troops run like hell. As a matter of fact, the famous British Major Tarleton in South Carolina met his doom on just such a maneuver. The enemy troops were instructed to run like hell until his dragoons were caught in an enfilade fire.

So you see, it isn't the fact of running away, then, that is reprehensible. It's the reverse of the now-I'm-supposed-to. See, the person is supposed to be attacking and runs away. All right. He is withholding his whole body. Now you got a rough one.

All right. Now, he's supposed to be running away and he runs away. So what? He's supposed to keep his mouth shut and he keeps his mouth shut. So what? See, that doesn't amount to a withhold, see, if it adds up to his I'm-supposed-to's.

But on the other hand, you can get a very profitable set of withholds off a child which are quite interesting because it seems to improve the child, but that's the only reason you could say so. You run the other side of the bracket – people who didn't want the child to talk. Well, children are so outflowing that all this restrained communication puts a withhold in from the other side of the picture and adds it up so the child then starts withholding on other things of his own volition and you'll get things rather tangled up. But it gets assisted by the inflow on the child of "you mustn't talk."

Well, add all that up and what does it amount to? It amounts to failure to communicate with the environment, or restrained communication with the environment which, of course, winds up with not being here in the environment, which winds up with being – having the environment pulled in on oneself, which winds up with any other condition that you could possibly think of.

And insanity itself is simply must reach-can't reach, must withdraw-can't withdraw, just a built up ridge.

In other words, double sets of overts and withholds will produce the same mechanism.

In other words, he should have been shooting Germans and he wasn't, you see? But at the same time, why, he wasn't supposed to be shooting Germans and he did. You see, this would compound the felony and get it all mixed up in circles. And either one of them he might not communicate to anybody about, which would then constitute a withhold which is charged up with both of these contrary acts. You get this thing really going in circles after awhile.

You could ask somebody, "Well, what should you have communicated?"

Marvelous question. Doesn't apparently lead to anything at first glance. It's a marvelous pattern withhold question. Marvelous Security Check question. "What *should* you have communicated?" You're liable to take in a pc who's been running at a normal one division drop, and he falls off the pin on the thing. He really has a ball with this thing. He winds the tone arm around twice and comes out and a small cuckoo jumps out of the sensitivity knob.

In other words, you get action here. What should he have communicated? You didn't even say "and didn't." See, that's the trick question. What should he have communicated?

You can also get the same thing of "Where should you have been?" But, of course, this is an operating, full effort withhold, see, "Where should you have been?"

Well, you didn't even say that "you should have been there" or anything, and he will instantly leap to this conclusion, complete the whole situation just as you did a moment ago. He'll instantly complete the question. He knows that you meant that he should have been there. He would know that you meant he should have said and spoken and what he should have said and spoken, and so forth. But all you're asking is what should he have communicated. Not to anybody, and so forth. And you'll get an immediate response. Why? Because it sits on top of a withhold.

You see what you're fishing for.

All right. If your Security Checking is done in the perimeter of those definitions and understandings, it'd be very, very successful. And if your Security Checking is just done by a wooden, wound-up doll proposition of "What are you withholding? Thank you. All right. Good. Thank you very much."

And the pc sits there and the pc says, "I'm not withholding anything" The E-Meter's not very lively or operative, you see. "What are you withholding?"

You're getting a rise, and you keep on getting the same rise, and so on, you see?

"Well, what are you withholding? I'm supposed to ask you this question. It says over here on the sheet, 'What are you withholding?' All right. It doesn't produce any reaction on the E-Meter, does it? That seems to do it then."

Of course, the package doesn't read, and nothing reads, and you can't get the rudiments to read, and the pc won't talk to you, but you've done your duty.

No, you haven't done your duty until you've applied the fundamentals of the mind. And then you've done your duty.

Now, a very withholdy pc will stack up withholds on top of withholds, which is quite interesting. If they've got a set of withholds on a subject, then the tiniest, tiniest impulses to withhold will remain as withholds. So you see that mechanism all the time. This pc has critical thoughts, critical thoughts, critical thoughts, critical thoughts. Well, he's got some withholds behind all these critical thoughts, you see.

But for the purpose and sake of auditing, if you're not doing Security Checking, then it is perfectly valid for you to say to a pc, "What are you withholding?"

And you get no fall, you get no needle reaction, go on. Because he doesn't know he's withholding anything. But don't make the mistake of believing he's not withholding, because he is. He definitely is.

See, you got your rudiments in, and the pc – you didn't get a fall on the meter. You don't now have a missed withhold, see, to contend with. You obeyed all the rules of the game and you've got the pc now into session and going along fine.

But if you've made the assumption at that moment that the pc isn't withholding anything, then you're bats because the pc undoubtedly has some laudable withholds. This alone. This for sure. The pc has a withhold. He's being very nice. He's being in-session, see? The pc's sitting in the chair. He'd rather have sat over by the window and looked out through the window but he's sitting in the chair. Actually, he's withholding himself from sitting at the window. But he considers this a laudable withhold.

He's very happy because he's complying with what you want him to do and he classifies it all up under the subject of control and he's very cheerful about it and he won't get mad at you and everything is fine. But don't make the mistake of believing he doesn't have a withhold because he does. He'd rather sit over by the window. He's withholding himself from sitting over by the window. No matter how lightly he's withholding himself, it's still there, you see?

Of course, that withhold possibly doesn't amount to anything unless all of a sudden the pc starts getting upset in the session from other causes. Now, you have to go back and pull the withhold that didn't register. It didn't register because it wasn't a withhold that he knew about. But it *was* a withhold.

And he all of a sudden goes out of session and you apparently have all the rudiments in, but - you had all the rudiments in, but there was a withhold.

Now, "rudiments in" merely means in condition to be audited. That's all that means. If you always have to audit somebody through a present time problem who has one, this is a *reductio ad absurdum* and a piece of nonsense.

This fellow who's sitting there, he's got a set of crutches, well, you couldn't audit him at all, could you, because he obviously has a present time problem. He doesn't consider it a present time problem or a problem that is here and now although it is here and now. But he doesn't consider it so *at the moment* is the only thing that gets you by the withhold and gets you into the session.

But sooner or later, if you start ARC breaking him and upsetting the thing in general, and the pc isn't making any progress, you'll go back and you will find that there's always been a withhold on the subject that he had a present time problem. Because of course he had a present time problem. He has two crutches, doesn't he? And it's a hell of a job getting around. Of course, he has a present time problem.

Now, it doesn't register, however, as a present time problem, so you go on and get your auditing done because he isn't thinking about it. But you could stir up all manner of withholds on a case.

If your purpose was to use the rudiments to audit the case, you could always find the rudiments out. You could always shove... I can take any case right after you've checked the case, or one of the Instructors checked the case, and I could show you that all the rudiments are out.

You've just checked it for the auditor that the rudiments are in. The Instructor has just checked it for the rudiments, the rudiments are in, and so forth. And I could give you one of these "PDH the cat" routines and show you conclusively that the rudiments are out. I could sell the pc on the rudiments being out quicker than scat. See?

"Well, have you had an ARC break? Do you have an ARC break?"

"No." There's no response. That's what you've been asking and what the Instructor asked.

And I would say, "Well, have you had an ARC break lately?"

And the pc would say, "Well, yes, as a matter of fact. I was quite cross with the auditor yesterday," and so forth.

Now, I don't ask "Has that been handled?", you see. I say, "Well, are you still feeling a little bit – well, just a little bit cross with the auditor?"

In other words, I'd pull the ARC break in present time from yesterday, don't you see? And then infer that it's happening now in a sort of a curve, and the pc would consider it and some casual observer would say, "Well, gee, you know, those rudiments are out. That's all there is to it."

Well, I put them out, see, overtly put them out. And, "All right. Now, do you have a present time problem?" I get no reaction of any kind whatsoever. He isn't thinking he has a present time problem. That's the only thing you can say about it.

I could say, "Well, do you mean there's nothing wrong with you in this whole world?" [laughter]

And the pc would immediately say, "Well, put it that way, I don't have much money."

"All right. Well, now, have you thought about that in the last few days? Do you think you'll be thinking about that in the future at any time? Well, could that apply to this session? Might your attention slide forward in the session?" [laughter]

And I could completely sell the pc and sell anybody else observing, "Well, good God, these rudiments are way out. How could he possibly be audited?"

In other words, all these things are there latently and could be pulled into view, and your purpose in getting them in – your purpose in getting them in – is, of course, to cruise across the lot of them to where the pc's mind isn't on any of them and get the session going. And that's the only reason that you're running rudiments in the first place. And you don't want the pc ARC broke or upset during the middle of the session; well, the best way to guarantee it is to make sure the rudiments are in. But because you've got the rudiments in doesn't mean these things don't exist. And that's the only point I'm trying to make to you.

So if you can cruise across them this lightly in the rudiments – you say to this person, you say, "Well, are you withholding anything?"

And he says, "No," and you get absolutely no reaction on the meter.

And then you say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And he says, "Yes."

And you do get a reaction on the meter, well, then the rudiment which went just before that must have been out. You'd say, "Must have been out."

No, it wasn't out, you see? He couldn't have a present time problem unless he was withholding something so then obviously the withhold question is positive, not negative. But it didn't register because, of course, you didn't stir anything up, see?

You could have tackled it this way, you see, and you'd have found it way out.

"Do you have – are you withholding anything? All right. Nothing Thank you very much. Well, have you been worried about anything or anybody lately?"

Now, the guy is going to have a present time problem in just a minute, see?

"Have you been concerned about anything? Has your attention been on anything at all?" and so forth.

And he finally says, "Well, yeah. Matter of fact, attention's been on the boss quite a bit lately, and so forth and so forth. I've been thinking about my pay raise and whether I was ever going to get it or not."

And you say right promptly, "Well, is that a present time problem?" you know, hopefully.

And the fellow says, "Well, yes, come to think about it, come to think about it, it is. Hmm."

Now, you say, "Well, now are you withholding anything from the boss?"

"Well, yes. As a matter of fact, I haven't asked him for the pay rise."

"All right, then. Were you withholding anything when I asked you the question?"

"Oh," he'd say, "well, what do you know, I ..."

He's guilty now, you see. [laughter]

In other words, you could throw those rudiments into a cocked hat. The best way to clear up rudiments, of course, is to clear up the exact rudiments that are out. And to go

through the rudiments like a little tin soldier on parade. You know, "*Brrrt-bup-bup!* Thank you. *Brrr-bump-bump.* Thank you. *Brrr-bump-bump.* What was the fall? Good. *Brrr-bump-bump.* That's flat now. Thank you very much. *Brrrm-bump-bump.* Now, we'll begin the session."

That's the best way to get through the rudiments. But that isn't the way you security check.

You security check quite differently. You security check more or less in the light I was trying to show you, you could always throw the rudiments out.

You always try to throw the rudiments out on the Security Check. Now, take that cautiously. But you get the idea? You use that same proceeding.

You're saying in effect, "Are you withholding anything on some dynamic or zone of action?" and so forth, whatever else you're saying.

And the pc says, "No."

And you say, "Well, do you mean you've never withheld anything on this?"

"Oh, well, that's a different proposition. You say I never withheld. Yes, well, I have had a withhold at one time or another on this subject. But that's all settled now" – fall on the needle.

And you say, "Well, what was that withhold?"

"Well, I've never told anybody that."

"Well, all right. Tell me now."

"Well, I don't know that I should tell you now, but, *ahhh*, here it is," you see?

In other words, you can throw rudiments out by implication. Do you see that? And therefore, you can get ahold of withholds by stirring up the bank.

Now, if you sit there running withholds the way I was telling you to run rudiments, of course, you won't get anything off the case.

If you run withholds with, "*Brrrm-bum-bump.* Thank you. *Brrrm-bum-bump.* Thank you. *Brrrm-bum-bump.* Thank you. *Bmm-bum-bump.*"

Well, you see he's clean, I mean, perfectly clean. But don't let me get ahold of that pc immediately afterwards because I'll show you some withholds. There's a question there: "Have you ever been mean to your wife?"

And he got off a couple of withholds, and so forth. And he doesn't now consider that any withholds are missed. It's all right. It's clean, you see? He doesn't think any withholds are missed. And it's all right. And that question will sit in place unless something drastic happens because he's still worried about his wife.

So, you say, "Well, have you *ever* withheld anything from your wife?"

You see, you've asked him, "Are you withholding anything from your wife?" you see. You know, that's *brrrm-bum-bump*. Like a rudiment question, you see? *Boom*, you see? "Thank you."

See, *brrrm-bum-bump*, now, all right. *Bang!* He says, "Well, I withheld the fact that I really wasn't at the club last night, that I was at the billiard parlor," or something, see?

And you say, "Thank you. Now, are you withholding anything from your wife?"

"No."

"All right. Now, it's all right. Okay. Good."

You go to your next question.

And you see that you could do this same gruesome trick that I was just showing I could do. Get ahold of this pc. It's a null question. You say, "Well now, what would be the consequences of communicating to your wife?"

Let's do it by fundamentals, see, let's not do it by rote.

"What would be the consequences of communicating with your wife?"

"Oh, nothing. I could tell her most anything. *Most* anything."

You say, "Most anything. Well, very good. Well, what is included on the ones you couldn't, you know? What's the rest of it from the most?"

And he says, "Well, that's another thing."

And your needle starts to get very restive now.

"Well, all right. Well, what couldn't you communicate to your wife about?"

"Well, I actually couldn't ... Got a letter the other day from a girl that I said goodbye to a long time ago and promised my wife I'd never have anything to do with again. And if I told her about that – I wouldn't be able to tell her about such a thing, and so forth."

Well, you come in triumphantly on the end of this thing and say, "Well, are you withholding that from your wife right now?"

"Well, as a matter of fact, *ha-ha-ha, ha-ha-ha-ha, ha-ha-ha-ha*, as a matter of fact, I am, you know. Hadn't realized it, you know."

And you say, "Good. Thank you. Now, what else wouldn't you be able to communicate to your wife about?"

Good enough. And you're going to find out that he's got a whole stack of withholds, and you can sit there and get them all off by rote. You don't have to know anything much except what can't he communicate about where.

You could run a whole Security Check by just taking and writing down all the parts of the eight dynamics. And just going down the line and finding out where the pc couldn't communicate at all and what he's withholding from them. And you'd produce some fantastic gains on the pc. But after you've stirred them up, you've got to pull them.

But the auditor, in doing Security Checking, must realize that he has a [speaks the word with a French accent:] mission, and *le mission* is not to find the withholds so much as stir them up so the pc can find them, too. And the difficulty you're having in this – in pulling withholds, and so forth – is you're trying to pull withholds the way you find out if the rudiments are in, "*Brrrm-bum-bump*. Thank you."

You know, hopeful that nothing happens, see? Well, God, you must be hopeful that nothing happens in the rudiments. I tell you, I myself always sort of hold my breath from beginning of session, you see, until I finally said that fateful word, "problem," and a good, solid, Tone 40 "Thank you." I try not to get too much relief showing in the final acknowledgment of the rudiments or too much speed going in, "Well, all right. Now, we'll run this process on you if it's okay," you know.

And sometimes the Model Session goes all to pieces at that point, you see, because I'm so elated; we got through the rudiments and we're really going to do some auditing here and everything is fine and here we go.

Oh, that's not the mood with which you approach Security Checking. The way you approach Security Checking is quite differently. You approach it as an auditing session and an auditing session is supposed to reach into the mind and pull out string after string like the magician pulls all of the magic flags out of his breast pocket and out of his sleeve, and out of the finger ring; just thousands and thousands of flags coming out of thin air, you see?

Well, you're supposed to find material when you security check because that is the stuff of which aberration is made. And the way you security check is as suggestively as you possibly can. But don't be like the psychoanalyst and decide from your own past what the pc's withholds will be. That is quite fatal.

You could do a Dynamic Assessment on the pc and get a Dynamic Security Check. Well, you don't have to be that crude. You could be much more fundamental. You wouldn't even have to have a form in front of you to do some of the most fantastic Security Checking you'd ever done in your life.

Just say, "Well, all right." Just watch the meter very carefully. Say, "I'm going to run a little set of items. Thank you very much. Now, just sit there quietly. Don't say a word. Shut up. Ah, that's good. Thank you. All right. Now, God. Spirits." You know?

And right on down through the first dynamic. Got a *bang* on one.

And you say, "Well, tricky, man. All right. Fourth dynamic. Mm-hm. Mankind. Good enough. That's very good. That's what you said, and that's what you got a fall on. Very good. All right. What doesn't mankind know about you?"

"What doesn't *mankind* know about me? Well, they don't know *anything* about me."

"Good. That's more like it." Now, let's get in there and kick, you know? "Now, what have you done that mankind wouldn't like?"

"Oh, well, first and foremost amongst these, I have to confess I've been a man. Oh, and that's not allowed."

"Well," you say, "well, that's very interesting," and you can carry right on down through the line.

You can just find not-know, not-know, not-know. "What have you done to – ?" "What wouldn't they like about it?" "What wouldn't this happen?" "What wouldn't that happen?" You got the whole thing all taped out in front of you. In other words, you've got the whole thing mapped.

You found a dynamic he was hot on. You'll find it'll only run for about twenty minutes on one dynamic before it shifts dynamic, I must warn you.

You don't sit there for a Dynamic Assessment for a twenty-five hour intensive. It's going to vanish on you in something on the order of one hour or two hours at the absolute outside. You've got to shift to another dynamic and then shift to another dynamic. Every time it starts going cool, shift to something else.

You'd have that case roaring. But it's your job to find withholds and therefore your job to stir up withholds and therefore your job to get imaginative on where you're going to locate the withholds. And then, of course, you are bound by this consideration: that you mustn't miss any.

But what is a – what is "missing a withhold" means? It means that something that falls on the meter and the pc thinks he's getting away with.

So therefore, the easiest way to handle missed withholds is just to clear any question you're asking and then say, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" and watch for the fall on the meter. If you get none, you've not missed a withhold on him even though there are eight thousand more, because he doesn't think you've missed a withhold on him.

If he doesn't think you've missed a withhold on him, you have not missed a withhold on him. That is all, you see?

"Have I missed a withhold on you?" does not register on the meter, then you haven't. Simple as that. But you can always stir up withholds. You can always stir them up. And you ought to.

But you really, basically, should security check by definition, by fundamental. There are areas into which this person cannot reach. There are areas into which this person has reached that he shouldn't reach. You must get those things off the case. And all of a sudden he starts straightening out and the first thing that reacts, of course, is his communication. He goes more into session.

If you're doing Security Checking wrong, if you're doing "*Brrrm-bum-bump*. Thank you. *Brrrm-bum-bump*. Thank you. *Brrrm-bum-bump*. Thank you. *Brrrm-bum-bump*. Thank you," and think you're security checking, ah, well, you're not because the pc is going out of communication, not going into communication. Getting withholds off frees up the pc's communication line.

And the first place it's to manifest, of course, is in the auditing session.

So that's the long and short of Security Checking. Those are the bases of Security Checking. Those are the fundamentals with which you operate on Security Checking. And I

wouldn't really consider that you were much of an auditor unless you could audit straight against fundamentals.

Very dangerous to teach an auditor to do anything else but audit against fundamentals and so you should know something about that.

And the next time you're security checking a pc – which will be in the very near future, in fact in the matter of an hour or two – you should try this on for size.

"What were you withholding?" "What doesn't (something) know about?" "What are the dynamics – are you out on?" "Now, what Security Check question should somebody have stirred up so that it would have been a withhold?"

In other words, realize that the auditor is monitoring them, dealing them through, and ready to grab them. And then you're going to see relief, providing, of course, you run adequate Havingness along with them to restore the pc's ability to reach after you've got off the reason he couldn't reach. And you'll see some miraculous things happening with pcs. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Thank you.

HOW TO AUDIT

A lecture given on 11 January 1962

Thank you.

And this is what? Eleventh of Jan. The mystic month. And we are finding ourselves in the middle of – no, it's at the beginning... What cycle are you in? [laughter]

Well, anyhow, it's on a planet, on a twelfth-rate sun, and it's the beginning of the – it's shortly after the winter solstice. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Well, if you lived right and if you knew what you were doing and many other unlikely activities, you have it made. But we have to assume – we have to assume that if none of you have grown wings in the last twenty-four hours and you actually have had a pc on an E-Meter as an auditor and the pc hasn't grown wings in the last twenty-four hours with all the tools which you've got, we must assume that there is some faint disconnection between what I *am trying to teach you* and what you are doing I would say there's some *small gap*. Maybe not a large gap. Maybe only a light year or two. [laughter, laughs]

I don't mean to open up with that sarcastic, professorial attitude, but like a student or two that we've had who never had any critical thoughts "because they were all true" [laughter] – that we've run into two or three times, by the way; it's quite an interesting mental phenomenon – why, we have to assume that you have not confronted some of the facts of life. And this lecture is devoted to some of these facts of life.

And it's a scrambled lecture because it's on both Security Checking and 3D. And some of the people who are listening to the lecture, of course, haven't gotten up to Security Checking yet and will immediately have a tremendous impulse to go out and run a 3D promptly and immediately on anybody in sight.

And let them do so. Let them go ahead and fall on their heads. It's all right. It's okay. Let them get a half a dozen wrong terminals, and you know, and get these things all mixed up in some way and null the wrong things. Get a list null by getting the rudiments out. You know the system. And then – decide then that this best fits the pc and force it on him. That's what is known as a California assessment. [laughter, laughs] Oh, I'm awfully hard on California.

Actually, I haven't got any overts particularly on *this* California – this particular California. But I must have some awful overts on some California on some planet or another to get as many motivators as I get from that quarter. The only way I can figure it is that this must be somewhere else.

Well, anyway, getting down to the facts of life, there is some small difference between the way I would security check and the way you're security checking. Let us put it that way.

And I was showing Mary Sue at lunch how I would go about this and she unburdened herself of about three very juicy withholds I'd never suspected before, so there must be some-

thing ... [laughter, laughs] And she'd never suspected she had them either. So there must be some effectiveness in this particular method of Security Checking. Because as far as I was concerned, she was clean as a wolf's tooth clear back to the beginning of track, you know.

I said, "Well, this is the way I'd go about it," you see. And I was talking about this very thing with her and I said I would ask so-and-so and so I asked her so-and-so, you see and then I would ask so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and, *bang*, you see, she was in-session giving me the withholds. I knew she had withholds because she was so embarrassed, but there it was. It was something fantastic. It was something on the order of not collecting a diploma or something like this. It was very – something or other, but seemed to produce considerable charge and I noticed her eyes turn color – different color.

And if you can't make a pc's eyes turn color, don't talk to me. You're not in my class. [laughter] Do you know I actually watch a pc's eyes? If I can't make a pc's eyes change color, I don't think I've done anything. That's one, maybe you've never – maybe you've heard me say that before. Maybe you haven't.

But if I can't make a pc's eyes that are sort of a slate brown, you know, a sort of a mixed up pea soup that's got some cement in it, you know, and if I can't warm that up and – actually, you think I'm just talking now, something that should be qualified about change color. No, I mean that. Change color. I made a pc's eyes turn from a very arctic killer blue to a brown in one session.

You even know the pc, only he probably – I don't think anybody commented on it particularly. It was one of those things which they just couldn't confront, you know?

And there are things like this. There are things like this. I notice I have your attention very alertly.

It's all in whether or not you get to the *pc*. After all, you're auditing a *thetan* and a *thetan* has various characteristics. And if a *thetan* can communicate directly and straightly toward what he is communicating with, of course, he immediately begins to communicate more immediately and directly with his body as a – as a completely secondary effect.

Somebody gets well, so what? So somebody made a body well. Well, well, well. We've been doing that for ages. You've been making people well among the Aesculapians and amongst the Indians and amongst the thises and thats. You can always make somebody well.

I had a sailor one time that insisted on going overboard to recover a line that he had carelessly gotten mixed up in the propeller. And it had really gotten chewed up down there and the water was about fifty degrees or forty-five degrees or thirty degrees or something like that. He didn't quite have to break through the ice.

And he said, "Well," he said, "I'll go over and free it."

So I said, "That is an excellent idea. An excellent idea."

He went in and got chilled to the marrow. Most people get only chilled to the bone, you see, but he got chilled straight through to the marrow. And he came out of the water shaking so that the stern of this rather heavy boat was quivering.

I made him well. I handed him a bottle of issue brandy. That's it. Total action. Didn't even put him in-session. Handed him a bottle of issue brandy. And he promptly and instantly recovered and then I had nothing – I had from about 150 men nothing but volunteers to go over and free the nonexistent lines. [laughter, laughs]

So I get back to the fact that making somebody well is not much of a trick. It really is not much of a trick. Even a medical doctor occasionally does it by accident. He tries not to, but he occasionally does it.

Actually, if you want immediate first aid surgery, why, go to some old grandma someplace. Stay away from the medical profession.

But you get – that's a plug. That's a – that's a commercial. [laughs] I'll collect from the grandmas of the world for that.

Anyhow, it's true. My old grandma used to – I used to get a sore throat when I was a little boy running around in subzero weather and she'd take a wet cloth and hang it around my neck and I'd go to bed with a sopping wet, cold cloth around my neck and next morning, so help me Pete, the sore throat would be gone. It's fantastic.

So anyhow, if you're going in – if you're in the business of curing bodies and you can't cure bodies, why, God help you. Because anybody can cure a body.

Hand them a bottle of brandy. Pat them on the back. Whistle at her. You know? Raise her morale. Anything. Anything and you're liable to get into a situation where you've cured a body.

In a society where care of the body, care of the body, care of the body, care of the body, care of the body is read on all the best television programs and in all the best periodicals and is featured in all of the best stories, they get off no further than a game called "care of the body." "Brush thy teeth and thou will be salvaged," you know? They're all set.

Well, all right. Bodies are okay. The bodies are okay. There – nobody's running down a body with it, but to fixate totally on this as a game, sounds to me to be one of the more interesting idiocies.

It's true that a thetan can feel like the devil if the body's falling apart, but what's he in that kind of condition for?

Now, all you've got to do to cure a body is put a thetan in some kind of condition and you promptly and immediately have somebody who is happier, but you have a well body. And one of the first manifestations of somebody recovering is he recovers from some chronic somatic of some kind or another.

Now, if you're dealing with technology which is able to restore the communication lines of a preclear, you inevitably will cure up all manner of maladies. You also, with what you are running today with Security Checking, Twenty-Ten and 3D, you will run into the condition where you cure up all the maladies they had and they get a whole new set.

I remember Pon, the day she left here and so forth. I asked her how some horrible somatics and difficulties – she came in here worrying about them, you know. And she said, "Oh, they're all gone. I have an entirely new set now."

But a body responds in direct ratio to the communication level of the pc who is engineering that thar vehicle. All the body is is a meat vehicle if you can imagine such a thing. And, of course, somebody imagined one one time or another. You wouldn't be sitting there in one now. But it's a meat vehicle.

And communication of the thetan is the monitoring factor. Now, it is true that a body will run on total automatic and sometimes you find thetans who aren't even there and a body in pretty good condition. Well, that's because he hasn't communicated with it. It's quite the reverse, you see? There's been no communication with the body of any kind.

It has been born and has growed and has come up to its present estate of elegance without being the least bit troubled by inhabitants. No, no habitation has occurred.

You see some girls like this in – get down around Hollywood, something like that, you see them walking around. And what they are is an operating body. And they're fine. There's nothing wrong with this – to be an operating body. But you start talking about the finer things of life or something like this and you find out you get no response whatsoever. It is just an irresponsibility.

But it's an irresponsibility of fantastic magnitude. I've looked at this many times and been quite amused by it. It's the low-scale mockery of it all, don't you see? This thetan hasn't even got enough horsepower to make a body *sick*. See? And they will very often be sitting – you read about this in *E-Meter Essentials* – they'll very often be sitting on Clear read. You know, they're eight hundred thousand fathoms deep and sitting on Clear read. You know, way below anything.

Start to process them, your first reaction that you get is they fall off to about 1.5 or they fall off to 6.5 or something like that. And you have to work pretty hard to get them into a density. In other words, they come up to density. And then they go on and proceed on upward. And they start getting into some relaxed state of mind.

Well, somewhere in that middle ground, you start processing a pc without creating a physical change in this pc and you are doing something different than what I am trying to teach you to do right now with the technologies which you have at hand.

This is rather typical of me, by the way, that twenty-four hours after you've got the package that resolves all packages, I always bawl you out for not being able to do it and that keeps up the record and keeps everything straight.

Now, it's almost what this is.

Actually though, you should have been getting results with 3D and Security Checking consistently and continually for some little time. Rather horrendous results, so therefore you must be doing something different than what I'm trying to teach you to do. Now, that unsettles all of your stable data.

Let me go into this very – in very detailed fashion. All I expect you to be able to do is run a perfect Model Session. Read anything that the E-Meter tells you and read it right now, not an hour after the session. Do a very good detection of an out rudiment or a withhold – and what's the difference. Just do a instantaneous detection of it. Just be able to smell that thing

right there through the meter. In other words, that's something you can do. You can look at that meter and if it goes *whap*, know that you have hit something and find out what you have hit. In other words, if you get a needle reaction, know that you have a reaction.

Now, I'm talking, however, about a British Mark IV. I am not talking about a Model T 1922, Mathison. I'm very much inclined to the theory that most auditing falls to pieces exclusively on this one point of a busted thetan running an E-Meter, see. I mean, there's something wrong here that this thetan won't communicate with that needle. That is the biggest breakdown in auditing. When somebody can't audit or the pc's getting mad at the auditor and so forth, you can trace it back pretty doggone routinely to just this one point, is the auditor was not handling that box in his hands. That's all. I mean, the main breakdown in auditing is not some little tiny ramification someplace. It's right there on that one button of they can't run an E-Meter.

So I expect you to be able to run an E-Meter and know what its manifestations are and handle it perfectly all right.

And know, when you have asked a question, if you have gotten a response and to be able to clear that response off of the meter. Now, that is a specific skill. And you'll find that there is no faintest, slightest, tiniest change of any character whatsoever, as we go along in technology, that changes this. This definitely is the same thing and it is what it is and you can read a meter or you can't. I mean, that's all there is to that.

I mean you either can read a meter and if it's a good meter and know what it is saying and so forth or you can't read a meter and that's the end of that. You follow this? I mean, this is an open and shut proposition. This is a specific skill and this skill is itself. And there isn't any arguing with this skill. I mean, a fellow can either read a meter or he can't read a meter. And if he can't read a meter, he can learn how to read a meter. We've proven that time after time. So that is something that you have to be able to do. In order to produce any kind of a – of an action of any kind whatsoever on a pc, you have to know what that meter is doing and what it is all about. Period.

Well, that's your chief skill right there for your lower activities or any auditing activity. And you'll find out if an HGC is running with the rudiments out and you'll find out if they're turning out unchanged profiles and if they're having an awful time of it and a terrible time of it and all of that sort of thing, as occasionally happens some place in the world. You'll find nothing very esoteric. You just find out they can't read E-Meters. I mean, it's just gross auditing error. Also, they could be equipped with – as they have been in the past – they could be equipped with E-Meters which don't read. See, squirrel meters, the various meters that were built in the United States. These meters don't read.

By the way, the old green and gold meter of the 5th London, alike with all of the early American meters, don't even vaguely come up to this Mark IV. This is not any plug – I mean that they don't read things that the Mark IV does read.

In other words, all earlier meters than a Mark III could be counted upon to miss withholds. So you needn't curse yourself too much about that. I mean, that's the way it is.

All right. We've got a situation there where if you have an E-Meter and you can read it you can then obtain certain results.

In other words, you know what's going on in the pc. All right. If you have that as a skill, *voilà*, you have it as a skill. And if you don't, you don't. And no auditing is going to count. That's for sure. Going to have pcs upset with you, going to be in a tangle and so forth.

All right. Now, that's a specific skill – *reading* the meter. It's a specific skill being able to *pull* a withhold. That's a very specific skill. Being able to chomp down and yank the withhold up and let it be aerated.

Running a process routinely is something that auditors do well. It was looked on as a highly desirable skill many, many years ago. I call it to your attention that they do it with the greatest of ease now. There is hardly anything to it now. It's just a *bang!* I mean, every – anybody can run a repetitive process.

Now, let's look at a much more specific skill than all this, and that is listing and nulling a list. Now, let's not call it any other thing than just that.

Take what the pc says, write it down on the page and assess it by elimination and come up with a result at the end of that time. That is a skill. And that skill is not likely to change. It's one of the tools of the auditor. That's something you have to know how to do before you can start assessing anybody.

And you've got a condition here where if an auditor can read a meter and if an auditor can list and assess by elimination, then your chiefest and most direct actions of an auditor are performed. If an auditor can do these things, wonderful. If an auditor can't do these things, well, he can't audit, that's all, see?

You know, any of you are going to go home and you're going to be absolutely horrified, you know? You curse your Instructors for beating you over the head and so forth. But when you get home and when you get back to your operating area, you will appreciate it because you're going to see some – hah – auditing.

Hasn't anybody left Saint Hill that didn't go home and say, "Oh, my God! How could I ever have considered this *auditing*." I mean, they've been *horrified*, just horrified.

In other words, their own expectancy of what an auditor should look like and sound like and do had been raised up the line. And they go home and they find auditors with their feet on the back of the pc's chair muttering into the electrodes, you know, and just – and all of a sudden break off the session, go out and get a Coke, talk around the front of the building for a while, you know and then remember they got a preclear in session. I mean, that's how ragged it looks. Actually, it isn't that bad, at all. But that's how bad it looks to these people when they see it. And they get quite militant along this line.

Well, I'm not saying there's that much of a gap between what you're doing now and what I think you ought to be doing, but almost. Almost.

You *must* learn the mechanical action and most of you have, of reading a meter accurately and well and making a list and nulling it to come up with one item. Now, those are specific skills and you should be able to do those skills. No matter what we dream up from here

on, running a repetitive process, getting the rudiments in, being able to read the meter on Security Check questions, being able to list and assess by elimination, boy, that's going to be with you a long time. So you might as well learn how to do those things well. But please, please, please don't think that you have now learned how to audit. Because you can do those specific skills does not mean that you are a sentient, alert, quiveringly-fast-on-the-trigger auditor. It doesn't. There is more. There are more above that.

You learn – you learn how to keep the rudiments in, run the Model Session, read a meter, security check, make lists and null them and come up with items and run repetitive questions. By all means, these I expect of you *perfectly*. I expect you to be able to do those things without a *flaw*. And *then* I can teach you how to audit. And it's just about that bad. That's about what it amounts to.

The knowledge of the human mind – a knowledge of the human mind – a knowledge of a thetan that we have now are so basic, so fundamental, that you ought to be able to think, sitting there in the auditor chair, straight through any kind of an impasse and achieve any type of result, *bang!*

I'm not trying to give you a lose. A lot of you think you're doing fine. I don't think so yet, because I haven't seen you changing the color of anybody's eyes. Isn't that a hell of a thing to demand of you?

But I can. So why don't you? I don't even consider it a trick. A girl sits down in the pc's chair – a lot – a lot of people who have watched me audit never noticed this. I'll audit a pc until their eye color changes. Maybe it's just a very faint change and maybe it's from brown to blue, but it's a change because that's the most direct channel of communication from the thetan to you and to the outside world. And if you can improve that channel of communication from that thetan outward, he can't help but do something to his eyes.

So if you've altered a thetan's channel of communication, you have done something to the amount of sparkle or glisten or something of his eyes.

Now, I don't care if you turn them flaming red. *Do something* to the color of his eyes.

Now, you see, I'm talking straight from the shoulder now and I hadn't actually let you in on some of these little facts of life. You recognize this now. Now, I'm saying there're certain technical skills that you can perform. And these technical skills are excellent skills. And there are very few auditors in the world at this present instant who can even approach any of you. *But that doesn't mean that you know all there is to know about auditing.*

I can sit down, look at a guy, put him in session, ask him what he's worried about, which way he's going and so forth. I'll usually use the current and the most and the best, you know. But I'm not above using anything that fits his case. But I use it very positively and very directly and I ask him what the score is and, using usually the most and current and the best, will apply it directly to that particular case by definition, not by a rote action. Not by a rote action. I'd apply it by definition. Of course, I'd do the rote actions. I can do those as well as you can.

I mean, actually you can get as good as I am on that level very easily. Very, very easily. Because what is it? It's reading a meter and translating it into set forms which are all per-

fectly lined up and which are perfectly valid and which are the product of years and years and years of application, observation and research. Yeah. Well, you can get up to doing that.

Now, I'm asking you to do another thing. Now, I'm asking you to audit the pc who is sitting in front of you and not somebody else. And not some synthetic person that you dreamed up or some person that's sitting at the other end of a form or something of the sort. Audit the guy who is there, please. Audit the person.

Now, there are certain things you're going to *do* that are going to produce disaster. And one of those is miss a withhold. First and foremost across the boards, that one. That's the biggest – after you know all these other skills, then the biggest mistake you can make is to miss a withhold.

You just miss one withhold and you've had it. And for your information, the next time your pc is ARC broke, you follow it right back, puppy to the root, to that missed withhold and you will *find* the missed withhold. And the pc will just settle down and just act like a complete lamb as a pc the moment you've got it.

You can do that. You can do that. You can keep all of your rudiments in just with withholds. Withholds are that important. So you can hold a pc in session. You can keep him in session no matter how many present time problems or state of case or scratchy needle or anything else he's got. You can hold him in session.

You got technical tricks that hold him in session, one way or the other. But because you've got these tricks, don't fall so far short. Don't think you've got it wrapped up because you can do a few tricks. You've got to be able to audit the person who is sitting in front of you. Audit that person. Handle *that* person's peculiarly constituted mishmash, based securely on the fundamentals that we know.

Now, you see, he is no mystery as far as fundamentals are concerned. We know what makes him cook. We know from what spring his aberration proceeds. We could give you all the rules and theories by which he got aberrated, for sure. But nevertheless he is an individual package of cow's breakfast versus dog's breakfast.

You see, he's his own peculiar handmade mud pie. See? He is that. And that's peculiar and that's peculiar to that pc. Now, you got all the rules, you know all the basics, you know all the rules by which he got aberrated, you know the fundamentals and so forth. That's all fine. But on those he's built a peculiar edifice that he calls "me" or "my mind." And you have to be able to put your finger on any button in that, that is there to be pressed and produce a considerable reaction in the pc.

You have to be able to produce an advance of his communication. That is what you are trying to produce and that's all you're trying to produce. I don't care how many ways you phrase it, that is all you are trying to produce – an advance of his communication.

This person says, "Well, the good old days. And why aren't I still able to operate in a space opera. That was lots of fun. We used to take our electronic cannon, mount it on the flight deck and depress the rheostat and a space fleet one-and-a-half light-years away would blow up in smoke. And now I have trouble spilling a cup of tea. Ah, sad. Ah, woe. Ah, woe is me. What has happened to me? Is it because my mother was mean to me? Could that be it? Or

is it because I once read a book by Freud? Perhaps – perhaps that caused it. Or perhaps it's because the world has changed."

It isn't any of these things. This is just one of your basic fundamentals. These are one of your basics of the theory of the mind. This is one of these things. His communication reach has shortened. He can't blow up any space fleets one-and-a-half light-years away, he can't now. He can't even reach into a spilled cup of tea eighteen inches from his schnozzola.

Did you ever see anybody spill a cup of tea? They always leap back. Funny thing to do, isn't it? In other words, they aren't reaching at all already and they want to decrease their reach further.

Now, what's the matter with this character? His communication no longer has the same reach. And that's all that's wrong with him. As his ability to reach – which is to say to communicate – decreases, he considers that he is aberrated. It's this stupidly fundamental, see.

And when you audit this person, all you've got to do is extend his communication reach. That's all you've got to do. Now, there were many things that did this and most of them were short reach things. 8-C. That's one of them. That's a short reach, but it nevertheless is pretty good. When it would work, it just was wonderful. But that was increasing the reach to MEST and that was showing your – showing him, "Now, look, it doesn't bite when you touch it. And it doesn't kill you to be orderly in your emotions."

Told him these things. "And it won't – you won't perish because I am here communicating to you. Therefore, you can receive a communication without dying. And it isn't killing you because you're touching MEST and look, you've got your reach."

Well, actually, that works best on a fellow who heretofore has not been able to reach quite to the end of his nose. And you get him to reach out to arm's length. That's all there is to it. You extend a pc's reach, that's all. Which means extend his ability to communicate. Anything else you want to call this, any other way you want to go about this, you will find that whatever you're trying to do with the pc is covered by this one point. And your technical skills are addressed to this one point.

Now, his inability to reach can come about from these two things: One, he is restraining himself from reaching in some fashion or another, just directly restraining himself from reaching or he doesn't know what to reach. And there's only those two things.

He's keeping himself from reaching and he never suspected that before you came along. And the other one is, he doesn't know what to reach into or at. And there you are, too.

Now, it's on that one second button that you get your biggest gains. That's why 3D works. You show him what this character's – you show him what he's been trying to reach into. It's Goals Problem Mass.

Every time he went floundering around in his mind, of course, he collided with all this impacted mess of valences of one kind or another, all of them filled with terrific enturbulances and he couldn't even identify them. He didn't know where he was and he didn't know what he was doing, so he just didn't know which way to go. He didn't know what to reach. He

didn't know what was the future and what was the past and where he sat and so forth. He had a hell of a time.

All right. On the first one, the auditor has to be smart enough to be able *to find out* what the fellow's restraint of reach is and we call this withholds. How is he restraining himself from reaching?

Well, there are many mechanics to withholds. He has reached at sometime or another, overtly. He has reached. And then he has decided that that was a bad thing to do, so now he withholds the reach next time. And of course, this gives you a confusion immediately followed by a rest point, the withhold, and of course it locks it up very nicely on the track and makes it float rather timelessly. Not as bad as a problem, but it's a confusion and a stable datum, one after the other and it locks it up.

And now that he has decided he must never reach that way again, see, type of reach – he has never – he has decided he must never exercise that *type* of reach again – he has now forgotten utterly what type of reach he was exercising that he mustn't reach again. So he's in a total confusion as to what he is withholding.

He doesn't know what he's withholding. All he knows is he's restraining his reachingness. He's – he'd better. All sorts of horrible things might occur if he didn't. All of them imaginary. Oh, not all of them imaginary. I imagine if one or two of you went down and pounded on the door of the local gendarmerie and spilled a couple of your withholds, why, they would probably lock you up in a sanitarium or something. They probably wouldn't send you to jail, or something. I think, in terms of criminal withholds, well, the burden – the burden of proof is on the other fellow that you did it. You just got it off as a withhold.

Some people go so far as withholds, is – in order to know that they've gotten them off, they have to get hanged. And that seems to me to be a terrific exaggeration. That seems to me to be aberrated conduct.

All right. So there's the auditor. There's the auditor and he's faced in this one pc – who is not all the pcs there are – in this one pc, there is a randomly cockeyed mess of ill-assorted pullbacks that forbid him from communicating. See, a bunch of withholds.

Well, he has his own line and lot, as I've mentioned in other lectures. He's got his own brands. Here are all these withholds. Well, how are you going to get these withholds? You think I could write up enough forms to give you to cover the withholds of the whole universe? No, I'm going to take a shortcut on it. I'm just going to tell you, "Get off somebody's withholds."

Go ahead and use forms, by all means. They're very useful. I think you should also know how to get off a withhold. I think you should know how to find one. I think that would be interesting. Just directly and overtly find the withhold and get it off. *Crack, crash!*

Here is this pc. He is not any other pc. He definitely is himself. And although he runs on all the rules of the game and those rules of the game are invariable pc to pc and although you are auditing definitely on the rules of the game and no other rules; nevertheless, he's his own peculiar breed of aberration. He is festered in his own individual way.

The package which he is with – restraining is his own, has infinite variety. Now, an auditor can get so lost in the infinite variety of the pc's 3D package and the fantastic complexity and unexpected idiocy of the pc's withholdings, that he thinks there wouldn't be any way possible to reach him. But that's the auditor's belief that *he* can't reach. Isn't that interesting?

You know why you don't – why the pc doesn't reach into valences? Because they're enturbulative. Every time he reaches into one of these black masses, it bites. He gets somatics and he gets cold and he gets this and that. But honest, it won't kill him. Oh, yes, they have killed him many times though in the life of livingness. Not in auditing sessions. But living a life – yeah, oh, man, they killed him many times.

In fact, he couldn't even die if he didn't have them. So from his point of view, he is handling the stuff which murders thetans particularly and especially him. And he's sitting there, you know, not going through this and if he lives very carefully and he doesn't look very much or if he only looks from eight feet out forward only for a foot, he'll be all right, maybe.

And then one day he accidentally – he gets out of a car and he accidentally, *gong*, he misses and he will look at this valence over here, you know. And he'll put his attention right square on the valence and it will activate and that is his sinusitis. And it goes *splat*. He knew he shouldn't do it. In fact, he knew he shouldn't do it so well that the second he does it, he instantly forgets he's done it and said it was because he got chilly today.

The rapidity with which he can forget his goofs in handling his own bank is marvelous. No, he daren't reach into these things. They bite. They bite. They killed him and killed him and knocked him off and killed him. He knows this.

He's out – he's out driving on the highway and one of these valences moves in. *Mm-hmm-mm-humm-hmm-hmm-hm*, that's the end of him. He reached in the wrong direction.

He's chewing on something, he's chewing on something and chewing on something, thinking about something and all of a sudden he feels kind of agitated, you know and he chews on something. All of a sudden, why maybe he blanks out and drives straight into a tree. That would be the most elementary thing.

More complicatedly, he accidentally restimulates one of these things. He sees a pretty girl and he's thinking about something else and he thinks about how pleasant all that is and he thinks it all – how nice all that is. And then all of a sudden he realizes he shouldn't think all that was that nice. And he realizes he shouldn't be thinking like this. And then he sort of says that he wouldn't be able to tell his current girlfriend that he'd been admiring the girl in the roadster, don't you see. And so then he realizes he'll have a withhold from his present girlfriend and having a withhold from his present girlfriend, he brings in a valence. See, he brings in this valence and the valence activates and he gets very agitated and he can't coordinate suddenly and it's two highways and he drives on the wrong one. Yeah, he had been killed by his valences many times, so he knows better than to touch them – that's dangerous.

All right. And as far as his withholdings are concerned, why, he knows he'd better withhold. There isn't anybody understands him anyplace. He knows that.

Of course I – from our point of view, if he came up and told us that, we would say, "Well, your difficulty is that we understand you too well."

You know, people complain about Scientologists not being sympathetic. Well, I didn't breed this no sympathy into Scientologists. But once you've learned to handle something to that degree, confound it, you just can't bring yourself to worship it anymore, you know.

And this fellow comes in and he says he's led an unhappy life and his mother was mean to him and his first wife was mean to him and his second wife was mean to him, his third wife was mean to him, his fourth wife was very mean to him and his fifth wife is being just as mean as the others. And a Scientologist doesn't follow through with the proper human cue, you see.

He's supposed to say, "Oh, you poor fellow," or something like this. Instead of that, he says something – something blatant, you know. "What do you do to these women?" [laughter] Something elementary, you see, something down to earth, something effective and so on. Busts the guy's dramatization badly. That's all right. He'll recover faster.

Now, as far as withholds are concerned, what are the basic withholds that a person is confronted with? Well, they could be anything. They can be in the most assorted and unlikely packages. But he knows he can be punished for getting them off, because one of the things he's done is make people guilty every time they got off withholds. So he knows if he gets off a withhold out in the public, why, of course, he knows that he'll be made guilty and they'll hang him. And it's that type of mechanism. His overts are visited upon him.

So he's rather educated into submerging these overts. And of course, they have nothing – these withholds – they have nothing to do with his state of health. And he knows that better than anything else. That he really knows. His withholds have nothing to do with his state of health. No. Nothing to do with his brightness. Nothing to do with anything. He could just go on withholding forever. You'd think some of these thetans just think that, you know. They can just go on withholding forever. And somehow, while withholding, recover miraculously on some level or another. Can't be done.

You cannot teach somebody to communicate better while that person is restraining their own communication equally throughout the activity of trying to reach better. Do you see what an idiocy this would be? If the person is going to keep on restraining the communication throughout the exercises to reach better with that communication, of course, the communication is never going to arrive. So of course, he's never going to be any better. That's it.

So an auditor has these two zones of action. He's always had these two zones of action. In Dianetics he had pictures. And these pictures, by the way, are quite interesting. But pictures are a very shallow look. They are a hundred billion miles deeper than anybody ever looked before on these sort of things, but they're a shallow look compared to valences because valences are some of the wildest packages of pictures you ever saw. We're now auditing pictures by the quintillion. You throw out a whole package of pictures when you throw off a valence, see. And that – I don't know how many pictures a person would have in a lifetime. And every valence is at least one lifetime, so just count up the number of pictures that would be expressed in this valence.

Somebody was telling me the other day – it was very funny this package that floated in on him because he could look in on it and, just about the size of a 35-millimeter slides, he

could see these pictures. Well, of course, what did he think they were? They're engrams and nothing else, don't you see?

There's types of engrams. You have condensed engrams, you know and crossfiled engrams and impacted engrams and sometimes you can take engrams and mush them up like a – like a bunch of black dough and then when you try to take them apart, you see, why, they explode. Something like this happens.

Pictures have nothing to do with it, now. Let's not worry about pictures. Let's talk about valences. And then you're into 3D. Now, let's not talk about drills and getting the pc to communicate better. Let's talk about knocking out the things which keep the pc from communicating. There – what things are impeding the reach? And we know that he is impeding his own reach and that these are being impeded by having things he cannot – or he feels he cannot communicate.

All right. It's up to the auditor to get those off. Now, I don't care if we have policy letters. The auditor does it standing on his head, hanging by his toes, does it by handing carrots to the pc every time the pc gives up a withhold. I don't care what method is used here. The point is the auditor has to be good enough to get that pc's withholds. Not some other pc's withholds. But that pc that's sitting right in front of him. He has to be able to get that pc's *withholds*.

What are they? Well, the auditor doesn't know. On the basic fundamentals of the game, you could say, well, a generality of withhold is the pc is not communicating something because he doesn't want to, thinks he'll be hung, tried to make other people guilty, is restraining people from knowing about him. You could go on and make a long category about it, but just come down to the solid fact that the pc is not communicating because he's holding back the communication and you've got it.

The pc isn't reaching because he's not reaching. And why is he not reaching? Well, he has self-imposed restraints called withholds. And that's that. That's it. That's the entirety of Security Checking. All you're trying to do is release jammed communication lines that are pulled in by the pc so that he will not anymore communicate into certain areas. That's all.

And that's all you're trying to do. I don't care how many systems or rituals or anything else. You're just trying to find out what he is withholding from *whom*. And of course the converse of this is that if he is withholding from *whom*, why, he ain't communicating somewhat to that *whom*. So therefore, he isn't reaching that *whom*, so therefore, he doesn't feel he can be free in that direction, so therefore, that is just one more channel in this universe that he cannot put a communication on. That is just one more zone into which he cannot reach.

In other words, men build their prison cages out of these bars of "mustn't reach." And one by one they say, "I cannot reach into that zone and I cannot reach into that zone." In other words, "I have withholds from this zone and withholds from that zone," see?

And every time they do that, they put another bar on the cage and after a while somebody wheels them off and uses them in a circus as a freak. They get elected president or something.

But withhold after withhold, you see, they just pile it up and the next thing you know they're in a cage. That's all there is to it. That is all there is to it.

Now, knowing that and understanding that completely, why, you should be able to get withholds off. You see, these other technical skills learned and truly done and well done, you should be able to get withholds off.

What would you have to do to get withholds off? Well, all you'd have to do is find out where the fellow ain't. Not isn't, that's too polite because that's where he ain't. Where ain't he?

Well, I could pull a withhold off any of you just on this one basis. You're here, so you're not home. I'll show you a formula if you want one. All right. You're here, so you're not home. Isn't that a self-evident fact? Hmm? That's self-evident.

Well, any pc who is sitting in the auditing chair opposite you isn't home. You may be auditing him in his living room at which this would alter. Then he would not be at his office.

In other words, he ain't somewhere. That's – isn't that the first fact that meets the eye?

Female voice: Yes.

You can't avoid this fact. Here he is *in* the auditing chair. In the pc's chair. And you're *in* the auditing chair. You sit in the auditing chair, look at the pc in the pc's chair and the first thing that you could observe, as far as location is concerned, is he ain't somewhere else. He's there. Isn't that the first thing you'd observe?

Well, how come he blew from this other place? [laughter] Now, let's be real crude about the thing. All right.

Of course, we could say this is *far, far* too significant. This is *far, far* too fundamental. But why ain't he there, see?

All right. *Reductio ad absurdum*, he is of course withholding himself from home as he sits in the pc's chair. Not being home, he's withholding himself from home, obviously. He isn't there, so he must be withholding himself from there. That's the most evident idiocy that you could possibly imagine. So *there's* a withhold. If you're looking for withholds, *there is one*. He *ain't* somewhere.

Now, consciously or unconsciously or factually – certainly factually – this pc – this pc is not where he was. It's just that crazy, you know. So he is withholding himself from where he was or he wouldn't be here.

Now, that would be the first tiniest little gradient and of course, it's not aberrative. Nobody's upset by it except people who want to be there. And there's nothing more complicated about it than just that. That's all there is to it. And yet it's a withhold. And if you're looking for withholds, there's the pc, so therefore the pc isn't somewhere else, so therefore the pc must be holding himself.

Now, if you took a pc – and I'll show you really how to find a withhold, you say to the pc, you say – you say, "Where haven't you liked to be?"

"Well," the pc says, "I just never ain't liked to be down at the seashore."

All right. Now, you've really developed a nice, interesting situation right there. Pc does not want to be down at the seashore. He is sitting in the pc's chair and he is not at the seashore. This is obvious. And he does not *want* to be at the seashore.

Now, that he doesn't *want* to be at the seashore at *all* and he is sitting in your chair there, he's not at the seashore – given those conditions, I could develop you some of the nicest withholds you ever saw. *Bang-bang-bang-bang-bang!* They'd feel – the pc would feel much better. He'd be in communication in all directions all of a sudden. How?

Well, you'd ask him, one, what they have done to him at the seashore. That's very carefully worded, see. "Well, what have they done to you at the seashore?"

Oh, he'll answer that. *Oh-ho-ho*. Who was it and you know, get the details of this. What they've done to him at the seashore.

Now, your next thing is *who* did it to him at the seashore.

And then the next one that comes up, of course, is has he thought any critical thoughts about that person.

And then immediately behind that, you ask him, "What have you *done* to that person?"

And that formula lands you in some of the hottest withholds on any case you ever heard of.

Just find out where the pc ain't and doesn't want to be. He doesn't want to be there and he isn't there, so obviously he must have some withholds on the place which are quite in addition to not being there physically. And then find out what they've done to him there, that stirs up the motivators. And he's always happy to pass on the motivator. That's always safe communication – a motivator. It's nothing the pc can be hanged for, he always thinks. Only Scientists hang them for having a motivator.

And there's your next action, of course, is *'ho*. *'ho* did it? Get a name, you know. Get one, two, three names. "*'ho* did it? *'ho* was this brute?" And then, "What critical thoughts have you thought about that?" You know.

Well, it's proving itself all the way. They didn't want to be there. They aren't there. They didn't want – don't want to be there. They have motivators there. Well, we're getting warmer here now. And there's some person there who did these motivators to them. *Mm-hmmm!* There we are. And now they have critical thoughts about that person. We're moving right in close. Now, at – up to that point you have not done *anything* to help the pc or cure his aberrations. Now, you understand you have not done *anything*.

I don't care whether you were pleasant in session or sympathetic or I don't care what juicy motivator you pulled off of him. I don't care how many critical thoughts you managed to get and I don't care. You haven't done anything for this pc. *Baa!*

It's – you do those things, you possibly could change his profile. You'd make him happier. *Yip-yap, yip-yap, yip-yap*. See, I mean now, *pfffft*. These are little grains of sand. They're nothing, see? You haven't really done anything.

Now, that spring-trap question. *Nyaa-ha-ha-ha*. "What have you *done* to that person?"

"Oh," the pc says, "*Ha-ha*, well, *ha-ho*, that's something else. *Hooooooooo. Ha-ha-ha.*" As goosey as a bear on hot skates, and you have to fish now. But go on and let him tell you a few more motivators and a few more critical thoughts and you'll loosen it up.

Now, the odd part of it is in Twenty-Ten, after you've gotten that far and you've gotten the withhold or two off, you know that running Havingness will cause them probably to volunteer a few more withholds on the same area. It's quite interesting. Havingness will get them to give you some more withholds. Elementary.

And you say to the pc, "What did you do?"

And the pc will tell you. And when the pc has told you all, when you run some Havingness, he will tell you the rest of it.

Then run some Havingness and stabilize and the pc will feel wonderful. And you'll change the color of the pc's eyes. Why?

Because the pc *really* was being careful not to communicate in that direction, has been careful ever since not to communicate in that direction.

Well, it's not at any accident that you arrived at a proper set of withholds because you applied the first principle. He ain't somewhere else. He's here. Well, why ain't he someplace else? Well, the obvious common denominator, from someplace on the track he must have blown. Obvious he must have blown.

So if he blew he must have withholds. He must have committed overts before he got out of there. Obvious. I would say, "my dear Watson," but I'm afraid this is a little smarter than Sherlock. It's just on this prima facie evidence. And there's your basic *Security Checking*. That is the basics of Security Checking and that's all the basics there are to Security Checking. And you can change a pc's eye colors and hair wave and anything else you can think of just by applying such a principle.

But that's because you're auditing the pc who is sitting in front of you and because you do want to find out what this pc is and you do want to get the withholds off of this pc and you do want this pc straightened out. So given the basic skill of being able to do Model Session, get the rudiments in and *read a meter*, that is *important*. Being able to do those things, why, of course, you can audit the pc in front of you and find out what *that* pc's withholds are. Now, if that pc doesn't consider any withholds withholds and so forth, you have other versions.

You'd run the whole thing all the way through and then find out what the – what the who that you got out of this package doesn't know about the pc's deeds, actions, looks and so forth. And all of a sudden, the pc comes up enough in responsibility to know that that was an overt. You can play this any way you want to, you get off withholds.

I'm not necessarily stressing how you get off a withhold now. I'm telling you how to locate a withhold and how to take a pc who is right there. And, golly, you know, you've already accomplished the greatest miracle of all time. You've got this thetan into the pc's chair. From there on, it's easy as long as you know your business.

See, the biggest miracle was getting him there to be audited. The biggest miracle is that Scientology exists. Why, after that, there's nothing to it. There he sits, so why are you

dodging, see? Audit the pc in front of you and get off the withholds that pc has. If he doesn't think he has any withholds, get off the things other people doesn't know about him and he'll all of a sudden find out he has withholds.

All kinds of ways to go about this, but what a pc considers is a withhold has nothing to do with what you consider a juicy withhold would be on a standpoint of quality. It's what the pc's withholding.

Honest to Pete! You can listen to some girl sometime or another who is just bursting into tears over this fantastic, *horrible* thing they've done to their family. *Oooooo*, how *awful* it is, you know? They didn't send Aunt Molly a Christmas card, you know. That's the withhold.

"All right. Now, is there any overt connected with it?"

"Well, it's a pretty bad overt. Didn't send one last year either." [laughs]

Don't badger her. Clears the meter. The meter's clear on the thing. You can't find any more on it. Don't ever make the mistake of saying, "The quality of the withhold is not such as to have produced tears in the pc. Therefore, there must be much deeper and more significant overts in this particular area because nobody would cry over not sending a Christmas card."

How do you know? It's not your bank. What do you know what kind of a Goals Problem Mass package prompts all this, huh? *Hm?* Do you realize this person might have been the biggest Christmas card manufacturer in the whole of Germany three lifetimes ago? Do you realize this is absolutely contrary to every mores of a Christmas card manufacturer?

And it very well may trace back to fifteen hundred thousand years ago when they didn't send a Christmas card, they sent a bomb. It said "Merry Christmas, family dear," and they opened it up and that was the end of the tree and everything.

How do you know what it goes back to in the package? The thing about it is, is did it clear the meter and are there any more?

Now, I told you the other day I could throw rudiments out at any time. Well, you got to throw the pc out. The trick is – the trick is, you see – to audit with the rudiments in and to run the rudiments so they stay in, see?

You open the session. Keep the rudiments in. And then you throw the pc around, see? You handle the pc. You're the one who stirs up the pc's bank. *You're* the one who restimulates the pc's bank and gets the withhold. There's nobody else around. The pc isn't there. I'm talking truth now, you see. You're the one that stimulates the pc's bank.

Now, an auditor auditing this way is auditing improperly: "While running the withholds, stir up the pc's bank all one possibly can." Pardon me. "While running the rudiments, stir up the pc's bank all one possibly can," you see? "While running the rudiments, get them out as far as possible so as to get them in," you see? "Really run the case while running the rudiments." See, that's highly improper. But it's – has an equally improper sequel: "And when doing the main body of the session, be as careful as possible not to stir up the pc's bank." See? "While auditing rudiments, always get the pc in a turmoil and while running the body of the session, why, keep it as calm as possible and do as little muddying of the still waters as you can," you see? That's exactly in reverse.

You want to audit the pc with rudiments in. Every once in a while when you're doing Security Checking on a pc with the withhold question in the beginning rudiments and the session has started. See, the session has now started. The pc has a half a dozen he thought yesterday and last night and came in and decided to tell you and so forth. The session started.

Well, recognize the session started and just run it from there. That's a clever auditor. Clever auditor never lets auditing get in the road of auditing results. Auditing results are not something that would happen in spite of an auditing session.

What you've got to get is a smooth approach into the rudiments. Don't muddy up the still waters. With an air of great confidence and command of the situation, by taking over and controlling all environment in all directions clear on down to the horizon regardless of storm clouds, winds and leaking window panes. In spite of all this sort of thing, have that session *so deeply* under control in the rudiments that the pc never *dreams* that he is anyplace but in-session. Now, that's auditing.

The pc had a present time problem before he sat down in the chair. He doesn't have one now because you're auditing him. Not because you ask him, not because you ran one, not because you handled it, but just because you're auditing him. Obviously, he doesn't have a present time problem, you're auditing him. He realizes all will be resolved and it all keys out and there he goes and so forth.

Now, get that in *smoothly* and *rapidly* and then arrive at the rest. And then take a *great* big butter churn, about half-universe-size butter churn and put the pc in it and attach the motors to it. As far as his mind is concerned, rile it up all you possibly can. And the reason why you're not changing the color of the pc's eyes is because you're not muddying up his bank. You're letting still water be still.

It's you that do it to the pc. You think the pc's going to think of all these things? He's – look he spent lifetime, ages. Why, he's been careful not to think about this for the last millennia. And you think he's going to think about this all by himself? What do you expect him to do? Sit, be – there he is in the auditing chair and unless there isn't something else happening, he's just going to sit there in the auditing chair, just as he has in the whole last millennia.

Well, what else is going to happen? Nothing else is going to happen unless the auditor makes it happen. So it's the auditor who's got to stir it up. It's the auditor who's got to do something. It's the auditor who's got to get something done. And if the auditor doesn't start anything ... oh, this idea of sitting there very carefully, you know and sticking closely by the rituals so that we keep the still waters of the pc without a single ripple to be seen anywhere and so forth.

We get to the end of the session, I guarantee, absolutely, you will never change a pc's eye color.

Now, by cutting the pc to ribbons with sabers, by getting angry with the pc and busting the Auditors Code in all direction – well, you've stirred him up, [laughter] but you didn't necessarily get your hands on anything in the case.

No, you want to stir him up. Just as I was telling you in the last lecture, that you say to this pc, "Well now, did you have a present time problem? You been concerned about anything in life the last day or two? *Ha-ha.*"

And you can see you didn't get a read on the present time problem. Disappointing, isn't it?

And you say, "Well, in the last day or two have you worried about anything in life? Is there anything in life that is worrying you?"

And the pc says, "Well, I have been a little bit worried about the payments on my house and so forth."

"Well, could it be possible that that's worrying you now?"

"Well, now that you mention it, yes, it ..."

See, you could always connect the pc up to present time problem. Well, you don't do that in rudiments, but you do it in the body of the session.

The pc says – you say, "How do you feel?"

And the pc says, "I feel fine."

And the auditor says, "Well, I can fix that, too," to himself and goes ahead and does something. [laughter]

Man, if you're going to run these quiet sessions with no somatics and nothing going on and everything very nice, the pc will wind up at the end; the pc will say, "I feel fine," and he'll think you did fine and everybody did fine and so on. Everything is fine.

But you're not going to change anybody's eye color. I don't know. You got about a ten thousand hour expectancy to Clear.

No, you got to look at this pc. This pc is sitting there. You're going to take this pc and you're going to put him over the jumps, man.

You say, "All right. Now, are you very happy?" during the rudiments, you see. "Are you very happy about everything? Are you happy to be sitting there? Nothing is troubling you sitting there? Are you very happy?"

Now, you got the bulk of the session. The question you're asking now is, "How unhappy can I make you about a few of these things in order to get you to take a look at them and get the withholds off of them and clean them all up at the other end and come out the other end alive and in better communication. How unhappy can you get?"

Well, you sit there overtly and you say, "Aunt Grace, Uncle Bill, George," something, you see? You say these various things. All of a sudden, you get a fall on George, you know.

And you say, "What's that?"

Well, what are you doing except restimulating the pc so the pc can find something?

"George? George? Oh, I get this on George. George who?"

Well, the wrong way to attack the problem is, "Oh, I get a fall here on George. Oh, good. Have you done anything to George? Very good. Thank you very much. All right. Now, we don't have a fall on George now. That's fine. Now, here's Aunt Bessie now. Have you ever done anything to Aunt Bessie? Well, thank you very much. Very happy that you've never done anything to Aunt Bessie. All right. Uncle Bill. If we can just keep this meter from reading and we can just keep this awfully null, we somehow or another will get through the Sec Check."

Well, that's not the way to do it.

We say, "George?" We get a needle twitch. And we say, "Well, have you done something to George?"

No, that would be the wrong way to approach the thing. At least get the pc talking to you. Stop omitting this Auditor's Code line about staying in two-way comm with the pc.

"George? Who's George? George 'ho? When did you know him? What did he do to you? What critical thoughts have you had about him? *Ooooo*, is that so? *Ooh*. How interesting What did you do to him?"

"Agggg. And it's this and it's that and it's the other thing and it's the other thing and it's the other thing and it's the other thing. And I don't want to tell you and besides *hee-hee-hee*, that wouldn't be very important," and so forth.

And I'm still getting a fall on the meter. You say. "What is it? What is it? What's some more about George? Well, what *did* George do to you about then?"

"Well, *ha*, it isn't what I did to George. It's what George did to me. That is obviously the whole thing, you see."

Well, what are you looking at the meter for to find out if the pc still have a withhold? The pc's still got a *motivator*, so they must have a *withhold*. How could a pc get a motivator without having a withhold. See, that's auditing by the rules, but it's also auditing with good sense.

Instead of looking at the meter, you could say, "Well, have your families been mean to you?" You're trying to pull overts on the family. "Has your family been mean to you? What has your family done to you?"

And the pc still goes off on a long machine-gun parade of what the family has done to him.

Well, you say, "That's fine. Good. Thanks. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. Now. Have you ever had any critical thoughts about all that? *Oh*, yes, very good. Well, what did you do to your family?"

Anything. Any way you want to enter it.

A little bit later they told you this. They burned down the house and ran up grocery bills and had their father accused of treason and a few other minor things. And there you get all these things off, pc says, "Funny thing, I never told anybody about this before," and so forth.

And the auditor says, "Oh, fine." You finally null the needle down on the thing. Well, another way to null the needle down on the thing is say to the pc, "Well, all right. Now, what else did your family do to you?" See?

And they say, "Well, the family did this and the family did that and the family did something else, the family did something else."

And you'll say, "What did you do to them?"

See, I mean, you're sitting there looking at the needle. Any time the needle twitches, they still got withholds. Well, any time they still got motivators, they still got withholds.

And this is just the rules of the game. This is auditing by the good sense of what it takes to audit. That's all. It's you're there to take these still, running waters. That's the trouble with them, you know. Their still, running water is only about a quarter of an inch deep. From there on, they're a churning torrent of total introversion because it's all held in and nothing is flowing out, see.

And you say, "Where are these self-imposed prison bars?"

That's what you're doing and you have to stir him up like mad sometimes to find that. Oh, you can get a pc so absolutely *sweating* on the subject. *Not* at the thought of telling you their withholds. That's the wrong direction for them to sweat.

But just sweating on the subject of how terrible *life* has *been*. These still running waters are no longer running still.

"Well, did you have a bad time with your first husband?"

Girl has a second husband, must have left the first husband. Well, that's a fruitful field of withholds. They aren't there, are they? Not still married to the guy, are they? All right. They must have left, so therefore the rules apply that they still have overts on the person. I mean, it's as elementary as it is, you see.

Pc has left places all over the track. Every time they left anywhere, they left some withholds. Simple. But you have to stir these things up and bring them into view and you have to move the case around. And you can't sit there, "Have you ever looked at a pretty girl? Thank you. Have you ever looked at a pretty girl? Thank you. Have you ever looked at a pretty girl? Thank you. Have you ever looked at a pretty girl? Thank you. Have you ever looked at a pretty girl? Thank you. I don't get a reaction now. We'll go on to the next question. Have you ever stood on your head? Thank you. Have you ever stood on your head? Thank you. Have you ever stood on your head? Thank you. Have you ever stood on your head? We got all the withholds off that now. Thank you very much. Now, we'll go on to the next one."

I could cry. I watch this, I could cry, man. I could just cry. There's a pc sitting in front of you. This pc has got perfectly – well, a sort of a slate mauve colored set of eyes set in deepest bloodshot. Pc is not in communication with life. Pc every time they – you start to think they have developed a reputation of being a very conservative person because they always think first. Well, the reason they think first, because otherwise they'd stutter. What makes this pc this way? What's this pc all about? What withholds does this pc have? Same thing, isn't it?

Where isn't this pc communicating to? Well, let's look it over and let's find out what the score is here. Where is the zone of no communicate. Certainly, you're not going to learn it by talking much to the pc. You're going to get the – learn it by getting the pc's responses to what you're saying to the pc. You can't just sit down and say to a pc, "All right. Tell me the zones of communication that you're not communicating into in life. Good. Thank you. Now, what withholds do you have from those areas? Thank you very much. One, two, three, four, five. Thank you very much. Well, then the meter's clear now."

"I wonder why the color of his eyes hasn't changed. Ron said the color of his eyes would change." No, you audit the pc that's in front of you and, man, you can turn their hair green.

No, you improve somebody's ability to reach and you improve somebody's physical health. You also improve their – the calmness in their environment. You also improve their ability to live. You also improve all the people that associate with him indirectly – their ability to reach. Thetans are basically good. When they can reach, they do all right. And when they can't, they raise hell. And that's about all there is to it.

Now, as far as 3D packages are concerned, 3D's the same way. You do a dozen things with 3D. This is almost unlimited, numbers of things that a sloppy auditor that can think on his feet can do with 3D.

Pc says, "Well, I've always had dyspepsia and I want to get rid of my dyspepsia."

"All right. Give me a list of people who would have – who would oppose dyspepsia."

And you list the people who had dyspepsia. It doesn't matter.

All right. Now, "Who or what would oppose that (finally assessed out item)?" End of session – no dyspepsia.

Fantastic. You say to this pc, "What have you always wanted to do?"

You see, you're not going to audit this; you're not going to run it, so it doesn't matter if it's the wrong terminal. You've only got to have a right terminal if you run it.

So you can say to this pc, "Well, what have you always wanted to do in life?"

Pc would say, "Oh, I always wanted to be an artist. Never understood why, but I always wanted to be an artist."

You say, "What kind of an artist?"

"A painter."

"All right." You say, "You wanted to do what now?"

"Well, I wanted to paint. Paint, specifically."

"Well, who would paint? What sort of a person would paint? What kind of a person would paint?"

"Well, a painter."

"All right. Good. Who else would paint?"

"A dilettante."

"Who else would paint?"

"Oh, uh ... an artisan."

"Who else would paint?"

"A painter!"

"All right. You see if there are any more of these?"

No. No more of these. Assess it. You get a painter. That was elementary enough, but it'd be a good thing to do.

Now, you roll your hands up and you say, now, "Who or what would oppose a painter?"

List, list, list, list, list, list, list and null, null, null, null, null, null, null and all of a sudden the individual will be looking at you rather oddly and strangely – particularly if you've run some Havingness somewhere in the vicinity of this.

"Let's see, I certainly feel strange. I certainly feel different about the whole thing. The thought of painting makes me want to vomit."

And you say, "Well, that's very, very interesting, what do you know about that."

"I didn't realize it before, but I just can't *stand* the idea of painting."

Well, that's very interesting. You've now made him reach into the zone and area of painting. All right. And whatever item you've finally found, who or what would oppose that? Next thing you know, why, the guy will be sitting home diddling with the crayons and making good with the pictures. All of a sudden, he can paint.

The guy says, "Well, I know I'd get better..." (This is another use of hidden standards.) "I know I'd get better if I suddenly started speaking Arabic. I've never been in Arabia and I haven't run into any Arabic in this lifetime, but I know Scientology would work if I suddenly started speaking Arabic." That's a very good way to handle that hidden standard. Say, "Who or what would speak Arabic?" List, list, list, list, list, list, list, null, null, null, null, null, null, null.

"Good. Who or what would oppose that item? Who or what would oppose that item?"

And he says, "*Allah, Allah, uk, Allah, ugala, ugala... splig-wug, dates*" – other Arabic words.

Who knows? He's liable to start speaking Arabic. On the other hand, he certainly will stop worrying about speaking Arabic. You see, those things are minor results. They don't have too much to do with the case. Don't have too much to do with anything. It would simply be a subsidiary use to 3D. You can do anything with 3D. If you don't – if you don't – don't run those items, you understand. I mean, don't set those things up and run them on the 26 December command sheet or something stupid like that because they're not proper items.

But they certainly did shift the bank around and blew out terminals, particularly when you accompany them with lots of Havingness.

You see, Havingness blows terminals and withholds loosen up terminals and 3D finds them and throws them away and you're in the business of circuits whether you like it or not. So you better learn how to audit and learn what you're auditing and stop sitting there saying, "Well, have you ever raped a waterbuck? Thank you. Have you ever raped a waterbuck? Thank you. Have you ever raped a waterbuck?"

And you finally wake up after a while and find out that the pc has been saying for some time, "What is a waterbuck?"

That is not the way to audit. No, learn to do these skills by rote, learn to do them absolutely perfectly. And then learn to audit. And it's on the basis of auditing who is in front of you and so forth.

Now, whenever I make you a lecture like this or I tell you to do something like this, always here or there a student goes into some wild skyration in some direction and does everything backwards, upside down and somebody is chucking his cookies out of an upstairs window. Something like this is going on. And it's disastrous in all directions. And the Instructors and other people around that are responsible for these things actually hate to hear me say things like that.

But have it very clearly understood, there are some things that you should know perfectly before you start this kind of thing and then you can get off the springboard of knowing how to audit the pc who is sitting in front of you.

And speaking of waterbucks – speaking of waterbucks – Mike was nice enough to get us a picture of a waterbuck. [laughter] And I thought you'd be very interested in this waterbuck. I understand that the waterbuck has kinder eyes than this, but there is a waterbuck. There is a waterbuck. And by courtesy of Quentin who got this for Christmas, here is a tiger. [laughter]

Now, I didn't want you to not have any havingness on these two terminals and so forth. Because I realized that if I kept talking about them, sooner or later somebody would start running them as a package. [laughter]

Well, I've now given you some havingness on the subject and I hope that remedies it enough so the circuit will blow.

Okay. Well, you've gotten along pretty well and you only have a thousand light-years yet to go before you get off to the starting point. I don't like to – I don't like to be sarcastic or upsetting along this particular line. I usually tell you you're doing fine. I usually flatter you. I try to keep up your confidence and that sort of thing. But frankly there isn't a rough case in the lot of you. There isn't a rough case in the lot of you. That's right. I'm saying that absolutely factually. There isn't a rough case in the lot of you.

And the weapons which you have right at this particular moment will take any case that is here and blow it to ribbons. If anybody is sitting around worrying about his case, why, I hope that his auditor has heard this and I hope the person who was worrying about his case stops worrying about it and starts auditing.

But the main – main thing that we're interested in – the main thing we're interested in is your obtaining results and we're very interested in these results. And I can tell you frankly that it's all right to teach somebody out in some Academy someplace, "*Da-da-da-da-da-da ra-ta-tat*. Thank you. *Da-da-da-da-da-da ra-ta-tat*. Thank you. *Da-da-da-da-da-da ra-ta-tat*. Thank you." And expect them at the other end in some way or another to achieve some kind of result.

Well, it's magic that I can make them achieve a result, even that way. That is – that's pure magic. But I'm not asking you to totally exercise this particular magic. I'm asking you to exercise – to learn these skills well and then exercise your own magic. You know you have some. It's about time you brought it out of mothballs.

Thank you.

NATURE OF WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on 16 January 1962

All right.

Okay. What's the date?

Audience voices: 16th.

All right. 16th Jan. 62, AD 12.

Now, it's a moot question whether I lecture you today about 3D or 3D Criss Cross or Security Checking Twenty-Ten. It's a moot question because the difficulties of both are exceeding you enormously.

In fact, it's almost, "Have you ever heard of them?" [laughs] I don't mean to be sarcastic and I never lay it into people. I gave you a low-toned lecture the last time I gave you a lecture, remember? Last week – gave you a low-tone lecture; told you there was enormous gap between what you ought to be doing and what you are doing – as great as the gap between what you are doing and what is being done in the field. And that's a pretty wide gap. See, there's a big, a big lot of stuff that you could be getting in there and pitching on.

Now, we have various things that would assist this. And these things are normally summed up in a subject of technology. Now, technology is what you ought to be studying.

Technology is divided into two parts. And these two parts are *how* you do it, what motions you go through, and *what* you do. How you do it and what you do. Don't try to wrap up technology under one heading of "Well, it's technical."

How do you run a session? And what do you run in the session? And these are two different subjects and they are very broadly different subjects.

Now, actually, I'm torn in several different directions in giving you a lecture today because I've got so much data to give you on Security Checking and on 3D Criss Cross and other things like this, and the anatomy of the Goals Problem Mass, which we have a lot more data on that you'll be very interested in, and so forth. But it's very difficult for me to keep this in a very orderly groove, because there is just – how'd you get this stupid? I mean, you know, you must have worked on it, you know? You must have worked on it. Somewhere or another on the track, you must have said to yourself, "They shouldn't know, and that includes me." [laughs] Somewhere here. But I wish you just hadn't done it so often. If you'd just done it less frequently.

Now, of course, it's a good thing that you do have withholds, some of you. That's a good thing. That's a good thing. Think of the cities that would be destroyed, the planets burst into pieces if you hadn't withheld here and there. We're not trying to teach you to not have

withholds – that if you have an impulse, just do it; we're not trying to teach you to do that. We're trying to get you out of the tangle you got yourself into. What do you mean doing – having such terrible impulses? *That's* the tangle we're trying to solve in a pc. How come the pc has these impulses that he then has to withhold? See, now *that's* the problem. It isn't the problem of withholding.

Now, if you took all the withholds off of a born killer, see, and you didn't remedy the case in any other way at all – ha-ha-ha-ha. I could look at a few of you right now – I'm not mentioning any names; [laughter, laughs] I don't want to be personal – but just supposing you didn't withhold some of the things you think of. Just supposing.

Immediately we get a cough here. [laughs]

All right. The withhold is, of course, that area of motionlessness which follows that area of doingness which you "shouldn't ought to have." And the whole study of withholds comes about from "shouldn't ought to have done it," you see? If you shouldn't ought to have done it, you then begin to withhold it, which, of course, classifies action under the headings of "things you should have done" and "things you shouldn't have done."

But what do you know? There's a whole bunch of things called "laudable withholds." Now, it was very laudable of you not to sink the battleship. This was very laudable. It's very laudable of you not to have gotten angry at the waitress. Yeah, it's laudable. But a laudable withhold, of course, is always something that society expects of you, providing you've got these other impulses which society has classified (whatever society you happen to belong to), has classified as shouldn't-ought-to-have-done-it actions.

Now, it all depends on where you was brung up (some people were brought up and some people were brung up) and exactly what you shouldn't ought to be done-ing. Now, the whole subject of that is not the subject of philosophy, it's a subject of mores. It's what is moral. To whom and where and what group, under what circumstances, is a laudable action and an action that ought to be withheld?

Now, you have, then, all withholds divided, and all actions divided into "laudable actions" and "laudable withholds." And the laudable withhold goes along with the undesirable action, and the laudable action goes along with an undesirable withhold. Well, figure it out. That's true, isn't it?

So you is always horsed between two horses. See? Is it laudable to went and done it? All right. Well, then it's not laudable to withhold it. All right. If it's laudable to withhold it, then it must be coupled with of – "You shouldn't ought to have done it. It shouldn't be done." You see?

So one of the pair of the overt or the withhold is always laudable and always desirable. And the other one is, it is undesirable. See, if you got a laudable withhold, you must have had a desirable action. In other words, a laudable withhold is an undesirable action – get it straight: laudable withhold, undesirable action. Desirable action, on the other hand, of course: you have a bad withhold.

For instance, it is laudable in some societies to hand out money indiscriminately. See, that's very laudable. That means you're generous, you believe in Allah, all kinds of other ac-

tions. You must hand out money in all directions. And if you withhold it, if you withhold any money, you're of course a miser. See, you're a cheapskate. You're a miser, you see? Now, that is the punishment they assign in order to – you see, that's a derogatory withhold because the action is considered by the group to be desirable.

Take any given action – let's take kissing a girl – just take that as an action. I don't know whether you're familiar with this action or not, but – [laughter] Kissing a girl. All right. Now, let's take a look at the various societies and their various regards of it. And you find out it'd be very interesting. The Marriage Counselors Society of Los Angeles. Of course, this is a very laudable action and therefore you are a very evil man if you don't kiss a girl. If you're not the type of man who kisses girls, then you're an evil man. That's according to the mores of the marriage counselors. Because of course the more girls that get kissed, the more business they have. [laughter] Elementary. Elementary.

All right. Now, let's take the Sex Is Evil Society of New York City. The Sex Is Evil Society. All right. Every time you kiss a girl, you see, you are evil. So you're an evil man because you kiss a girl.

Now, you go down to Hollywood, for instance, and kiss a girl, they think you're crazy. I didn't mean to – it as a crack, and so forth. I didn't mean it as a crack – a derogatory. In the first place, it couldn't be derogatory because you can always explain cracks about Hollywood on the same basis, "It isn't critical – it isn't a critical thought because it's true!" You hear that? [laughter] How do they say?

Now, there's just one action. And the fellow who does it in one group is evil and the fellow who doesn't do it in another group is evil. It's a case of "you can't win." But there's another side to this game, too, you see? The one action of withholding kissing girls in New York – then you're a *good* man, you see? And in California, you see, why, you're a – Marriage Counselors Association – why, you're a *good* man if you kiss girls. In New York – Anti-Sex Society, you see – you're a *good* man if you withhold kissing girls. Now, between these two things you get confused.

In a war there's nothing quite as upsetting to a company officer as a soldier who won't shoot enemy troops. This is very upsetting, very upsetting. The War Department in the United States, and I am sure in England, has often sat up all night long compiling statistics as the number of unfired weapons or weapons fired in the air at no target during actions of World War II. And it is a terrible worry to them, particularly when the figure gets above 50. When the figure gets above 50 percent, you see. Why, look at – the taxpayer has devoted his blood and treasure to manufacturing bullets, and there is this chuckleheaded soldier sitting on the front line who won't even pull the trigger, you see? So this is a bad withhold. Very bad business, you see? This is a rough thing here. A fellow shouldn't do it, you see? He shouldn't withhold that bullet.

All right. Now let's say he's even a member of the police force and he goes down the middle of Main Street, and he fires this – fires off a gun – somebody fires off a gun. The same officer at a different period of time may then be sentencing him for having *shot* a gun, arresting and sentencing him for having done this action. So the *time* it is done has something to do with it. Not only the society, but the *time* this is done. The timing of the action tells you

whether or not the desi- the withhold is desirable or the action is desirable. So it's no wonder you get confused.

You get it all straightened out, you see, that certain society, called the United States population, considers it laudable if you fire a gun at a man in time of war, and considers it evil if you *refuse* to fire a gun at a man at time of war, see? That's in time of war.

Now, in time of peace, the same society, the same people, consider it laudable to *withhold* firing the gun and evil to *fire* the gun. See? So you get confused. So your pc gets confused.

Your pc after a while doesn't know whether it is laudable to act or to withhold. And if you were to ask a pc bluntly, "Now, is it best to reach or to withhold yourself from reaching? Which is best? Which of these two actions would be the best action? Is it better to reach or better to restrain yourself from reaching? Now, what is the answer to that question?" Then if you – the person asked it, if he were really forced to solve it, would go around the bend – because it all has to do with the mores and the time and place. What group would consider it, you see? When? That's the anatomy of the situation.

In other words, you've got a situation going here where you cannot say that at all times one certain action... Let's take one action. There *is* no action that at all times is good in all places. And there *is* no withhold that at all times should be in action or withheld, see? There is no one certain withhold that at all times must be withheld everywhere.

So you cannot say that there is a bad withhold or a good action, or a 100-percent-bad action or a 100-percent-bad withhold, see? It all depends on from what viewpoint do you view this?

Now, that's all viewed with a worm's-eye view of the wog. And if you ask a wog these questions, you've had it. Because he can never answer this question. He will never answer it from one end of the world to the other if you say, "Tell me an action that is at all times good in all places. Tell me something that should be withheld in all places at all times by everything and everyone. Tell me such a withhold."

You can't, from a wog's-eye view.

Therefore, we must be dealing – and when we're security checking – with another factor. We must be dealing with something else. We can't, then, say, "He has withholds," and feel cheerful about it or feel depressed about it, either way. Because good men probably have more withholds than bad men, which therefore makes everybody very puzzled. And they don't want to become good because they know that all good men never communicate. And by this definition, the goodest men they are, are out in the cemetery.

You see, so everybody gets in a, in a ball-up about this. So we must be doing something else than pulling all withholds from all people at all times – all withholds. See, we must be doing something different. And we are.

We are remedying the compulsion or obsession to commit actions which have to be withheld. In other words, we're remedying unreasonable action. And that's all we're doing.

And that covers Security Checking like a blanket. You see, you're remedying unreasonable action. That's all.

Now, if we were fixing somebody up so that he would fit very well into the society of the Calakahoochie Indians, we would have to study up the Calakahoochie Indians and find out what they considered to be undesirable actions, remedy these in the pc, and he would be considered a very good man indeed amongst the Calakahoochie Indians. The only trouble is we cannot guarantee that our pc is going to pick up a body with the Calakahoochie Indians. This we cannot guarantee. They probably, by the time they get around to it, will have been totally wiped out by the United Nations.

The United Nations hears about it these days, they exterminate it. This is the – it's the modus. That's – the word is out these days. I don't mean to say anything bitter against the United Nations. Nobody is fonder of cooperative, coordinated action than I am, and – of course, I don't see any of it in the United Nations so I don't like them much, but that's all right. Let's just pass over that silently with a moment of bowed heads.

The – we can't guarantee that the United Nations will not have gotten there first, you see, or somebody else will have gotten there. We can make no guarantee where this pc is going to go next. There he sits in the pc's chair or there he sits in the Academy for that matter, and well, times are uncertain, and the generals they got on this planet aren't up to my standards. And they're liable to blow the whole top off the place at any minute, and – or some auditor from Burbank, or something like that, is liable to get hold of this person next, and the person does a bunk and passes Arcturus and thinks one of its planets would be a good place to stop.

In other words, we cannot predict, we cannot predict where our pc is going to land within the next century. Well, he has two hundred trillion years behind him, the probabilities that he will land in different places in the next hundred years are rather certain. He's been landing in different places for two hundred trillion years and to say that he is now never going to land in another place is idiocy.

He for sure is going to land in different places elsewhere. He's going to be in different societies than he is in now. Therefore, there is only one thing that you can rehabilitate in the pc. There's just one thing that you can rehabilitate in the pc, and that is his ability to determine his own actions. And that's all you can rehabilitate. You can rehabilitate nothing else. Do you follow that?

All you can do is make him governor of his own deeds. And if he can be made to be governor of his own deeds, we have then done the job for all societies in all places. And we have also rehabilitated totally, 100 percent, communication for this person. Because communication isn't, as some people would like to think, one constant long blah, which was started several thousand years ago and is still going on, you see? Most people – a lot of people have that; about 50 percent of the people have that. Or on the other hand, one total silence that began a long time ago and will be silent for a long time to come.

You see, communication is neither one of these things. Communication is the ability to control an outflow or stop it. It is to run start, change and stop on outflowing and inflowing actions: control of communication.

Now, control of communication, of course, downgrades into heavier MEST as control of reach, so that you have the ability to start, change and stop outflowing and inflowing reach. And the ability to do this is, of course, the thing that you are rehabilitating.

What your pc is afraid of is that one fine day he will be in Piccadilly Circus or Times Square and take off all his clothes. Now, you recognize that it's perfectly all right to take off all one's clothes in one's bedroom or even some other bedrooms; [laughter] that is perfectly all right. But it is not all right to take off all one's clothes in the middle of Piccadilly Circus.

Now, one of the reverse mechanisms of the human mind is that a person can be so worried about doing this that he will begin to think about nothing but withholding this. So he goes around twenty-four hours a day, except when he's asleep – and he doesn't sleep much either because he might walk in his sleep; you could even take care of that, you see? And he is afraid that one of these days he's going to go down in the underground, or the subway, take a train and go to the exact center of the city, stand on the sidewalk and take off all his clothes. He's pretty sure that sooner or later he's liable to do this and he becomes totally concentrated on doing all he can to *not* do it. And you could devote a wh- a person's whole life to not performing that one action. You could actually train a person to a point – you could get him so worried, you could get him so obsessed, you could get him so upset, you could get him so concentrated on this one point – that he would never think about anything else.

Of course at that moment you would classify him as insane because he couldn't even remember to eat, he couldn't remember to go to bed. He would walk around all the time thinking to himself about "I must not go down to Times Square and take off all of my clothes." Do you see that?

Well now, what he is doing, then, is practicing a consistent withhold of an undesirable action and most of his attention is wrapped up in restraining himself from performing this undesirable action. And it's an attention trap to end all attention traps.

All right. The reverse of it is true, too. He must remember to *do* a desirable action. Now, you could get somebody and you could train him completely that he must never pass a beggar without putting a coin in the beggar's cup, and that terrible bad luck will ensue if he fails to put a coin in a beggar's cup.

All right. That's fine. That's fine. That's a very laudable outflow, isn't it? Only a cheap-skate would not do that. Only a miser would fail to perform this very desirable action, you see?

All right. Now, let's multiply it. Let's multiply it. Let's make it so that he begins to believe that if he doesn't do this action at least once every day, that he will be ostracized and cauterized. He must do this in order to live. He must outflow this action. He must give to charity.

If you think I am being a little bit archaic here, just to this degree, that this particular obsession is most resident in the Middle East and was most prevalent about fifteen hundred years ago. Boy, they and – well, fourteen hundred years ago, thirteen hundred years ago, twelve hundred years ago. They were really working on this hard, you see? "Alms for Allah,"

you know, and so on. And the *Koran* was all written around how thou must give in order to be lucky, you know?

But anyway, it still exists today to some degree. But let's supposing that we trained this guy on an obsessive, compulsion basis, rickracked him up one way or the other, gave him electronic implants and made him implant others to do it – in other words, got him real set; and gave him a bunch of failures implanting others – so that he must put a coin in a beggar's cup every day.

Now, let's speed it up. He must put a coin in a beggar's cup every hour. Now let's really fix it up so that it must be a different beggar every hour and he has to keep a map, then, and a roster of all the beggars in the city in order to perform this action. Otherwise, the sky will cave in or the muezzin will not hold up the minaret or something.

Well, you see, that's an obsessive action. That's an obsessive action.

Now, what would happen to most of the citizens of Western society today if they failed to come to work in the morning? That's a desirable outflow, isn't it? They have to outflow a body from home and put it down at work, right? Correct? Hm? And on this we have accompanying economic disaster, social disgrace, denial of all things that go along with having a position and a salary in the society, you see?

All right. If we enforce that to that degree and then we withheld it in that degree, we'd probably have the fellow – he wouldn't have any clothes, so he'd be in the middle of Piccadilly Circus without any on whether he liked it or not.

Now, if we educated the same man to never outflow any money and never to give any money – we've educated him both ways now, a hundred percent – and we got this exactly and equally balanced, we'd have an insane ridge. And he'd have the glee of money or something.

Now, if we had this fellow totally educated to believe that he must never go away from home because he might go down to Piccadilly Circus and take off all his clothes, but that he must go away from home in order to have money to buy clothes, every time he went across the lintel he would not know whether he was heading for Piccadilly Circus or work. Which way was he going? Was he going to Piccadilly Circus to – ? Oh, no. He'd better not go to Piccadilly Circus. And after a while he forgets why he is leaving home. And he just doesn't leave home anymore.

And you find a tremendous number of people who cannot leave their houses. Well, you can run houses in vain on them without curing this phobia. You can remedy the havingness of houses and everything else. Why? Because it – the trouble with them is not the house, it's Piccadilly Circus. They don't know why they mustn't leave home because they've now forgotten that they might go down to Piccadilly Circus, you see, and take off all their clothes. And because they might do that, then they'd better not go out of the house. But they've forgotten why, what they're liable to do, and therefore you have a covered overt with a covered withhold, and you've got the present time action of a motionless person.

See? There he sits; he's motionless. In some sphere he is not free to communicate. Why isn't he free to communicate? Because he cannot find out what is the desirable action

and what is the desirable withhold, and what's the undesirable action and what is the undesirable withhold?

See, he doesn't know what these things are now. He cannot any longer differentiate amongst good actions and good withholds and bad actions and bad withholds, and he is no longer master of his own communication or his own reach, so therefore he has to be very careful to not reach and he has to be very careful to reach while he is being very careful not to reach; he must not reach, you see, because he might reach, but if he doesn't reach then he wouldn't reach. And you get your average wog. Average person. This is not an insane person I'm talking about. This is just the average bank. That's what it's composed of.

The fellow doesn't know what he mustn't reach and he doesn't know what he must withhold, and he's forgotten that he must reach and he's forgotten that he must withhold. But the habit pattern stays with it as caution. And it's interesting that all that psychoanalysis ever trained anybody to be was cautious. The more – longer they were psychoanalyzed, the more cautious they got. That's the difficulty.

Now, this other fellow who was trained obsessively to reach, he's trained obsessively to reach – he's got to reach, he's got to reach, he's got to reach, he's got to reach – he never has a chance to do anything else but reach, and he must never withhold on this subject, he must never stay home from work, see? *Never* stay home from work. Never, never, never.

And now he hasn't got a job. And not having a job, what does he now have? He has compulsion to go, but he doesn't know what he's supposed to go to. He doesn't know where he's supposed to go or why he's supposed to go or what he's supposed to arrive at or anything else. He just knows that he must go, you see? He's got to leave home.

And you'll find that these leaving-homenesses and things like that are cyclic. For instance, insane person is only insane sometimes between two and four o'clock in the afternoon. A person who has insomnia very often cannot sleep between one and four in the morning, see? Well, one and four in the morning, someplace along the line – one and four in the morning is a wakeful period of something or other. And they must – might have been a one – a night watchman sometime or another, you know, and they always had to be there at one o'clock. There is no telling why they had to be there but it was necessary that they reach at that particular time. So they feel agitated because they don't know where they're supposed to go, and they feel nervous. *Heh. Wzzzzzzz!*

Well, you – there isn't anybody you know that doesn't have a nervous period in the day sometime. If you sorted it out carefully, you would find that some period of the day they became very active, and another period of the day, at least one, they became very quiet. You don't know anybody who doesn't do this.

They get up in the morning, they have to get active. In the evening they go to bed and become inactive. Why? I don't know.

But a lot of people have a lot of trouble with sleep, because they're accustomed to sleep, or their sleeping hours compare with some other part of the planet, or some other time area somewhere on some other planet. And they're trying to go to sleep and wake up in the period that they're most accustomed to going to sleep and wake up because their training pat-

tern of going to sleep and waking up is that training pattern of, let us say, Los Angeles. And they're now living in London. There's eight hours difference, you see? Eight hours difference.

So actually, in Los Angeles you ought to be getting up around seven or eight o'clock in the morning, but you see, there's an entirely different time in London for seven or eight o'clock in the morning, so one just about goes to bed and becomes very wakeful. The second they go to bed, they become wakeful. Well, it may be coinciding with some period when they should be getting up. You see how dizzy all this can be, see?

Well, what is all that? Let's characterize that with what it is. This is strictly, totally and only a confusion of a reach and a withhold, according to the time and place and action. They don't know whether to reach or withdraw, and why or when or something. In other words, they have lost knowingness over the action.

Now, in order to restore control over one's communication or not-communication, receiving communication or not receiving communication, control over one's reach or not-reach, be reached or not be reached, one must get these unknowingnesses out of the road or the person will appear nervous sometimes to a point of total apathy and collapse.

When you ask them to do something or other, suddenly you'd – they're not able. They just – they just feel very nervous about this. They're not quite sure why they feel nervous about this. Matter of fact, they don't go into it so deeply as saying, "I feel nervous about this." See, they're not that analytical.

They're supposed to go down to the grocery store and they sit down on the porch and they stay there for two hours. But yet that's never happened to them before. But the next time they go down to the grocery store, they go down to the grocery store all right. They haven't any idea of lingering. It never occurred to them, you see, they were going down to the grocery store at the time they should have been going to bed in some other part of the world. You see how confused all this gets? How confused a person could be.

Now, in order to aberrate somebody on this subject, you establish compulsion to reach or a compulsion to withdraw or withhold – you establish this as an absolute necessity – and then shift them in time and place so as to bring about no necessity for this of any kind whatsoever, so that they forget it and so that they don't remember what they are supposed to do. In other words, make an unknowingness out of the whole thing. Bury it.

Somehow or another cloud the thing over, and after that, why, they've, to some degree, had it. But doing this once wouldn't aberrate anybody very much. After it had been done several hundred thousand times, though, it would begin to tell – begin to tell. The person would begin to get the idea that they didn't quite know what they were doing. That would become rather apparent, even to them.

Have you ever seen anybody that knew exactly what he should have been doing, knew exactly what he ought to be doing, gets all geared up to do it, get out all the equipment to do it, and then doesn't touch anything? Did you ever see anybody do that? See?

Well, his "Now I'm supposed to" worked right up to the point where it restimulated the hidden withhold. See? He goes right straight up. He's going into action. Now he's supposed to withhold it, you see?

Did you see – ever see anybody sit down, decide to relax – decide to relax, sit down, take it easy, have a good rest – turn around and they're tearing all over the house, you know, and the walls are caving in practically from the amount of running and fussing and scattering and changing the furniture and so forth. You ever notice anybody do anything like that?

Well, they've just hit the wrong side of things, see? Their compulsions to withhold or to reach are not in agreement, so that they sit down to withhold – in other words, they're going to withhold themselves from action, they're going to rest now – and they've hit so close to a borderline, some kind of a restimulator causes them to go into action: having decided to withhold causes them to go into action.

Now, when a person gets very bad off, any decision to act causes them to withhold. They have no differentiation at all. Any decision to act causes them to withhold. You've seen them. They get elected to office all the time.

Government program: That's a very, very good one, a government program. They're going to "do" this, and then the letter sits in the out-basket, you see, for six weeks and then it goes into another in-basket and sits there for seven months, and then it goes over to appropriations, and appropriations dawdles with it for a year or two, and that's just from the fact that the government is guilty, collectively, of overt acts.

You never have an effective government where you have tremendous numbers of overt acts mixed up in the government that are being withheld.

All right. Do you see, then, that the whole subject of withholds and Security Checking is intimately wound up with the action and inaction of people, and the determinism and the – of people and their failure to be self-determined, and so forth.

You take some bird, he's in a total hypnotic trance. He comes in and you say, "Well, close the door," and the door is closed. And you tell him, "Close the door." And they go over and they pick up an imaginary door knob and shut the imaginary door so that they will comply with what you've said.

You've set them down in a chair and they're in a chair. If you stood them up, they'll stand up.

In insane asylums they stretch them out, they lie down, they lie down there fine. You pick up one arm, put it in the air; it'll just stay there – catatonic schizophrenia. It's marvelous. They're just like tallow or clay or something. It's – anything you can do to them, you know?

Any – you know, you got – you'll get pcs like this. You want to watch it. They have eye flutter and various things. And you, if you were to suggest anything – it – this isn't why we suggest things to people on assessing – but if you were to suggest to this person that a battleship was his terminal, a battleship, yeah, boy, you're going to get a battleship registering. Because you shoved a battleship right into his skull, and he's got the battleship registering, and that's it and that's all that's there. You said it, so therefore it's it.

I have trouble with that. I sometimes assess people's terminals and so forth, and you can't get them away from them with shotguns – sometimes, sometimes. That doesn't mean those people are hypnotic. They know it was probably right. Oddly enough, it usually is right.

Good thing to do, good thing to do is take all eva- invalidations and evaluations and all overts off it, and strip it down to where nothing registers with regard to it and still see if it's it. That's the only way you would recover that. But this gives trouble every once in a while, where an auditor has suggested a terminal or where an auditor with altitude has found a terminal the pc isn't about to give it up.

Now, you're not in that range right now with 3D Criss Cross. It isn't as hard as that. Somewhat amusing to me to see some of the terminals I have assessed coming up again on 3D Criss Cross. There they are. They were there all the time, of course.

But here's your action. This person is totally susceptible to any restimulation. Now, get off the idea the person is totally susceptible to suggestion and how nice that is, because that's for the birds. The person is totally susceptible to any inflowing action of any kind – the person is totally susceptible.

In other words, they restimulate – *bang!* Their bank is so rigged that they see a spotted wall, they get measles, see? And anything that happens to them in society, they are instantly – reaction is to have that with them. They restimulate at once. And they are very, very bad off.

Now, a gradient scale of that is the average person. He sees a few things and they restimulate him where he's on a total effect basis.

Now, what's the matter with that total effect basis? There's only one thing wrong with that basis, only one thing. And that is a person has no command over his reach and withdraw. He has lost this. He cannot, then, be master of his own actions. He of course, then, is never governor of his own fate and of course he cannot be sensible about what he does.

IQ is the degree that a person can observe, understand actions, that's all – then withholding of actions, a person's grip of this situation.

You say, "Well, it could have a lot more ramifications, a lot more prettinesses about it, and so forth, and it'd be very much more complicated than that," but it isn't, really. It's one's government of one's environment.

Now, we are strange, as – if we considered Scientology a philosophy, which it is not, we would find ourselves almost alone in this one idea: that man should have any self-determinism. Because others, falling short of this, have looked on this point – and it's an important point – they've fallen short of it. They have seen that a criminal has a compulsion to commit crimes. And then being unable to pick up any part of the overt act of committing crimes or doing anything for the criminal, they say there is only one further answer, and that is to make the criminal withhold his crimes harder.

Now, that is peculiar as a philosophy because it doesn't work and that philosophy hasn't worked on this planet since I don't know how long.

You can compel a fellow to not go down to Times Square and take his clothes off to a point where he *can't do anything else!* Every time we see him, why, he's on his way to Times Square.

"Well, hello, Joe. Where are you going?"

"Well, I'm going down to Times Square – take my clothes off."

And you say, "Well, all right. I'll be down at four o'clock at the police station, bail you out."

And he'll say, "Well, thank you very much." Much relieved now, he goes down to Times Square and takes his clothes off. It's because he's withheld it so far that the withhold has failed. And it becomes a compulsion.

So, the action which is severely withheld very often reverses and becomes a compulsive action. A person knows he cannot withhold the action and therefore has to do it. And that is the danger of this philosophy that the more good, total withholds we have around, the better off we all are.

If you don't know this mechanism of overts and withholds, and you don't know why people act this way, of course you're liable to fall into this other philosophy as the only possible remedy. It's not a very good remedy.

Now, there's your basis of action. There's your basis of action and human beings. One, he does not know what his compulsive actions are or his "must dos" are – he doesn't know what these things are therefore he doesn't know what he is withholding. And not-knowingness is the common denominator of all withholds and overts which are operative on the individual.

Those things which are operative on the individual are *always unknown* to the individual. I might even teach you that someday. I keep telling you, and so forth. You're still always willing to look in a known area.

I know of some pcs that have been audited on their mother-in-law for years and years and years and years and are still having trouble with the mother-in-law, and it's never occurred to any auditor that the trouble couldn't *possibly* be the mother-in-law if the pc knew all about it. See? Pc knows about it – can't be the trouble.

Now, that gets in your road in Security Checking, that fact. Because the pc can know about it without you knowing about it. But that's half a know. And that isn't a good enough know, see? That's just half a know. So you don't know about it, but he knows about it. And he'll get upset if you don't let yourself in on it.

And you get the missed withhold phenomena, which is the most serious phenomena that stands in the road of Security Checking. Might teach you that someday, too.

I taught FCDC recently. Man, I got a despatch this morning. Boy. Wild, man. Absolutely wild. They've been going around tearing people's missed withholds. They have – that's all they've been doing. They haven't getting – been getting people's withholds off, they've been taking people's *missed* withholds off. Takes them one or two sessions per staff member. It's going gorgeously. All of a sudden, people are going back and straightening up their departments and fur is flying in all directions, and so forth.

They're even getting cocky, you know? They don't say they don't care whether you people are coming back from Saint Hill or not, but they say, well, even if you don't, they might make it. You've been gone too long. They've forgotten you. Well, anyhow, have to go home pretty quick and reestablish your altitude.

The difficulties we have are that a missed withhold is a half a know. And evidently there's nothing more painful to somebody who has got to withhold something he no longer has to withhold. You don't know about it, so he has to withhold it, but now he knows he has to withhold it because you don't know about it.

You see, the mechanics of this are very logical. They actually are very logical. You see, he has to go on withholding it because you don't know about it yet, and it's very arduous to have to go on withholding it because it's – that's a half a know, see?

See, you don't know yet, and you didn't find out, and he found out, only he wasn't able to communicate it, so now you've got a knowing withhold, and the individual just practically goes to pieces on this basis, see, on a half a know.

You know, he's got to walk around, knowingly withhold this now. Nobody to tell it to, nobody else can be let in on it, so therefore there is no other know to compare. So it won't duplicate, so obviously won't blow. It's a single terminal at that moment, so there is no duplication of it in any other terminal. So as there is no duplication in any other terminal – of course, he knows by perfect duplication, that nothing will blow unless it is duplicated and other mechanisms which thetans have been very, very clever, very, very clever in working out. So you got a missed withhold is upsetting to the pc.

And a missed withhold, a pc will just come down on your neck with a crash. "*Nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah.*" That's the Tone Scale of a pc on which there's been a missed withhold. Or...[laughter] Tone Scale of a missed withhold.

Now, when you're operating with a bad meter throughout an organization, everybody is at everybody else's throats. Everybody's missed withholds on everybody, so the tone of the organization is "*Nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah.*" Or... [laughter] and that's all there is, see? And I say I might teach you that someday.

Up to the moment, however, if you yourself don't run into it, you won't know it. One day you'll be sitting there as the auditor, and the pc will be going, "*Nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah,* and you've done this and you've done that." You will get smart enough to look for the missed withhold. And then all of a sudden the pc gets that off and, "Well, what were you mad about? What was I mad about? What was it all about? There isn't anything here. Nothing disturbing."

You feel, "You idiot."

Of course, the thing you feel most idiotic about is the caliber of the withhold you miss. You're still looking for quality. The missed withhold might be that the pc thought the E-Meter was shiny and didn't tell you and the rudiments went out. And that's a missed withhold. And the next thing you know, you've got an ARC break.

Remember I told you long, long, long ago that it took about an hour and a half for an ARC break to build up to magnitude in a session. Well, we find out why that is now, is usually the missed withholds, the first missed withholds are at the beginning of the session – not in withhold rudiment at the beginning of a session, but the pc sits down and says, "Well, I hope this will be all right," and doesn't tell the auditor.

See, he has a misgiving about the session and doesn't mention it to the auditor and the auditor doesn't pick it up. And then an hour – a half an hour, an hour, or an hour and a half later, you have a pc who is in a blowing, screaming mess, because that withhold, you see, adds to a next withhold, and they don't have to be serious withholds. The pc sat there and said, "Well, I wish I had a cigarette," and he doesn't tell the auditor. That is a withhold. Pc knows he's supposed to be in communication with the auditor and he's not in communication with the auditor on that point.

And the next point is, he wonders how late it is and he doesn't tell the auditor. He wonders what the next command is and he doesn't tell the auditor. And all these little grains of sand add up to a Sahara Desert with the pc on one side of it and the auditor on the other and cannon going in both directions.

You see how this multiplies? It isn't the quality of the withhold, it's the fact that it exists.

Now, the pc, oddly enough, doesn't know about these withholds when he thinks them. You have to make him think for a moment to remember them. In other words, they've drifted by and they're relatively unknown to him. If you keep those picked up, just those alone while you're assessing a list, the rudiments will stay in.

Now, an invalidation usually betokens a withhold. So you can ask for invalidations and then ask for withholds as a very fruitful method of getting both sides of the thing.

If you want to keep a session clean and the needle reading throughout a Security Check activity, you're in just a constant look over of this one point: Has the pc invalidated anything and is the pc withholding anything? And those are the Gemini twins of Security Checking and assessing and nulling. Invalidation and withholding. These are the two things which go glove in hand, hand in glove. Invalidation, withhold.

Now, the common denominator of every out-rudiment is withhold. That is the common denominator of every rudiment out.

Present time problem? All right. Well, he has withholds from somebody or he wouldn't be having a problem with them. You can ask, "Well, what withholds do you have from your wife?" and watch the present time problem evaporate in smoke, see?

All right. The pc has an ARC break with you; well, the pc must be withholding something from you, no matter how tiny it is. So therefore that's the common denominator of all these rudiments. No matter what rudiment is out, a withhold is the basis of it, including, of course, the rudiments about withholds. That is more seriously concerned with withholds. But it's still the missed withhold that causes you the trouble in a session.

The missed withhold is back of the ARC break. The missed withhold is back of all auditor upsets, save one – which I should mention to you – save one: where you are running the session for form's sake and not for the pc. You're not auditing the pc who is in front of you, and you are running a session just for form's sake, you have disobeyed the Auditor's Code to not being in communication with the pc and have set up an unintentional withhold for the pc throughout the whole session.

Do you remember I classified withholds from you – the unintentional and the intentional, and so forth? Well, you see, the pc who cannot talk to the auditor is on an unintentional withhold, but it is nevertheless a withhold and causes an ARC break with the auditor. And that is why difficulties in talking to the auditor cause ARC breaks. Because it makes an unintentional withhold on the part of the pc.

There sits the pc. He is trying to tell the auditor something. And in trying to tell the auditor something, he finds he's unable to tell the auditor something, because the auditor will not listen, will not acknowledge, will not stop doing what he is doing obsessively, whatever it is, will not listen to anything the pc has to say, and the pc suddenly, dimly – well, he doesn't really knowingly ever counter this point – nevertheless recognizes reactively and goes into reaction because of a withhold, because the pc is unintentionally withholding.

You – well, I'll give you an idea of an unintentional withhold. Have any of you ever unintentionally withheld anything? See? It's unintentional. You couldn't be there. Well, just think of not being home for Christmas because you had to work. Well, you had to work or something like that. Therefore, it was unintentional.

Now, when somebody will not listen to what you are telling them, you of course are put on an unintentional withhold.

Little kids ARC break and become teenagers along one curve of unintentional withholds. My little kids do pretty well on the basis that I'll knock anybody's head off that won't acknowledge them. See, let's not put the kids on an unintentional withhold. As a matter of fact, I think you've seen them around. They're very outspoken and quite polite, usually. And they're not ARC broke with people, that's for sure.

Well, get this idea. (I'm not setting them up as paragons of virtue, but I will say, I will say that my children are superior in one respect. I will say that my two little boys can dig more worms than any other.) [laughter, laughs]

A little kid comes up and he says, "Mama, Mama, can I go outside? Mama, can I go outside?"

And Mama just goes on knitting the dishes or whatever she's doing [laughter] and doesn't say a blessed word to the kid, you know? And pretty soon the kid gets the sensation of being mad at his mother and breaks her favorite teapot in the middle of the floor.

Almost all breakage by children is totally occasioned by the fact they've been put on an unintentional withhold. That's your ARC break mechanism amongst children. I imagine the Steiner schools and some other things would be very happy to know that.

You got this, you got this point, then, where the pc is on an unintentional withhold and then does react as an ARC break. See, the basis of an ARC break is a noncommunication.

Well, it's more serious than just a noncommunication because you can sit and ignore a tree for hours and have a tree sit and ignore you for hours without getting mad at it.

The intention to communicate must be present for a withhold to occur, which is another thing you must recognize about all withholds: an intention to reach before the person

has to restrain it. In other words, an intention to communicate must exist before an ARC break can result.

All right. If that is the case, if that is the case, then a pc who is being audited by somebody who is out of communication with the pc is on a perpetual unintentional withhold, but is nevertheless a withhold and will ARC break.

Now, it isn't that an auditor has to turn himself wrongside out just for the pc, but I want to call something to your attention. This is also under the head of Security Checking and withholding, and so forth. And that is: Every session you run is *for* the pc *by* the auditor. The session you run is *for that pc* and for nobody else in the whole world. It is not for the Instructors, not for the persons who are going to read this auditor's reports or the D of P or anybody else. The session is not for anybody else in the whole world than the pc who is sitting in that chair. It is *his* session.

And some of you training auditors over in DC and down in South Africa and in Australia can clobber them with just exactly that remark, because you will find *every* time you're having a *lot* of trouble, every time you're having lots of trouble with some pc in the shop, the pc doesn't have any idea that the session is for him, and you may have an auditor who isn't running any kind of a session *for* that pc.

The auditor is running it for some other reason. He is running it to run a ritual. He was running it to please the D of P. He is running it because he was told to. He was running it because he was taught at the Academy to do this.

Oh, you could just list – one of the things you could do in training auditors is just ask them to make a long list of all of the things, *why* they were running a session, see?

Now, why are you doing that session? They're liable to give you some fabulous long list, and it never occurs anyplace in it, that, you see, that they're running the session for the pc and because the pc is there to be audited, you see? That is liable not to occur to them. The auditors that are having trouble will always miss that point, see? They always will.

And actually, if an auditor masters just that one point, that one point, he can be an awful crock with his technology, and pcs will get well and think he's wonderful, and send telegrams to the organization to reserve that auditor. And you say, "Oh, no. You know, we were just about to send him back to the Academy." But this person does run a session for the pc. See? It is the pc's session, nobody else's. It is run by the auditor, a session is, but it's run *for* the pc. And the ownership of the session is the pc's. It is not the auditor's session. It is the pc's session.

If you can just master that point as oddly peculiar, as simple as the point may seem, you will master most of your difficulties in auditing, and also, by the way, most of your distaste for auditing, whenever that occurs. There is nothing more satisfactory than running a session for the pc you are auditing at that moment. And that is, its – it keeps you from getting very strained up. Oh, your attention is on the pc. Pc is usually very happy and pc is puttin' right along, *pocketa, pocketa, pocketa, pocketa*. And you're making hay in all directions, and so forth. And you say, "Boy, that was a good session, you know?"

And you check it over: You missed three of the end rudiments, you see, and you goofed up. You didn't even find an item. It's been three sessions and you haven't found the item yet.

You couldn't find any good reason at all, if you were to examine it technologically, why this is such a satisfactory session. Well, you see there, you could just set all technology and form aside and keep that one point, and you'd find it was very fascinating how well that one point would operate.

Now if you move in on that – good technology, you see, and good form – wow! See? You just – Wham! Pcs go up the line like startled gazelles, you know? They just right on up the Tone Scale.

But there is the anatomy of a session. If you want to make it smooth technically is you just keep those withholds off and then you don't give the pc a restimulation of all the undesirable actions.

Now here's what happens: The pc feels he is withholding something. It doesn't matter whether it's an unintentional or an intentional withhold. That he is *withholding* something now restimulates the fact that he is withholding something, you see? It's not withhold – it's not the withhold he's doing, it is the withhold back of the withhold he's doing that gets restimulated. And that withhold, of course, is a withhold of undesirable action. So, the fact that he is withholding anything causes a withhold to go into restimulation.

That withhold, being in restimulation, may be a failed withhold, which is so close to the borderline that it brings about obsessive action at once. And the pc finds himself in this god-awful position of engaging in actions he knows are reprehensible and is incapable of stopping himself from acting. And he wonders how in the hell he got in this condition.

There he is saying to this perfectly nice auditor, he's saying, "Well, you rat, you – you – you – you bum, when did you ever learn to audit? You ought to be shot. You ought to be hanged. You ought to be stood up against the wall and electrocuted." He gets confused, you see? And – . See? And he hears himself saying these things and he is unable to stop saying them.

Well, how did he ever get into this position where he's doing these things? Because he feels very bad that he is doing these things while he is doing them, you see?

Now, he's in the position – you've hit on something which is very hot on the bank – and he's in the position of having to go down to Times Square and take all his clothes off, see? And he doesn't want to do that. But you have inadvertently restimulated the fact that he must *withhold* going down to Times Square and taking all of his clothes off, so that means he *must* go down to Times Square and take all of his clothes off, see?

He doesn't want to do that. So his power of choice is overwhelmed. And you, by letting him have a withhold in the session, or by missing a withhold on him – I'm talking about a session withhold now, not a life withhold, you see – by letting him have a session withhold and not keeping those cleaned up, you're liable to kick back into this other channel. And you get into this, and he's got to go down to Times Square and take his clothes off. He just can't stop himself from doing it, you see? And he's amazed at himself.

You know, it's a very funny thing. People who do things like that are the most amazed people around, you know? They're much more amazed than anybody else. You know, they're saying, "What am I doing?" as they go right on and do it.

It's fantastic.

So you see, the fact that you put a pc on an unintentional withhold of being unable to communicate to you as the auditor – . See, it isn't his session, he's just an outsider. He just dropped in while you were running a session. See, he's just an outsider to the whole thing. He is probably there to make a report to Inland Revenue or something. Or he's holding down the chair so gravity won't make it skid. But he hasn't anything to do with the session, see? Nothing to do with him. Whatever the auditor is saying has nothing to do with the pc, you see? And the pc finds himself quite startled occasionally, he suddenly wakes up and he says something to the auditor. He doesn't recognize this condition exists till he tries to say something to the auditor. And he's saying something to the auditor like, "It's warm in here," he tries to say, you know. "It's awfully warm in here, you know?"

And the auditor is nulling a list, you know, and says, "A category analyzer. A category analyzer. A category analyzer," you know?

And the pc says, "It's awfully warm in here."

And the auditor goes on and he says, "A mica shifter. A mica shifter. A mica shifter."

And the pc says, "It's warm in here, you know? It's warm in here."

And the auditor goes on and says, "All right. Waterbuck. Waterbuck. Waterbuck."
[laughter]

And what happens is, the mechanic is that the pc becomes aware of the fact that he can't communicate to the auditor. And this equates to this fact that he must then be withholding from the auditor. See how silly this is? But it nevertheless equates to that. Because remember, you're dealing with a whole reactive bank that is totally constructed on the obsessive action and the withhold, see?

So the fact that he isn't communicating says he must be withholding, which rekindles a withhold in the reactive bank, and God help the auditor if that withhold in the reactive bank triggers the undesirable action. Because the pc is liable to do anything, just anything.

And there's how you get blows, there's how you get scolds, there's how you get upsets, there's how you get pcs saying remarkable things to you. See? That's how you get the lot, see? Unintentional withhold.

So you see, you avoid the whole mechanism if it never enters the pc's mind that he is withholding anything. See? Now, if that's thoroughly enough established, actually, he could withhold a little bit, you see, without rekindling anything. Because it's *his* session, see, and he *is* in communication with the auditor. He realizes if he said it, the auditor would hear it.

TR 4 from a standpoint of holding somebody in session is, of course, the most important of the TRs. TR 0 is the most important from the auditor's viewpoint, and TR 4 is most important from the pc's viewpoint. You can't run a session at all without TR 0, but a pc sees

TR 4 out like rockets, barrels of tar being burned and Parliament exploding, see? TR 4 – "Oh, this auditor can't handle TR 4."

Well, the way to handle TR 4 is handle it in advance and just give the pc the session, see? Because it's his session. It's his session. This is peculiarly for the pc.

All right. Now, in the field of Security Checking, in the field of Security Checking, what you're trying to do, fundamentally, is release or discover both the undesirable actions considered undesirable by the pc and the withholds which restrain them. So you get off the withhold by blowing the prior confusion. And when you're doing Security Checking, you're on the business of the prior confusion, you see, and the motionless point: the problem.

But the problem in this case is only half there. It's the withhold, so it blows very easily. So the prior confusion and the withhold, you see? And all you got to do is reach underneath the withhold to get the prior confusion to it. "What did you *do*?" you say. "What did you *do*?" It must be some impulse from the pc because the pc is the only one there. Some people who listen to what the college did to the pc, or what the pc is told, have not noticed something: The college is not present in the auditing room. It really isn't there, so therefore it can't be audited. It's what the pc is doing, you see, that you're auditing.

So the pc, what the pc's – outflowed that he didn't want to outflow, and what the pc withheld that he didn't want to withhold, these things are your main points of action and interest.

And "What have you *done*?" you see, releases the not-do.

But the anatomy of a withhold is the: *done* undesirable action, *stop* the undesirable action, *natter*, see? So you – the fellow says, "Oh, I am upset. I mustn't say anything to anybody. I mustn't talk about it, and so on. Those bastards are dogs. I mustn't say anything to them. They're a bunch of hound dogs and so forth. They're really no good, and I mustn't say anything about it because I might have some undesirable actions. Because if they found something where I was wrong – because if I said anything it would be terrible, and then it would screw everything up. So I'd better be very careful not to say anything, and so forth. And I'm not saying anything."

And you – most, most, most people, when they're giving you gossip, are always prefacing it with, "I don't mean to be critical" or "I don't wish to say anything bad," or "I don't want to get John in trouble," or something like this. They're always being preface about the thing, and then "Natter, natter, natter, yak, yak." And you get a generation, actually, you get a generation of the outflow undesirable, which underlies it all, pinned against this other, just operates something like a motor battery. And floating off the top of it you get all this entheta.

Guy can't reach and he can't withhold, but he can natter. So you find what is the critica– good formula, see?

You had a bulletin the other day which has a correction in it. It says, "Ignore all unkind thoughts." That's not actually accurate. There is one little point about it: You *use* the unkind thought, the critical statement, and so forth, to find the overt. They're a sure indicator.

You say, "Well," you say to this person, "Well, what, what's your unkind thought?" They give you the unkind thought. "Have you ever had any unkind thoughts about Joe?"

"Oh, all right. I got unkind thoughts about Joe."

"All right. What have you done to Joe?"

Bang! They got it. See?

It's a leader. It'll go right straight down the line. So you don't *pull* them. Don't spend five hours pulling unkind thoughts, you idiot – that's usually the phrase that goes through an Instructor's mind when he sees somebody doing something like that. Person's spent five hours working and sweating and so forth to get all the unkind thoughts off about their wife, you see? Instructor kind of obsessively thinks "You unkind – you idiot!" on the end line, because that's four hours and fifty-nine minutes completely wasted.

One minute of natter about the wife, see, is all you want. That is a whole fish basket full. You have no more room on the truck. What you do after that one minute is conclude that the pc has *done* something. If the natter is there, then the underlying done must have been present, which is being withheld. Otherwise, you don't get this motor action going.

And so you just say – the person says, "And, and actually, actually ..." – it doesn't have to be motivatorish – "... actually, my wife, my wife actually uses false, false hair all the time. Just uses false hair all the time and I just go into the house, I'm always falling over this false hair, you know. Ge- have a drink of beer – false hair. Eat dinner – all through my teeth, you know? It's a hell of a thing. And false hair – ."

Beca- he'll kind of state it as a motivatorish, but it could be overt and it could be motivatorish; the natter, you see, is not necessarily motivatorish. It's just either way, see? It's that it's natter, that it's critical, is all you want, and so forth.

And you say, "False hair. Well, good. Thank you. All right. Now, what have you done to your wife?" And the needle falls off the pin.

And he tells you something or other. And then he says, "Well, it's the false hair that really worries me, though. It gets into the – it's – I had a wedding cake. I remember it goes clear far back to the wedding. She baked the wedding cake, you know? And we couldn't even eat the stuff, it was all full of false hair. And so – ."

So you figure that it must have something, then, to do with the exact thing he's complaining about.

So you say, "Well, what have you done to your wife's hair?"

"Well, I haven't done anything to my wife's hair. I held her down on the bed one day and cut it all off with the scissors."

"Well, have you done it since?"

"No! Ha-ha."

And you'll see him brighten up at once. Blow the withhold off the overt, see?

Actually, if you're a master of the anatomy of this kind of thing, you can do some of the trickiest things for the pc you ever heard of. You'll leave the pc just gasping, you see? "How did you know?"

"Oh, a little bird told me."

It's just a matter of, if there's a natter, then there must have been an overt. And if there's an overt, there must have been a withhold, see?

So you could always follow – you got a big, juicy *done* off the line, see? And just ask the pc, "Well, have you ever done that since?"

The pc has to recognize that he's withholding the action – is liable to give you the rest of the overt. There might be more overt there after you release that much withhold off the thing.

In other words, it's a – an action followed by a withhold. Well, of course, mostly you're counting on the fact that they both blow by his telling you, and this is usually true. And this is safe enough, and you don't have to know all the facts of life, you see? And – but the other point is that if you ask, "Have you done it since?" or "Did you ever do that again?" he'll think you're looking for another overt, see?

And he'll look it over very carefully, and you blow the withhold. And you'll suddenly see the pc look very relieved. See, he's been, he's been holding back with ten-ton-truck motor, see? It's going perpetually, keeping him from holding his wife down on the bed and cutting all her hair off again, see? *Zzzuh! Zzuh-uh!* And he hasn't noticed that there's no reason to have the truck motor.

So he tells you he did it. Now, this should explain to you the mystery of why you sometimes see a withhold blow and sometimes not see one blow, and sometimes see a pc very relieved and sometimes not see the pc relieved.

All right. The anatomy is this: You find a withhold in the pc, see? The pc is withholding and you find out that the pc is withholding, see? You find out he hasn't told anybody about something or other, see? He hasn't told anybody about that sex in college, or something, you see? He hasn't told anybody. You've just triggered the withhold, see?

And the pc at that moment could feel uneasy. He sometimes will feel relieved at having told you but he also could feel very uneasy at that moment. Because you've sort of taken some of the straps off, and he's liable to do it again. And he knows it's an undesirable action, so he's not happy about having given up that withhold. Do you see that?

He's not happy about giving it up at all, because you've taken away some of the means by which he's keeping himself compressed as a jack-in-a-box, see, and somebody is liable to press the catch on the lid at any moment, see? And he's liable to do *that* again, you see? You see what he's worried about.

So you triggered some of the ways he was restraining himself without finding out what it was. And you'll see an unhappy pc. He doesn't get the session very well and it doesn't finish up too good.

"Well, he was security checked for two hours," see?

You read the auditor's report. "Did you make any goals for the session?"

"No," or "Partly." These are all very sad remarks.

Well, you can just count on some of this mechanism having gone on this way. You triggered the withhold, got the withhold slightly off, he didn't dare let it come all the way off because if he let it come all the way off, then he might do it again.

There he is down there at Times Square taking off his clothes, see? Hmhm-huh-huh-hhuh! He's almost conquered that, you see? He's withheld it, and he knows he can withhold it if he keeps his head in this exact position and goes to his psychoanalyst regularly. See, he-he-he-he-he knows he can live with that. Only he doesn't really know about it, you know, but he knows he might do something and *ooouuuoo*. And you take the withhold off and you got the restraint.

So if you made it a rule, an operating rule, that every time you got a withhold off, "Well, I've never told anybody or they don't know this about me," or something of the sort, that you try to find the overt under it. And then you'll blow the rest of it. And that every time, including that time, that you have blown a heavy overt that the person has done, you ask him if he's done it again, or did he ever do it another time – he'll tell you another time and another time, and then so on.

And if you ask him, also, when he'd not done it, the rest of the thing would go *phooft!* and all of a sudden the pc would look very relieved.

So if you pulled just purely a withhold without the fellow telling you what the overt was, you've actually goofed a little bit by not asking him, well, what did he *do*. See, "What have you done, done, done?"

"Well, I've just never told anybody about my conduct in college."

"All right. Fine. Good. We'll go to the next question."

Male voice: Huh-huh-huh-ho!

Now you see why the guy is upset with you. You've released some of the straps by which he holds himself down without permitting him to let go of it. So you've – he thinks maybe you've damaged him somehow.

No, you've got that far, you must go on from there and you must say, "Well, what did you *do* in college?" See? "What did you *do*?"

"Uh, well, I *woo-woom-mm*. I'd forgotten all about the – *ooo-mm-a-huh*. Well, actually it wasn't very much. There was just some of us boys, and it wasn't very much. It was just kind of a joke. We laughed it all off."

"Well," you say. "Well, you laughed it all off, what is the needle doing falling off of the pin here? What's that? What's the part you didn't laugh off?" (Only you wouldn't talk that way to a pc.) And if – he all of a sudden comes clean and your needle clears up.

And then having told you all that dirt, and he's got all the overts off, remember there may be some residual withholds. And the residual withholds, of course, come off best if you ask for them.

You say, "Well, did you ever do it again?" Heh-heh.

"Ooo, well, no, except that, uh-oo-well, there, *hoom-mm* Miami Beach Hotel, I mean the mmm-hm. Yeah. Well, no, we didn't. Ha! Yeah, I didn't do it at the Miami Beach Hotel. I *m-rr-r-raw* and didn't do it in Los Angeles, and didn't do it up there when I was at Canada, and then *b-rroo*. What do you know? Didn't do it during the whole war. Life is wonderful. Isn't that great? Except after the war."

"Well, what about that one?" "All right. Well, did you ever do that one again?"

Y-ng-ngt and *zoom-zoom*, and so forth. All of a sudden the guy feels like fresh air has been ventilated through the reactive carcass.

But if you know this as the anatomy of a withhold, and you know that the person, after you've gotten the overt off, may still be *withholding* obsessively, and it may not all be gone, and you know that if you get some of the withhold off, the person may be – without getting the overt – why, you know the person will get nervous. If you know that where there is a critical thought, there is a withhold *and* an overt underlying it, and if you know all of these things and keep the pc from going on little session withholds – keep those little session withholds and invalidations cleaned up as you go – and don't run the pc for the wall, run a session for the pc.

You see, there's various things that you could get confused on. It's the pc's session and it's his session exclusively, and run it for that pc. And the auditor runs it, but it's for the pc. Don't let your control go down particularly, but also, man, don't let the pc get the idea it's for somebody else.

And if you follow through, on the two-way comm – your TR 4 is good – you never have any trouble, and, boy, you can just blow somebody up through the roof. Oh yeah, they can just go up, up, up, up. Terrific. *Bangity-bangity-bangity-bang*.

But the point which is general – the points which are generally missed is sessions are not for the pc – that's missed. See, sessions are run for the piece of paper or the E-Meter, or something. I'm not being sarcastic. I mean, people treat a pc sometimes like a piece of driftwood. The pc doesn't exist in the session. If the pc thinks something, why, you don't have anything to do with it. He doesn't know what's going on. It's true, he doesn't know what's going on in his bank. True, you know better than he does, but at the same time – ha-ha-ha-ha – at the same time, you're there to straighten this out. And if you don't pay attention to what the pc is saying, you of course go out of communication with the pc, the pc goes on an unintentional withhold and so forth and there you've had it.

Also you could let the pc talk too much and not shut the pc off, but the way to shut a pc off, of course, the best way to shut the pc off is just shift his attention on to what you're doing.

Not, "Well, let's stop talking about *that* now, and start doing something else." That might appear a little bit crude. But just refer the pc's attention over onto some other part of the session and carry on with it. You can do those things very smoothly.

If you can learn to do those things, my God, how you will carry somebody up through the – through the Tone Scale. I mean, *zoom!*

Now – this is on just Security Checking, Twenty-Ten. And every time you run twenty minutes' worth of this stuff, why, run ten minutes of Havingness, and residual impulses to withhold blow in the Havingness, of course, and other things happen, and up they go.

But there is something else that you should know about Security Checking and running Security Check sessions, something that you should know very well. And that's another one of these – of "run it for the pc" in the mechanics of the withholds. And that's this – that's this: You try to null rudiments. You takes them as you finds them and youse tries to null them without shoving the pc around in any other zone or area than he is in. You don't go looking for withholds and present time problems and ARC breaks and down havingness while you're running rudiments – end rudiments or beginning rudiments.

In other words, you try to null the needle. Just overtly and directly try to null the needle. You takes the pc as you finds him and you tries to null the needle. That's what you does. And that's all you does. That's rudiments.

But you're the world's worst – maybe not the world's worst, but – close candidate – let me put it that way: you're a candidate for the world's worst if you carry this action of the rudiments over into the session body. Now if you carry the spirit of taking the pc as you find him and try to null the needle on things you ask the pc, and *only* try to null the needle on things you ask the pc, the way you handle rudiments, you are not going to get any gain on that pc to worth a nickel. Because nothing is going to happen in the session, and he – sometimes you accidentally find something. And if you null the needle real good, why, you'll end up the session, the pc feels a little bit better, he makes his goals partly or no. And it's all about here.

Now, there's a vast difference between running rudiments – a vast, vast, *vast* difference between running rudiments and the body of a session. You're trying to null the needle on rudiments but in the body of the session you are trying to find data and clean it up, and it's an entirely different activity.

In other words, you find the data, and then you null the needle on the data. And you find the data, and you null the needle on the data. And you – one of the reasons some of you very well might have rudiments out so often is because you put them out.

Rudiments are simply there to be nulled. The pc is accidentally sitting in something, you null it. See, if he's accidentally sitting in something, you null it. Good. That's it. Bang!

You might be looking around and have these two things reversed. You might be trying to run the rudiments so as to find things and then null them, at which time you would do nothing but run rudiments, and in the body of the session just trying to be nulling the needle – see, these things here could be completely reversed – and you'd get no reaction at all from the pc. You'd get no real gain on the part of the pc from any auditing.

Now, the body of a session is devoted to finding data and nulling the needle on it. And it's another action, it's the additional action. And that action must be done. And if it is not done by the auditor, what has he got? He has got a pc who is sitting there in the chair. He is calm, cool and collected. He is getting a session. He is happy. He is in a room. He is *miles*

away from any trouble. Isn't it sweet? He doesn't have a present time problem, he doesn't have an ARC break, he doesn't have anything. And so he has nothing in restimulation of any kind whatsoever and now you're simply going to read him some questions, one after the other, and null the needle on them.

You have an unrestimulated pc. Now, listen. You have to restimulate the pc in order to clean it up, because it won't come to the surface of the bank unless you pull it up to the surface of the bank, I assure you.

See, your rudiments smoothed him all out, didn't they? Now, supposing you ran the body of the session just to null the needle. Well, of course, you're not going to get anything done at all.

How do you get the pc restimulated so as to run something off? Well, I've given you other systems of doing that and that's not part of the lecture. That is very pertinent to the lecture, however, that you *null* the needle in the rudiments. And in the body of a session looking for withholds or auditing the pc on anything else, you've got to find what you are looking for and you've got to persuade the pc to look for it. You've got to get the pc in there digging. And you've got to dig. And the body of the session is done with a pick and a shovel and dynamite, and all kinds of digging tools, oil-well drilling rigs, anything you can think of. And you keep stirring this stuff up and clearing it off the top of the mound, and – and you're *busy*, man! *Busy!* Get *busy* in the session. Don't just sit there and say, "*Dadadadadadadadadadad-poooh! Dudududududududududu-poooh. Dadadadadadadadadu-poooh. Dadadadadada* – well, I had a good session today. Pc didn't have an ARC break the whole session." Nothing happened either.

No, you gotta dig it up to clear it away. Otherwise, it's just there, see? And you look at sessions from that point of view – that you've got to dig them up before you find anything and then you've got to clear it up, having dug it up – you all of a sudden will see what a session is all about and why you've got to have rudiments nicely. Because you don't want the pc digging things up accidentally. You only want the pc to dig up what you want the pc to dig up.

And if the rudiments are out, of course he's digging things up accidentally all the time and he's sitting over there, a busy little beaver. Dig, dig, dig, dig, dig, dig, dig. Chop down trees. Dig, dig, dig. Make a dam. Grout up the dam. *Dadaroom-dadeedada-dadadaroom. Boom. Boom. Boom. Boom.* There he is. Dig, dig, dig, dig, so on.

And you're sitting over there mining coal, and he's sit- . Hasn't anything to do with him; he's drilling for oil. [laughter] And that's the secret of it all.

Of course, if you know the anatomy of the reactive bank, that it consists of overts and withholds, and that you're trying to restore his knowingness first, and then his self-determinism over these actions, and so forth, and if you know those things you could almost audit by definition. Just audit by definition. Say, "Well, the pc isn't there. Why did he blow?"

Just ask the pc, "Well, has he blown from anyplace lately?"

Guy will say, "Yes, I left a cafe before I finished dinner last night."

You say, "Good. Now, what are you withholding about that?"

"Oh, well, I didn't realize I was withholding anything about it, but as a matter of fact I am."

"All right. Good. Thank you. What is it?"

"Well, it's so-and-so."

"All right. What overt did you pull just before that?"

"Oh, well, we don't want to go into that, do we?"

"Yes, we do. We're going into it right now. All right. Good enough. There it is. Well, then, you going to do that again, and so forth?"

"Well, I decided I wouldn't. Ha-ha!"

And you say, "Well, that's good. Now, where else have you blown from in the last two hundred trillion years, son?"

And you will see the depth and distance to which a Security Check can reach. Do you see?

All right.

[end of lecture]

3D CRISS CROSS AND GPM ANATOMY

A lecture given on 17 January 1962

Thank you.

Okay. Good enough. We do this one sitting down. Okay.

This is what?

Audience: 17th.

The what?

Audience: 17th.

Of what month?

Audience: January.

17th of January. What year?

Audience: AD 12.

AD 12. And where are we?

Audience: Saint Hill.

Huh?

Audience: Saint Hill.

Yeah, I know, but what planet?

Audience: Earth. [laughter]

Earth. Okay. Thank you very much. All right. Thank you very much for orienting me. I've been flying about here and haven't had much time to look up.

All right. I have a lot of data to give you about 3D Criss Cross. And I'll try to make it graphic to you in spite of a lack of chalk. Piece of chalk around here?

And you don't know from nothing. I mean, you're stumbling and fumbling in the dark in all those black masses. I never saw people get so lost.

3D Criss Cross is the natural outgrowth of Routine 3. Find a goal, find a terminal, run it. But of course, you cannot guarantee that the auditor will find a goal that is the pc's goal. Might be an oppterm goal, you see? Or a terminal that is the pc's terminal. Might be just a lock terminal. Might not be checked out and it might be done in California. [laughter] I

shouldn't be hard on California. Actually, these are sufficient overts that we can take over the lot. Have to run up a few overts before you mount the attack, you know.

So this Routine 3 was successful in a relatively few cases to produce a Clear. Now, its percentages are quite poor. I never gave you anything but the facts I know. And the percentages on the thing are quite poor. I suppose they're something ridiculous like about, oh, I don't know, 85 percent, 90 percent, 95 percent flunk. Meaning only about a 5 – somewhere between a 5 and 15 percent is about all you get out of Routine 3 Clear. I've been telling you that for years, that we're just clearing a few and we're looking to clear a lot more.

Well, there are two things there. You see, the goal could be an oppgoal and it could not be something the pc wanted to do anyhow and the terminal could be the opposition terminal, at which time you'd wrap up the pc and he wouldn't know which end he was standing on.

And in view of the fact that these techniques always get done by somebody who doesn't know what he's doing – that's true. That's true. These bulletins get out. You'd be surprised the distribution we have which is out from under. And somebody reads half a bulletin and hears the lecture backwards and then they're all set, see. They miss all the things you're not supposed to do, you know, and so they do those. And then they can't duplicate all the things they're supposed to do, so they don't do those. And you can't have around too long techniques that have a terrific liability to them, don't you see? Too many people get cut to pieces with them through unauthorized use and untrained auditors and all that.

So Routine 3, however, did produce Clears. Now, the way it produced Clears was to produce a key-out Clear. You ran this terminal out and when it blew, it disconnected the pc from the Goals Problem Mass. That is how that produced a Clear. And it did lead the person out into an area of free track and you might as well get used to that idea that there is a lot of free track on the case, even when there's a Goals Problem Mass, you see? The person can – does have track to run on that does not impinge on the Goals Problem Mass.

But one day he's running an engram that has an airplane in it and the left wing of the airplane is black. Oh, oh. And you run it and you run it and all of a sudden, the pc has got a field. And he has never had a field before, but now he's got one.

Well, you see, he was running on free track. That is to say he could move on the time track because he was not keyed in on the Goals Problem Mass. Well, what you did then when you found his terminal was to find that terminal most intimately connected with the Goals Problem Mass which could be run on the pc and when that was discharged, it disconnected him from the Goals Problem Mass, but it left the Goals Problem Mass floating about unchallenged by the pc.

Therefore, a person cleared by those particular technologies – were unstable. That is to say they might have gone for a century, they might have gone for a minute. It was all in the lap of the gods how rapidly the Goals Problem Mass would move in on them.

Now, they had a good chance that it wouldn't because they were already well separated from it, you see. But there was still something in the bank that could bite. Now, the Clear, then, was an apparently stable person only so long as the Goals Problem Mass didn't key in on him. But there was something that you could key in on a Clear which was unsus-

pected and that was a Goals Problem Mass. That is the thing that could be keyed on him and that was the thing which was unsuspected. That is it. That is *the weenie* as they say in Hollywood. Except the weenie is something by movie scenario technology which everybody is after. Everybody is after the weenie. That'll be the gold in the gold mine or it'll be something of this sort. It's what the hero is fighting the villain for and if the villain gets it, that's bad. And if the hero gets it, that's good, you see. That's a weenie.

Well, this is not quite a weenie because nobody wants it. [laughter] So it's a kind of a reverse weenie.

And the Goals Problem Mass is the reactive bank. These things are synonymous. There is no difference between the Goals Problem Mass and the reactive bank, aside from this little addition. The reactive bank includes or could include sections of free track, you see. And actually, analytically, the pc can touch these things, too, and is quite often surprised to find out he's lived before and that sort of thing, by touching free track in past lives. So you could say the reactive bank also has it, on a borderline, some free track.

But these engrams that the preclear was so excruciatingly screaming about and was so upset about and that you've run pcs through and they were all tangled up and rolled up in balls and had their heads come off and so forth, brother, that's nothing. That's free track. Huh? [laughs] Will looks at me. Huh, yeah, it's just free track, that's all. You can run this stuff. Not aberrative. Analytically approachable.

You're the executioner at the Tower the time that you smothered the two little princes.* They're still looking for that guy, by the way. Did you do it? We'd like to get the thing cleared up. [laughter] We never could determine whether they were smothered or not smothered, you know, quite, you know. Anyhow, we'd like to clear that up over here in England. We like our crime, us English. Anyhow ... [laughter]

So, that's free track. You can run engrams and you can have a ball, you see? And you can run free track and everything is fine and wonderful and very inviting and it's all very colorful and very nice and one day you get near the Goals Problem Mass and after that, you have black and white. And then you get a little closer to the Goals Problem Mass and you get two-dimensional pictures.

And then you get into the Goals Problem Mass and the lights go out, and you haven't got any pictures from there on. You see how it works?

But of course, you could get keyed out and all of a sudden, you get two-dimensional pictures and then you'd get three-dimensional black and whites and then brilliant three-dimensional color and you're back onto free track again. See, this thing could be keyed in and out. Well, that's what you auditors have been fooling with when you're auditing a pc, you see?

* Editor's note: This is an allusion to a historical event from 1483, the time of the Wars of the Roses. After the death of his brother, King Edward IV, Richard of Gloucester (afterwards Richard III) arrested his nephews, Edward V and his brother Richard, threw them in the Tower and asserted that the marriage of his brother was invalid and thus the children had no claim to the throne of England. Soon afterwards the two children were murdered, probably on the orders of their uncle.

And you probably right now could think of many instances where you've done this on a pc. Can you?

Have you ever run a pc – run a pc along gorgeously and all of a sudden he didn't have any picture? Huh? Very embarrassing, isn't it? And you all of a sudden got yourself into a situation where everything was black and the next thing you know, it was white and beautiful and green and gorgeous and 3-D and everything was fine. Have you ever done that? It's more – rarely done, but auditors have done that – all of a sudden turned on a pc's pictures.

You run enough responsibility on a black mass and you will get the pc out into pictures again. And the keynote of that is responsibility and there's been a lot of material on that that you've already had. It's in bulletins of last – of 1960.

Therefore, something was in the road of Dianetics. Something lay directly across the path of Dianetics. And that was a thing that ... What was it? You know? Nobody knew.

Well, all these years, a decade afterwards, here it is. It's a Goals Problem Mass and that's pretty good. In terms of geological time, it only took ten years to dig it up. All right.

That is the thing which keeps you from running a person to Clear through running engrams because sooner or later you run into some edge of the Goals Problem Mass and of course, it doesn't go out with engram running.

If people didn't have the Goals Problem Mass, Dianetic processing by running engrams could send somebody to Clear rapidly.

But because of the Goals Problem Mass, hitherto undetected and called in Book One – it's all covered in Book One, by the way. It's circuits and valences. And circuits, valences, machinery, stuff of this character. Machinery isn't mentioned in Book One, but circuits and valences are. And I think there's a page and a half or two pages or something like that, listing types of circuits.

Well, those circuits add up to and become, in modern usage, the Goals Problem Mass. Because we can now tell you what a circuit is. And it's taken quite a while to find out exactly what a circuit was and exactly how to handle the circuit.

Now, the first technologies of clearing were better than *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*. The earlier technology was the better technology, which was simply to key out, key out, key out. See, what picture could the character confront? What could he tolerate, you see. What could he tolerate? Sort of a gradient scale of tolerances and so forth. And eventually, of course, he'd blow off the Goals Problem Mass and off the free track, too. And he would give an appearance of Clear. Of course, we don't know what the needle characteristic was of the first Clears because we didn't have any meters.

That's a good reason why we didn't know what the characteristic was. But, nevertheless, these people acted Clear and they weren't troubled with engrams and they answered up to these various characteristics. But if they did have any track, as it says in Book One, it was free track.

In other words, an individual could be dug out of what lingering edges of the Goals Problem Mass or circuits there were and put onto nothing but free track, he himself, a thetan,

and he would then feel wonderful and he would give the responses which we have called Clear. That's all elementary stuff.

But ten years after the fact, here it is – the Goals Problem Mass.

Now, when a person has lived a life in which he deserved no free track – in other words, he wanted to do everybody in or he wanted to get done in himself; you know, that sort of thing – he got into a grouper of some kind or another, which collapsed the track on him. About the time he blew out of his 'ead, he collapsed his track.

And this made a relatively black mass full of pictures and made out of energy masses. It had behaviors and characteristics. It had goals and everything else because it was that life-time packaged. He packaged it all right.

In other words, the whole track collapsed on the person – *boom*. One minute, why, there he was merely executing everybody in the British Isles and the next moment there he was – a twig fell on him or something like that – and that was enough motivator and he blew out of his body and collapsed the whole track of that lifetime into a ball. And it will; it'll collapse into a ball if it's got enough groupers. Electronic phenomena.

It'll also disperse and explode, by the way, and you haven't got a ball. You've got it all over the universe. So you got a dispersal-type circuit and you've got a condensed type circuit, which are quite interesting. You also have an inert circuit, which isn't condensed or dispersed. It's just persistent.

All right, you had a ball. And this individual then, thereafter, carried along with him a black mass which was a whole packaged lifetime. But it was a personality. And it had all of the characteristics of a personality because it was his identity in a whole lifetime. It was an identity which was carefully built up over a whole lifetime.

Now, that is a circuit. And that is all a circuit is. And if you think I'm going to belabor this on and on and you want to know about the engrams the guy developed and how he developed them and how the mental energy got into the circuit and what a grouper is and how it all collapsed, read *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*. There's phrases and all kinds of things and actions of one character or another.

You live a life as a communist and you'll get a nice circuit. Why? Because it's total togetherness. It's marvelous, you know. And you just get total togetherness, you see? Anything appended to that life where the total ambition was total togetherness, why, we get a crusher and we get a black ball of some kind or another. In other words, that's a grouper. Got it?

All right. Now, that is in essence a circuit. There are *three* types of circuits under *two* classifications. There is an inert circuit, which is neither outflowing nor inflowing and there is the active circuit. The active circuit is divided into two classes – inflow and outflow circuits. So you have an inert circuit, an outflow circuit and an inflow circuit. Actually, three circuits, but actually two types only. There is the active and the inactive circuit – the inert circuit.

Now, this is quite important to you because every now and then you will assess and assess and bang your brains out and assess and assess and so on. You finally get the pc and the pc reads beautifully and everything goes along fine and then you audit with the auditing

commands of the latter part of December, early November 61 and you just audit and you audit and you audit and you audit and you audit and nothing seems to happen and nothing seems to happen.

And there isn't anything happening and the pc goes on in the same characteristics and apparently gets a few cognitions and all going along. The pc's getting better, but you're taking the long route. Now, what kind of a circuit you got?

Female voice: An inert circuit.

You got an inert circuit. That's right. That's inert circuits. Why? Why does it behave that way? Well, it's neither outflowing nor inflowing. And that's the characteristic of an inert circuit. It doesn't outflow and it doesn't inflow. It's sort of an is-ness of beingness. But nevertheless it's packaged and it was pretty vicious in its day, but its activities were mostly the crimes of omission.

So you could say the crimes of omission characterize such a circuit. The pc, in running it, seldom recognizes omission as a crime. They cannot conceive of omission as a crime, you see.

They're a bunch of people standing on the bank of a river. This person comes along, notices the bank of the river is caving in, you see. Stands there and watches the bank of the river cave in and never mentions it to the people that the bank of the river is caving in, you see. And then the bank of the river caves in and all the people go into the water and drown and this person then says, "God is wonderful as he works his ways," you see. [laughter]

That is very inert activity and they don't recognize it as God-awful overts. You see, it's – the desirable communication is totally missing. They don't ever communicate, see? And actually they don't withhold either. And you'll run into this type of character and it's quite fascinating because they haven't got any withholds. When they're in that circuit – when they're in that inert circuit, they don't have any withholds.

If it happened to – if it occurred to them to tell you about a rape, they would. If it occurred to them to tell you about a murder, they would. They just murdered somebody, they'd come around and say, "Yes, well, I just murdered somebody." But it doesn't occur to them to withhold it but it also doesn't occur to them to ever mention it. See, that's no overts, no withholds; in other words, inert. The sins of omission. These are more or less the characteristics. These characteristics could be broadened and embroidered of an inert circuit and they have more mechanical importance to us than they do mental importance. It's the mechanical importance of this that I'll get along to in a moment.

All right. Now, you take an active circuit. Now, an active circuit could be a total outflow circuit or a total inflow circuit. When I say use total, remember absolutes are unobtainable. No such thing as a total outflow or a total inflow, but you know what I mean. I mean this character really outflowed or this character really inflowed. Now, when that circuit is found, you get *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, audit, audit, audit, bing-bing-bing, cognitions, cognitions, terrific, terrific, terrific*, you know.

Or, actually, when an inflow circuit is opposed to an outflow oppterm, you see, or an outflow circuit is opposed to an inflow oppterm, see, or even when an inflow or an outflow

circuit is opposed to an inert circuit, you'll still get these various characteristics, one after the other. You see?

So what do you got? What do you got? You got various reactions of circuits, but you also have interactions with other circuits. You see how this is building up? Quite elementary, actually. Oddly enough, the whole of the Goals Problem Mass is about as difficult to understand as a kid's game of skittles or something. It's very, very elementary. That's why man has missed it. He's looked for the *deep significance*. You see, the *deep, deep, deep significance of it all*, you know. "And we were all made by God in a sea of ammonia by a scientist," or something, you know. And "Where did we all come from?" And he gets all involved and this sort of thing and goes on and on and on.

And he has never looked at what he is composed of. His own composition and mental thinking and that sort of thing, has never been inspected. In fact, we are the first to inspect it anywhere in the vicinity of this planet.

All right. The three types of circuits. Now, an active circuit, outflow or inflow, let me give you examples of these two.

Active circuit outflow: This fellow was a messenger. A messenger dispatcher is better. He was a messenger dispatcher that brought tidings of dismay or something in all directions.

In other words, he was always sending out messengers and eventually, of course, he became a messenger. So you'll find "a messenger" is mixed up in "a messenger dispatcher." So that circuit will be appended as a lock. So you'll have the messenger dispatcher. And the first thing you'll find, as an auditor, that goes *tickety-tick* and reacts, of course, is a messenger. And then you will find a messenger dispatcher as you move in on into the bank, you see? Because actually you're moving in against the outflow of that circuit. This case outflowed. This case outflowed.

Industrialist. Aroomroom – made cars. See, outflow, outflow, outflow, outflow. *Agitator*, issued propaganda. Outflow, outflow, outflow, outflow. *Gangster*, outflow, outflow, outflow, outflow. Knock everybody off, you know. Any type of terminal, you see, that's engaging in actions which outflow is potentially a circuit. Now, there's something else it takes to make a circuit and we'll get around to that in a minute, too. But get the idea that an active circuit is a circuit which outflows.

All right. An inflow circuit: An inflow circuit would be something that inflowed. A temple priestess. There's a honey. There's a doll as far as inflow circuits are concerned. A man comes up – inflow. People come up with offerings for the altar – inflow, and frankly, we haven't got them on this particular time span right this minute, we just have people dramatizing it.

But, I can remember in the old days of the temples of Astarte and so forth. *Boy! Wow!* You talk about an animated vacuum. [laughter] *Wow!* I've seen somebody absolutely torn to bits, the flesh torn right off of his bones. It was just *schlllp*. Vacuum. Give me! Give me! Well, you see them once in a while, today. But they're just dramatizations, that's all. And that was for good. That was for keeps, see. So that makes a – that makes an interesting valence.

And that is a well packaged valence, always. Because, of course, the inflow characteristic of it pulls everything else in, too.

So everything is assistive to "pull in." Now, there's – there's your three classes: the inert, the outflow and the inflow.

All right. Now, let's go a little bit further, now. What is it that makes some lives package and some lives not package?

It's the degree of overt and withhold connected with the life. It is the withhold which packages up the tightly packaged ones. And it is the "must communicate" which packages up the active ones. You get a dispersal type valence accompanied with a very solid pack-type valence.

Now, I told you it isn't just withholds, you're only running half of the picture when you run withholds only. You've got the other side of this situation. "Must communicate," see?

Now, exactly what you'd call that, I haven't bothered much to investigate. But I imagine it would be a "moutflow," you see "must-outflow" or something like that. A "moutflow," or something. But it's a "got to communicate." And it is the reverse of a withhold. Instead of "hold in," the guy must go, "flow out." And I was taking that up in yesterday's lecture.

Now, you've got the individual has compulsive pushouts which are desirable, which tend to mask, then, *undesirable* actions or prevent undesirable withholds, see? So the withhold in that particular case is undesirable. This is less usual as a mechanical mechanism, but nevertheless exists and you see it around most anywhere.

All right. Now, what hangs up the Goals Problem Mass? I refer to you my lectures of December and you can recall those – they, the lectures of December concerning the characteristics of the Goals Problem Mass, see? You've got a terminal and an oppterm and the terminal and the oppterm are fabulously balanced one against the other and it's absolutely impossible how these two got that well balanced. But you've got postulate-counter-postulate, effort-counter-effort or pull-counter-pull and you've got a problem as a result of this. In other words, you've got your problem. The idea of a problem. You've got the – the Force 1 versus Force 2. And that hangs up and they exactly balance, so the pc has a problem.

Whenever the pc has a problem, he's got one opinion, somebody else has got another opinion. Or he's got one force, or the – somebody else has got another force. And these things are counter-opposing. And all things we know about problems, back through the years, are all applicable to the Goals Problem Mass. Everything we know about problems applies to the Goals Problem Mass because it is a problem in magnitude.

Now, we've *really* got a problem. It is the problem of an identity versus an identity or the problem of an identity versus identities. It is not the problem of a thought versus a thought.

"We *will* go to the movies," he says.

She says, "No, we *won't* go to the movies."

Well, of course, that's a common domestic problem.

All right. This is blown up to "Priests must perish. Gods must perish," see. This is a little bit higher magnitude, isn't it?

All right. Now, let's blow it up further. During a *whole* cycle, *all* temples must cease and *all* temples must be created. Versus versus. Packaged into a total identity. Identities versus identities.

Now, you have the idea of the man against the man. The army against the army. The civilization against the civilization. The system against the system. You've got these things *crush*, one against the other and how they remained balanced so neatly for two hundred trillion years was one of the things which I told you was the vast delicacy and matter of interest to the Goals Problem Mass.

So I have, therefore, been studying this and believe me, I've really done some studying on this particular item. This is quite an item. And don't think that studying it isn't something like boxing with your hands tied behind your back with a grizzly bear. It's uncomfortable cuffing.

It's quite a – quite a ball. You know, it's something on the order of examining the characteristics of dynamite as it explodes.

Now, take a valence or circuit "A". Valences or circuits, we don't care which is which is which. Not even synonymous. They're an identity. And that has [with French accent:] *a mission*. That has *le mission* it must accomplish. And then we get circuit "B". And circuit B is "*Zat mission* she shall never be accomplish. *Ha-ha*."

In fact, "We concentrate on nothing else but ze nonaccomplishment of zat mission. *Ha-ha*." And there they sit. In ze bank for zeveral zycles.

Pc runs into them. One minute he doesn't know whether he's accomplishing the mission or trying to stop the mission from being accomplished. And this is one of the things that absolutely baffles people. How, with such terrific enthusiasm, they will go straight along the line, you see and try to – try to get this thing done, you see? And then the next thing you know, sit down calmly and tell everybody it just must not be done. That's all. I mean, that must be stopped. Such an activity is totally undesirable anyhow.

Usually they – to make – to keep themselves from looking silly, they sort of sit still and sort of disparage what they've been doing, when in actuality they've run in from the one valence into the other valence.

Now, a thetan is a handy little character and he's very slippy, but he is susceptible to vacuums. And he is liable to get pulled into most anything and he's liable to go into most anything. So he gets in the vicinity of one of these valences – which he himself, by the way, has kept mocked up and is keeping mocking up.

But remember, during the lifetime when he lived this... You see, he's lived all the lifetimes there are in the Goals Problem Mass. That you must know about this character, you see. There isn't a lifetime in the Goals Problem Mass that the thetan himself in person has not lived. You can talk all you want to. He can sit there and talk – "Oh, those damned tigers, you know." "Us waterbucks, now, we're the thing, you see. And those damn tigers, we're not go-

ing to have anything to do with tigers." And he'll give you a big sales talk and hire Batten, Barton, Durstine and Osborn to run propaganda campaigns against tigers and you know, he's going to have a ball.

But the truth of the matter is, he's been a tiger as long as he's been a waterbuck. In fact, he probably used to be a tiger and then be a waterbuck and while he was being a tiger, he'd say, "Oh, man, those waterbucks. Absolutely delicious. Absolutely delicious. The thing to do right now... Now, a freshly killed waterbuck is fine, but *cured* waterbuck is just – that puts the edge on it. You go down by the stream, you see and so forth and *schlurp, schlurp.*" And if he happens to be in this valence of the tiger at the time you're auditing him, he has entirely different viewpoints.

And the next thing you know, if he swivels around the next time, he goes into the valence of the waterbuck. He has entirely different viewpoints.

What you want to worry about is the fellow who never swivels. And you only get that when you're running an inert valence. He never swivels on an inert valence, see. No motion involved in it at all. He kind of drips out of it or falls out of it accidentally one day or something like that.

Now, he's lived both of these lives and during that lifetime he created like crazy. Either he created impulses to keep himself from impulsing or he created withholds to keep himself from withholding. He created something to contradict something which was usually the same thing. He was busy. He was busy.

And during that very lifetime, of course, as a waterbuck, he was death on tigers and all the time he was a waterbuck, he was mix – he'd just keep mocking up things about what he was going to do to tigers. You know? What he was going to do to tigers. And tigers, you know. Tigers.

And because those things are hanging in space, they're never resolved. They're still mocked up, but the valence, waterbuck, continues to *mock* these things up. Which is quite remarkable. He spent a whole lifetime mocking up, so that that valence just goes right on mocking up. It keeps itself mocked up, in other words.

Well, of course, what is everybody that is a being doing here on Earth? He's trying to keep himself mocked up one way or the other, you know? Survive, survive, persist, persist. And we get back to the common denominator, *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*, and the dynamic principle of existence is survive. And this is the common denominator of all life.

Nobody said that we threw this principle out simply because we said create and destroy. That restored the rest of the cycle. Some beings are on "destroy others." And some beings are on "create others" or "create self" or even "destroy self," but the funny part of it is that they destroy themselves to survive and they create to survive. And survive is the thing they get pinned up on most easily, you see? So it is a common denominator of existence.

So every one of these valences has as its common denominator that it must survive and persist. And it must create in order to persist in some way or it must withhold in order to persist and so you get the thing totally packaged.

Now, it really wouldn't do very much if it weren't opposed. See, it would resolve and it wouldn't be floating in present time unless it were pushed against another valence of equal crash. You've got to have these two things pushed one *against* the other in order to get a *timelessness*. And that's how these valences float into present time. That's actually how they *jammed* into valences. See, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose, oppose. Whether they're opposing by withholding or opposing in any other way, it's opposition. They're agin it. They're agin something.

Now, this principle is quite interesting. This is a broad auditing principle I've talked about. I've said what you resist you become and that sort of thing. But actually if you want anybody to get locked up in this universe very nicely, just get him to agree that certain things are bad and mustn't be had. That's all there is to it. Just get him to agree that certain things are bad and he mustn't have them.

Now, what is the definition of bad is: mustn't have it. It's actually the only real definition of bad. That's the fundamental definition of bad – something you mustn't have or something others mustn't have.

Now, if people mustn't have it, it of course persists because it is never as-ised. So you get a non-as-ised thing. And the basic trick which makes this universe is simply this one trick. And a very interesting trick it is, which is just get everybody to agree that something is not *haveable*.

I imagine Immanuel Kant – somebody will run into Immanuel Kant sometime or another with his great unknowable unknowables and unattainable unattainables and how real truth – *real* truth, you see – transcended all human knowingness. So you couldn't have anything like real truth, you see, that sort of thing. See, you couldn't have it. Lord knows what you could as-is then, you see. So that any time somebody – if he really got that into a circuit, why – any time somebody would say, "This is the truth," it would be non-as-is-able. If you can't have truth, then it's non-as-is-able.

You should have the experience sometime of actually just running "have" subjectively. It is not very therapeutic, but you run "have" subjectively, you'll actually see a mass vanish as you can have it. You can sometimes run it on a somatic and you'll see the somatic vanish because the person has made up his mind he could have it.

So the non-haves persist. So it becomes a non-have universe. So it's the "not-have" characteristics of that valence that are persisting. It's something he couldn't have about the valence, so therefore it must be those things which oppose. So the valence actually is only composed of those things which oppose. Nice trick, isn't it?

I mean, the total energy mass left in this valence are those things which you can't have. So therefore, those things are oppose, so the total common denominator of a valence is oppose. Whether it is opposing by inflow or outflow or being inert or anything else, the characteristic of one of these packages is oppose. And none of its characteristics have ever been had. The pc doesn't have these characteristics, you see. He can't have anything that's in that package that remains in it.

Now, he might ... This is what is funny and what leaves your pc grasping in thin air once in a while. He's trying to find the rest of the life as a waterbuck.

He gets into this valence, you see and he can't find the rest of the life of a waterbuck. He can find spitting at tigers, running away from tigers, but he can't find very much grazing in the pasture, see, or swimming the stream, you know, or lying out on a rock someplace and no lady waterbucks. He can't find that. He'll look for that, you see. And he'll look in vain in this valence, you see.

He'll know that there must have been good times in this valence, you see, but he can't find them. He's had all those. See, he could have those, but what he couldn't have is a tiger. He couldn't have death, he couldn't have a tiger, he couldn't have this and he couldn't have that and all the things he couldn't have are then packaged in that valence. So you get a Goals Problem Mass as a can't-have. It's a total can't-have.

Now, oddly enough, its characteristics are usually more desirable than an ordinary life the pc lives. See, there were some things in there that were *very, very* select chop. Ummm.

Well, there's a temple priestess. See. I imagine that could be quite exciting at times. Yet the poor pc runs into the life of the temple priestess, which is all packaged into a circuit now. "Where's the bed," you know. Nonextant. Doesn't exist.

But reaching hands – they exist. Stabbing knives – they exist. The slit throat under the shadow of the idol – *that* exists, complete with blood. But only the less desirable blood, because maybe they had an appetite for blood while being a temple priestess, you see. And so – it's the things nobody wants that are left in this lifetime. And the pc almost goes around the bend trying to run it, see. Where's something nice about it all, because he knows something was nice about it. He knows it was exciting. He knows a lot of things about it, but he can't find them anymore and they're sort of all eaten up.

That's an interesting characteristic of valences. So you don't get pictures. One of the things that you run the pc – you run him in a Goals Problem Mass, he says, "There's no pictures here." Well, you know at once he's in a Goals Problem Mass. He says, "There's kind of a ridge and there's a thin veil and then there's a mmmm. And I sort of have an impression of the hand of an idol." And he keeps getting problems and it'll all give him the same pictures, you see. The ridge, the veil and the hand of the idol. Never seems to run into anything else while he's running it. That's because that's all that's there.

That's simple. I mean, it's elementary, my dear Watson, because there isn't anything else present.

Now, he himself as a thetan could mock it up again and will mock it up when it's no longer that undesirable and could put it all together again and would, except, of course, it would be sponged into the undesirable characteristics and he's not about to do that. And the attention of the person was always fixated on the terminal itself and on the opposition.

So there's two things of fixation. It's on the terminal and on its opposition.

Now, how does this Goals Problem Mass get so thoroughly condensed? How does it get so condensed?

Well, if you drew a picture, you'd get – really, you'd get something like this. There would be free track. All is well. And you have free track and the free track is going along, doing well. And then all of a sudden you've got a Goals Problem Mass, you see? Well, that's all right.

So there's a – there's a mass there. Well, let's don't call it a Goals Problem Mass. Let's just call it a circuit, an isolated circuit.

All right. The person had a trillion years of free track and then he's got a Goals Problem Mass, you see, because of his overts and restraints and inflow and outflow and all this sort of stuff and, all – you know, all that kind of business. And it just packaged that lifetime, *crunch!*

And he went along for another million years and so he's got another Goals Problem Mass. Well, let me tell you – pardon me, another circuit. Well, let me tell you the track could be just a series of free track with some beads on it. See, it'd look perfectly all right. I mean, a person would run back over it. He'd hit these things. He'd go into them, he'd come out of them, maybe get stuck on the track and you wouldn't have any trouble separating him from them. See, these are just isolated circuits spotted along in time.

And that's actually the way a Goals Problem Mass looks. It is not double. It is single, see? It's just – well, it's like a ladder. Free time track for maybe a trillion years and then there's a cycle. He spends a whole cycle in this weird game of a waterbuck, you see. And – but he's got a valence there of a waterbuck. *Crunch!* And it's all *condensed*. There's no free track in it at all. It's the unhaveables of the waterbuck.

And then you got free track for a million years and then you got some other valence. But this time he was an eagle and you got a – you got some kind of a terrific inflow-type terminal there, you see and it all went crunch, so that area's – no free track there. And it's just a little black lump on the time track and so forth.

And then go another half a billion years or something like that and then by that time he'd become a turtle. And there's nothing more inert than a turtle. And the inertness of it and the omissions of what he should have done as a turtle were overwhelming, so eventually the turtle's track caved in and that would just be there, you see. And then it'd go another billion or trillion years and he'd have another one of these *crunch* valences, you see? And it'd go along like that. And you, running the pc back over the track, would not have any trouble. None.

But that isn't what the time track looks like. That's what the time track should look like and what the pc thinks it probably does look like. And it doesn't look like that at all.

What happens? Well, he went along for a trillion years and one fine day found a waterbuck and a tiger. And there's a waterbuck and there's a tiger and everything's fine. And he sicced them on each other or something, you know. Made a game out of it. He was totally pan-determined over this thing.

And by the way, pan-determinism and self-determinism and other-determinism have as their controlling common denominator responsibility. All you have to do to get pan-determinism run down into other-determinism and self-determinism – all you have to do is just cease to take responsibility for zones. And if you take less and less responsibility, when

your responsibility goes to zero, you've got an other-determinism, you see? You've no longer got pan-determinism. You've got an other-determinism and now you're only responsible as a self-determinism. So you get maxims such as "take care of number one. That's my philosophy in life. Take care of number one," you know.

Well, I can show you somebody who has no responsibility for anybody else and at the same time has no ability to stand outside two sides of anything. He's always got to take one side. He's always one-sided in every view. He could never, in other words, handle anything but a fight. And the only – he couldn't *handle* a fight. He could only be *in* a fight.

You'll have a person that is never able ... If you had a cop like this, see, he'd always be coming in with beat-up criminals and he himself would be all beat up and so forth. And his neighborhood would always be beat up. Something would be beat up in this neighborhood and they've never had this much beat up in that neighborhood before so they merely figure it's getting to be a tough neighborhood. That isn't the case at all. They have a totally self-determined cop, who by the way has a Goals Problem Mass where he is a cop that is against them thar criminals. *Rrrrooop*. Well, the second he's got this type of a Goals Problem Mass, he can only take one side of a situation.

So anybody who is doing anything instantly falls into the oppterm characteristics and he can only do a fight. He can never see two people talking together without boosting it up into where one was fighting the other and taking sides with one. He'd identify one with himself and he'd identify the other one as other-determinism and he'd make a fight out of it.

In other words, he'd never bring peace. He would just bring war. And there'd be more war and more war and more war. Wherever he went, there'd be trouble, just trouble, trouble, trouble, trouble, trouble. He wouldn't be able to understand this and neither would anybody else.

But this guy would be all out, too, for number one. That would be his idea. He's a totally self-determined individual. He'll tell you the virtues of self-determinism are enormous and let the other fellow take care of himself.

Also he would never stand alongside of a chess game and watch two players. He'd just never do that. It would be a point he just could not stand to be. He could never be from town A and watch a football game between town B and town C. He just could never do it.

He would never go to such a football game. He just never would go. That's all. He would have to be part of town B, you see, to attend the football game and he could only attend the football game between B and C, you see. And he would always be violently against C and always be terribly pro-B. You see? And that's very embarrassing because his company moves to town C. He has to go to town C now, you see.

So now he's forced into a position where he might have to change sides or be pan-determined or be something else but what he's doing. And he can't do either of those, so he'll just find a new game. He'll just cease to be interested in football. That will be that. *Bing*, out, gone. That's it.

Well, he used to care for football. "Don't care for it much anymore. Horse racing's my game now. Us horses ..."

Anyway, there's nothing really wrong with other-determinism, pan-determinism, self-determinism, to be other-determined or pan-determined or something like that. It's no criticism particularly because it would never be a game. But to be obsessively self-determined and not know about what and to have a whole category of things which were always other-determined and then never know what they were either is to sort of walk in a weird mishmash of "God 'elp us. Who's against what?" And the person would always be rather upset. He'd never know what side he was on or why.

You see what's happened, though. His pan-determinism has deteriorated into total self-determinism.

Now, God help the fellow who goes out the bottom and becomes the mockery of pan-determinism which is "reasonable." It'll go down scale to a reasonability where you can *never* take sides. But you ask this person about taking sides and they kind of shudder horribly and they get a little bit sick at the pit of their stomach, at the idea of taking sides. "*Ohhhh*. Wouldn't be able to do that. *Ssssss*. No, no, no, no. Wouldn't be able to do that. No, no. No not now, no. No, we must be impartial. We must be reasonable. We must never take any sides of any kind whatsoever."

You get judges, United Nations, untouchables in general. And they're liable to be quite *reasonable*. And it'd drive you batty.

There can be somebody standing there with a knife in his hand, just having murdered somebody. The corpse is lying on the ground and they will be reasonable about what went on and who did it and so forth and they'll be very reasonable. And everything they say will be impartial. And they sound like a ruddy screaming maniac when you listen to them.

"Now, all right. Now, who committed this murder?"

"Oh, well, uh – well that – the – there can be several thoughts about that. There could be quite a bit of the – there'd be uh ... You could take many points of view with regard to that murder – if it was a murder, uh – and so on. We don't know whether a fellow did it, really and we don't know what his motives were. Frankly, we – we don't – we're not even positive the other fellow's dead, you know?" [laughter]

It'd drive you batty. You've talked to such people. We run into them sometimes in Scientology. They always have an open mind. They have an open mind to Scientology with the wind blowing straight down the hall, and you've got somebody who can't take sides.

And frankly, they're very close to an hypnotic state. If you really want to do something for them, you'd have to treat them more or less as an hypnotic person. It's quite interesting. The open mind.

"I'm open-minded about your ideas." I hear this every once in a while from somebody. They're real weird. Maybe somebody's stumbling in the front door, hit both sides of it, collapse over the stairs, you know and so on. And they turn around to the Receptionist, who's a girl and say, "Well now, Dr. Hubbard, I uh ..." It's quite remarkable, you know.

Because they don't know where they are and they don't know what side they're on and they don't know because it isn't safe to be on any side of any kind. That's the end of that. It's not safe to be on any side anyplace or to be anything.

Now, you nevertheless – this would all shake out in a Goals Problem Mass. They aren't any harder to process than anybody else by Routine 3D Criss Cross.

All right. Now, what happens in actuality? What happens in actuality? Well, it's a very simple mechanism actually.

The guy gets the tiger going toward the waterbuck and then he decides that he's been a little bit too rough on waterbucks and he starts favoring a waterbuck and going against the tiger, see? But he can't quite restrain himself from following the first postulates in the game which was to get the waterbuck fighting with the tiger. So he just gets more waterbucks eaten up, see? But he keeps going against the tiger more and more and more and more against the waterbuck and he gets terrific overts finally on the waterbuck and he becomes a waterbuck. He can no longer differentiate between himself and a waterbuck. He is a waterbuck. That's it.

Now, the waterbuck gets tremendous overts on the tiger of various types and other, usually very covert waterbuck overts, you see, and by being so beautiful and being so destroyed.

That is a marvelous type of overt and hardly anybody ever recovers from it because they can't quite spot what it is. Girls do this occasionally. My God, a girl could certainly get even with you after a spat. They're hollow-eyed, caved-in, you know. Their beauty is shot, you know. Their beauty is absolutely ruined and so forth. Such mechanisms.

And these are overts of one kind or another. And so he just stacks up enough overts against the tiger and one fine day finds himself being a tiger and eating waterbucks.

Well now, you see, waterbucks are an ally, but he's being a tiger and to live he has to eat waterbucks and he will develop all sorts of vegetable faddisms as a tiger. "Us tigers should be vegetarians. Tigers of the world, awake! You, too, can have glossy coats by eating grass." Can see it now. And he writes a book and calls himself Gayelord Hauser – [laughter] this sort of balderdash, you see.

He can't quite face up to committing this overt against his terminal. But he's being a tiger and he inflows waterbucks.

Well, after he's inflowed enough waterbucks – he's now gone down scale considerably, you see – why, one fine day he has so many overts on waterbucks that he becomes a waterbuck again on a second curve. He says, "Now, being a waterbuck" – very obsessively and hating it because "Us tigers". He'd always really gotten friendly with the tigers, you see. But "Us waterbucks" is just a little bit thinned down and he sort of has a vicious attitude toward waterbucks because, after all, he's eaten waterbucks, you see?

And while in the waterbuck's head, he's busy eating waterbuck, you see, because he's still in a tiger valence, only he isn't. He's in a waterbuck valence. Or he's in a tiger ... No, he's in a wate – water – tiger – water – water ... See? And he embarrasses himself because he's down drinking water one day along with the other waterbucks and he says, "*Groooooowr*," you

know. And all the other waterbucks look up and say, "Good God!" you know. "And I say, old fellow, that isn't done, you know."

So he has to withhold that because he might do it again, you see – an antisocial characteristic.

And he just starts avoiding tigers and avoiding tigers and after he's avoided enough tigers, he obsessively exteriorizes from a waterbuck and interiorizes into a tiger. And now he's a downscale tiger indeed. And he will take this tiger mock-up that he's now got and it gets mange. It gets mange, brother. Its teeth drop out. It loses its claws with the greatest of ease, see. He becomes a very moth-eaten tiger. Even when he is young, he is a moth-eaten tiger. His mother meeting him on the trail turns her head sadly. [laughter] And he does this confounded *yickety-yak*, *bickety-bop*, *boopety-bop*, you know. Waterbuck-tiger, tiger-waterbuck, waterbuck-tiger, tiger-waterbuck. He can't stay away from either of them.

He finally one day runs the game out and skips it and manages not to be a waterbuck and manages not to be a tiger and lives some free track and everything is fine. And he goes along and everything is dandy and gets involved with a temple. And here goes some kind of a wild game that has to do with a temple priestess and the evil priest, you see. Oh, some mad game going on of some kind or another and becomes the temple priestess, you see, because she's so beautiful.

And actually she goes out and with great purity talks to the multitude, you see and makes people happy and effects cures and it's all – all just so terrific, you know. High-toned. Ethical. Everything's fine. Nothing wrong with this, you see and gets after the – gets after the priest occasionally, you know. A little bit, you know. Not much. [laughter]

Here we go! Because the next thing you know, why, the priest gets too much money and is agin all of these nice people and she realizes this priest is shaking the populace down. The offerings put on the temple of Baal are never eaten by Baal. They are eaten by the priest and his friends. And this is a great shock and is a very unethical action. The priest should withhold doing this.

In other words, she gets an overt on a priest and you know, goes out and exposes the priest to the multitude or something like this, you see.

Well, she goes and picks up another body as a temple priestess, you see. And life is going on beautifully, you see, but there's still another priest and she gets more overts on the priest and some more overts on the priest. Been quite pan-determined about this originally, but she's sliding over into becoming *only* a temple priestess and the next thing you know she's bumping off priests left and right. A guy shows up, says, "I'm a priest." Bang! That's it. [laughter]

She says, "Oh." But it's quite overt, you know. He's just dead, that's all. There's hardly enough time to breathe between the announcement and the demise. And gets enough overts on priests and one lifetime suddenly finds herself a boy and walks on down to the local temple and signs up as a neophyte and becomes a priest and takes all of the food from behind the altar that was intended for Baal, and sort of avoids temple priestesses. Doesn't have too much

to do with them. Has an open mind about them, [laughter] and so on. And then one day gets exposed by a temple priestess. *Ohhhh*.

Well, that's an overt, you see – that's a – that's an overt by the temple priestess, but it's a motivator the guy can't have because he's already got overts on this line, you see, so he goes *yickety-yak, bingety-bang*.

Next time he picks up a girl's body, becomes a temple priestess and now, it's a little bit different the way to handle priests now. Now, she's got overts, more overts on a priest. A little bit different.

A fellow walks up and says, "I'm a priest." And she says, "Well, dear, have a drink of nice wine." A little more comm lag between the announcement and the demise, you see, a little more covert, but the same end product.

And then picks up a body as a boy and goes down to the temple, enrolls as a neophyte, walks up the steps and that's it. Takes one look at the newest crop of priestesses and goes quietly down to the cell and begins to grind up the arsenic, you know, and stir up the tails of the asps and sharpen up the ... Oh, it's a marvelous game, you know. Kills more of these girls, you know?

Finally, so a temple priestess shows up and says, "I am a temple ..." It doesn't get that far, you know. *Clank!* [laughs]

And eventually this game has gone *boom-bang, boom-bang, thud-bang, thud-bang*, you see. Back and forth, temple priestess, priest, here we go. And he gets tired of that and gets pan-determined about something else. You see, that's the cycle. Well, that *still* would be all right. You wouldn't have any trouble solving that, but look what happens.

One of these packages gets into a terrific outflow and one day the person misidentifies somebody in present time with an old game and the valence will restimulate and make one of these Goals Problem Masses.

In other words, an old game on the track suddenly comes into present time as a direct opposing problem to the game they're playing.

Now, it's bad enough to have the waterbuck and the priestess games. You see, they themselves form problems, oppositions, but they're not delicately poised and they don't hang up easily. They're just overts and withholds and so forth.

That's – that's not good enough. You've got to get one of these *whole* games opposed against a *whole* game. You get the idea? I mean, these things have got to become confused by the pc so that he doesn't know which is which so that he doesn't know which part of the track is which part of the track. You see how that is?

He's got a whole game series composed with a whole game series, so he becomes an order of priestesses which are dedicated to the preservation of waterbucks. And when asked to design a new headdress for the priestesses, of course, designs a pair of waterbuck horns. And – *th-th-th-th* – it's all getting sort of confused.

And as time goes on, the Goals Problem Mass, of course, is overlapped on itself many, many times and is becoming itself quite condensed. Just as the valence became condensed in

time, so can a series of valences become condensed in time and so can all of the serieses of valence become condensed in time and occur right now on the track in one lump. And that is a Goals Problem Mass – everything opposing everything, cycles opposing cycles, everything opposing everything else.

Now, that would be all right if the person didn't live side lives which themselves condensed, which aren't on any main game at all, which get locked onto main games. So they live these lock valence – they're lock valences. They're not main chance valences. They're lock valences. And they don't have too much to do with the game, but one day, right in the middle of being a temple priest, all of a sudden he becomes a merchant. Has a lot to do with temples, you see, but he's a merchant. He's going to reform. He's going to get out of the game. That's the usual thing, you see. Going to reform and finds himself dealing with nothing but the temple, you know, as a merchant. And lives a life as a merchant – kind of sick, but lives a life as a merchant. And then goes on and lives a life as the – as a priest, see?

So in the middle of all this – but then years later, ages after this game is all dead, decides to take an education at a university in a country. Goes to the university. Everything is beautiful. Everything is fine. Only you have – the only educated people in this particular country are, of course, members of the ministry.

He goes along with this because to be educated, of course, you have to be a member of the ministry and that's perfectly all right. And everything is fine until one day he's standing there and he picks up an altar cup. You know, it's just form, you know. Nothing to do with anything. It's just form. And he picks up this altar cup, you know and is going to put it – put it up on an arch. All of a sudden gets terribly dizzy and comes down with pneutyphoid ammoni-coccus or something.

And he kind – nobody can trace what happened to him, so it must have been a bug. You see what happens? That lifetime, in other words, moved in *toward* one of these main games that he doesn't ever want anything to do with again and doesn't have anything to do with, moves in and latches straight onto it.

Now, you, in assessing it, can find that life going to the university as a parson or something, you see? And it'll assess out and then disappear. You see? Because as you assess it and discuss it and differentiate it with the pc, of course he differentiates it off the main game. And he sees that it isn't the main game and that it doesn't oppose anything and it just blows, just like that. See?

But up to that time, it was totally latched onto the Goals Problem Mass.

Now, the danger in 3, 3A and 3D is just getting one of those things I just described to you. Just getting one of – getting your hands on one of those. It of course, if it were proved out and checked out expertly, it wouldn't stay. It wouldn't stay in. It would blow. But you can't count on every auditor that's ever going to run this checking it out expertly.

Furthermore, it is very difficult, with the original 3D type of assessment and the original package, to know whether you had a terminal or oppterm. Quite difficult to know this.

They sometimes are all mixed up and you can't tell which is which. And one imbibes the characteristics of the other and it gets very confused.

So, what have you got here? You've got a method, then, of peeling off – in 3D Criss Cross, you see – you have a method of peeling off and blowing all of these lock valences that don't have anything to do with the main chance. And then peeling off cycles off of cycles and straightening the thing out and getting it back on the track again so it's in some shape to run. And you could find the center pins of the whole mass which would cause it to come back together again and you run those out. I'll go into more about that later.

We're talking mainly about anatomy now and the ways of handling this anatomy, I must advise you, of course, are susceptible to change. But the anatomy is it. This is the stuff. This is the anatomy of what you're handling.

All right. Now – now let's show you how you get a total collapse of the main chance. And if anybody's bank collapses at this particular time, and it disturbs the lecture any, I won't forgive you. Now, so just – just hold on to it now. And here's the way it does it.

A heavy inflow package, the heaviest on the track, opposing a heavy inflow package will make a double vacuum. You will then have a vacuum between two valences. Two inflow valences, you see. If you got the idea of A and it's inflowing madly and B and it's inflowing madly, you see, it leaves a vacuum in between A and B, doesn't it? And, man, that's quite a vacuum.

All right. Now, let's take two outflow valences. This is an elementary exercise in the Goals Problem Mass, you see. Two outflow valences. And they're outflowing madly, C and D. Boy, are they outflowing. See, they're terrific. *Boom, boom, boom*. Outflow, you know, glare fight, kill everybody, you know, that sort of thing

And as – if these two things were facing each other, you'd get a blowby. In other words, you would get everything flowing from D at C and everything flowing from C at D, leaving a vacuum behind the back of C and a vacuum behind the back of D. It's a study in enturbulances is what it is.

And then you'd get all of this other stuff spraying all over the place, caroming. In other words, you'd pin C and D together by just the violence that they were blasting at each other because their blasts miss, of course. See, you got a lot of missed blasts.

In other words, they're pinned together by mutual force against each other which caused vacuums back of each. This is electronic phenomena I'm giving you, standing waves. Electronics men turn gray when I start talking to them about this kind of thing because this is more than is known about electronics on this planet. Electronics have standing waves and they have all sorts of things. And we think, on this planet, that we've really conquered it all because we can throw a light switch and turn on a very expensive light and mortgage our wife to the power company to pay the bills, you see. We think we got electrical stuff pretty well taped. We can also turn on a radio – turn on a radio with bad tone and pull in something a few miles away that sounds like music and that you hear through the static and we think this is pretty good. So we know all about this stuff.

In actuality, it goes a lot further and a lot more about this. There are standing waves, motionless waves. Energy itself has various characteristics. It has traction qualities and so forth. It can produce some different and odd phenomena.

Give you an idea. Even in the universities they know of the ground wave phenomena. You can pipe electricity or programs through the ground. It doesn't go through the air. And you ask anybody about this, of course, and they don't know anything about it. They say, "Well, that is a field that has never been studied and that, of course, closes the book, because it has never been studied, you see. *Ha-ha-ha.*" Great! Hope they wake up someday and find out that that phrase "never been studied" does not excuse ignorance. So there's a lot of electronic phenomena of one character or another.

Now, you don't have to be concerned with this electronic phenomena or identifying this electronic phenomena. It's of no particular use to you to become that learned on the subject, but you've got it right where you sit. You've got standing waves and you've got electronic masses and you've got all kinds of enturbulances and so forth and these things are the reactive bank.

All right. We get C and D blasting away at each other and by the very action of blast, hold each other together.

I'll give you an idea. A gunman facing another gunman may be shooting at the other gunman, but do – can you conceive of anybody really distracting his attention from what he's doing? See? And he also doesn't want the other gunman to go away. So you see, there's a traction beam between C and D which holds them together while they blow each other's heads off.

And that stuff is represented in electronic flow and it's still there, in the bank. And then you've got two inflows, as I was just giving you. And these inflowing madly, each one, of course, leave a vacuum and the time track can be sucked up right into the middle between A and B. *Schrrup!*

In other words, electronic mass, it's timeless, and so on. There's no reason why it couldn't be pulled in and it does pull in and it can be pulled in. In other words, you've got a terrific vacuum between A and B by the nature of two – they're both inflows – and therefore you have a nonexistence of electronic potential in the middle. So therefore, any electronic potential will instantly fly into that hole. There it is. *Bang!* You see?

Now, between C and D, anything coming near will be pinned down – either pulled into the vacuums back of C and back of D... You see, things can be pulled in. Objects, electronic objects, masses, standing waves can be pulled in back of C and D and just sucked up against these two outflow terminals. And what do you think is happening at the same time?

Of course, you get this tremendous blast of action. C versus D gets activated occasionally and naturally makes an awful enturbulance. So you get a – you get a like a cyclonic storm going around, around everything that is sucked in against C and D, you see.

So there they are pinned in, but the currents are going by like mad while they're pinned in. You get the – you get the notion?

Such phenomena as this – I haven't described to you all the phenomena, but these are the principle ones: mix up an A-B mess now with a C-D mess, then pour it full of a bunch of inerts-masses just to give it mass and now pour it full of other things like actual vacuums, pictures of vacuums. You know, you have engrams full of vacuums and that sort of thing, you

see? And now pour it full of stuff that have got traction beams that are condensing beams and so forth and, man, it looks pretty forbidding. It looks pretty rough. And you get the pc near this stuff and, of course, he can't – feels like he's getting his head blown off in his physical body. And of course, he practically is.

There are ways to approach this thing and it's very easy to approach it. Now, it's there because he is afraid to reach into it. He doesn't want to go anywhere near it.

If left to his own devices, he might, however, putter with it, but not seriously. He's somewhat of the frame of mind of the child wants to go down to the river, which is a roaring torrent and is perfectly competent to sit there on the bank and make mud pies providing the bank is fifteen or twenty feet away and Daddy is near. But no closer, thank you. Too much of a roaring torrent going on, too much action.

Now, every time, of course, a thetan ... This is all individual. Each segment of this is keeping itself mocked up because it was a living thing at one time and it still acts like a living thing. The thetan thinks of himself as haunted by these things.

You know, he hits them and they go *bing*. You know, he's liable to put an energy beam into it and it says, "One, two, three, four, five, six, seven."

"What's this?"

"One, two, three, four, five, six ..."

"Oh-oh. You know I think I've got thetans in my head." [laughter]

In other words, he gets action. He reaches and something else flies back at him. And therefore he becomes very timid about handling his own mind, so he forgets things and he does this sort of thing.

Now, the individual, of course, gets pinned into this Goals Problem Mass. He can get into any valence in it. He can scatter in through any valence in it. And so, of course, coming near he activates it and he gets into these valences and they restimulate valences and valences restimulate valences, you see. And he can make this thing pretty live and pretty electronic and he can be in one side of it and the other side of it and he can go through it and exteriorize out of it and exteriorize in – interiorize into it. And – in other words, he can just have an awful lot of fun messing around. And this is life as it is lived on this planet. It's an endless, random, falling out of and into circuits in the Goals Problem Mass.

These are known as personality, human characteristics, human behavior, psychology, psychiatry, anything you want to call it. These are characteristics. And all they've done is study these characteristics of various reactions, of package reactions.

Of course, you get the anatomy of what the thing is, you can change those characteristics almost at will.

Now, 3D Criss Cross is a very smooth and gentle approach to this because you peel off... 3D Criss Cross will improve and change. The characteristics of Goals Problem Mass and so forth, are what they are. But I'll give a note here on 3D Criss Cross anyway.

These things peel off and by recognition and differentiation ... You see, you just assess, but assessment is devoted to finding as many, isolating as many parts of the Goals Problem Mass as you possibly can and proving them up as actual parts of the Goals Problem Mass.

And the action of doing this, of course, blows off all the package valences which are standing out on the outskirts, starts straightening up the mass by getting rid of it and unburdening it and getting rid of things which aren't the mass and assesses it right on down into the actual pins that are holding the mass together.

Now, it is time to run a pc, if you have to, only when you have the active terminals which have got the mass inextricably pinned into present time and are in present time.

Now, a pc having done all this, of course, has no great fear of the situation and possibly you could go back and date and straighten out these lives almost by inspection. Perhaps you could do it all by assessment. But that's beside the point. The point is that it is therapy by assessment because you established differentiation.

And when I see somebody at this present moment sweating like mad to find *the* package, see, I know he hasn't got the word. He should be going like mad to get as many items differentiated by the pc and isolated as possible because items fall into three characteristics: Completely null items. They have nothing whatsoever. They're free track items. They have nothing whatsoever to do with the Goals Problem Mass. They're out – way out and, you know, it had nothing to do with it. Never got locked up on it. Nothing.

The next, of course, is the lock item. And that is something that didn't have anything to do with the game on the main chance. The main games. It has nothing to do with the main game. It's just an identity which, unfortunately, got moved in toward one of the main games and therefore stuck and at the moment is considered by the preclear to be a part of the main game. But actually it had nothing to do with the main game. When he looks at the thing again and inspects it, it blows off. And he is much less confused about what it was all about.

Like he got – he got into merchanting and one of his customers was the temple. And just to that degree, he's pinned onto the Goals Problem Mass, so he'll run into the life of a merchant and it is not runnable. You can't run this. The bank will beef up and everything will go to pieces because, of course, it's right next to the Goals Problem Mass. And it's agitating the Goals Problem Mass without doing anything *to* the Goals Problem Mass.

And if you agitate the Goals Problem Mass by running false items that have nothing to do with the actual games in the Goals Problem Mass, it charges up the Goals Problem Mass without discharging anything. And you've got to have items that discharge as fast as they charge in order to keep the pc this side of going around the bend, see. But you can get the Goals Problem Mass all charged up like mad by running these oddball, offbeat valences, lock valences.

Then the third type of valence is, of course, those which are intimately associated and were part of these games. Actual games.

You could find a goal for any item in the Goals Problem Mass. You could find a goal for any item in it. You could find an opposition goal. You could find anything in it. And 3D

Criss Cross, of course, you'll find it very easy to do on any pc because you go in with test items and you establish as many lines as possible. As many as possible. Run ten. Who cares? Run twenty. Who cares?

I'll give you a sample of how you could go about this. There is a method given to you on the 3D Criss Cross mimeo and it said you'd run General O/W on self and then say, "Who would you treat like that?" and make a list and assess it. And you'll come up with one of the items. And you'll come up with a test item. Then you can take – with opposition terminaling that test item, you can move on into the Goals Problem Mass with actual items. And you can differentiate like mad.

All right. You can take a list of the things a person liked. And you run a long list of those and differentiate them and null them and he'll come up with an item which is part of the Goals Problem Mass.

And you can take things a – a long list of kinds of people that the pc disliked and, you know, liked – the like-dislike lists – and you can do the same, so you got another item.

In other words, you got three items now. All right. That's dandy. They just give you points of departure for more opptermes going – sorting out track. That's all you're doing – just sorting track. All right. What else could you do?

Well, almost any way of locating an item you have ever been taught in Dianetics or Scientology would be usable. You could do a Dynamic Assessment on the person. Use it as a test item and depart from it. See? There'd be another method of doing it.

In other words, you've got method after method. Anything that ever found anything that stayed in with the pc as a method could be used as a test item for 3D Criss Cross. And it doesn't matter how many channels you have. Have twenty, have thirty. You get up above that, your pc would probably be very confused.

I would prefer to be running about five. About five lines. Line A, line B, line C, line D, line E. Why? Just that much more chance of getting differentiation. Because, you see, as you enter these things, you enter different corners of the Goals Problem Mass, so you don't dead end. You don't get a chance of dead ending. You're pulling the whole mass apart rather than some little section of the mass. And if a line dead ends on you, well, what the heck, you've still got five – I mean, you've still got four.

All right. Let's say another line dead ends on you someplace or another. You've still got three. In other words, you're playing in abundance. Then develop some more lines some other way and keep them running.

In other words, keep assessing. Keep assessing. Keep finding items and the process of finding items blows off null items. And it goes by null items, blows off lock items and locates actual 3D items.

And eventually you'll either get into a position where there is only one package. Every time you take one of these lines and ask for its opposition terminal, the pc says, "A tiger." And every time you take another one of the lines and you say, "All right. What is the opposition terminal of this line?" The pc says, "A waterbuck."

All right. Let's try and find something else now. So you find something else. You find a tiger. And let's try finding something else. All right. You'll find something else. You'll find a waterbuck. And you can't go anyplace else. You're just there. That is it. And so you don't have any further difficulties with differentiation of what the items are. And nobody has to check them out for you. And those are the items you'd run if you had to run items.

You'll find these things are in ribbons by the time that you've done that much assessment on them all. They're all unburdened to such a degree that they're just easy.

All right. Now, how accurate must an item be to do an oppterm. I would say it had to be pretty darned accurate. I'd say if you bypassed an actual 3D item on a list and got the wrong item on the list and took a departure from it, your pc would be uncomfortable and your line would dead end or something weird would happen to the thing.

So I think the item should be very, very accurate. You should do your assessment very, very carefully with a maximum of differentiation and a maximum of care. I'm not encouraging you to do less than that. For heaven's sakes, check them out. Prove them out. Make sure the whole list was null. Get the thing absolutely in the package there.

All right. Everything is right. And then take off from that point and go on for another item. Then by doing that, you will find you get lots of processing done.

If you fail to do that, however, in 3D Criss Cross, the liability is not very great. You'll just dead end and the thing will go up in smoke and you'll lose that line. You won't arrive anyplace and you'll wonder where you went astray and so on.

Now, in that preclears lost their goals terminals – lost their lists of goals and lost their lists of terminals and then that took fifty, seventy-five hours sometimes to assess a terminal and a lot of other things and so forth, 3D Criss Cross should be a great relief to you because it wouldn't matter if a – if a pc had lost all of his records, you could still do a 3D Criss Cross on him.

And he'd stumble around, he'd miss a few, but they'd eventually turn up in the long run, see.

In other words, you – we've got a type of package now which doesn't have liabilities, (1) of improper assessment doing the pc in and (2) which doesn't matter if the pc's records have been lost, you could still establish the whole of it and (3) where the assessment is just fantastically therapeutic.

And completely aside from everything else, I think you would find 3D Criss Cross well done in a preclear with the proper steps as given is more therapeutic than any other single action you could undertake on a pc. Properly done it is fantastic! And until it looks fantastic to you, you probably aren't doing it right.

Get lots of items, differentiate them, find your item, check it well against the list and you will find out that just by doing that all by yourself, the pc will start walking on air. It's the best processing you'll ever have done. And the easiest.

All right. Now, there's the Goals Problem Mass. Regardless of the way we approach or attack the thing, there is the anatomy of it. It's a ruddy mess. That's what it is. And it's been

quite heroic trying to find – first find it and then find the way through it and then settle down technology that rather easily took care of it without tremendous liability. And I think we have all of those things at this present moment.

Thank you.

HOW TO DO 3D CRISS CROSS

A lecture given on 18 January 1962

Thank you. Thank you.

And this is the 1-8 Jan. AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

All right. Well, I can stand up today.

This is about the Goals Problem Mass, how to do 3D Criss Cross. And those of you who are now struggling to attain Class I so that you can study for Class II probably will have to review this one later. But this is a good time to find out about this.

There are several things to know about the Goals Problem Mass. There are several things, and there are several things to know about assessment.

There are two leading auditor skills. And these are the skills included in Class II, and those give you Security Checking, Model Session, TRs, Havingness, how to find the Havingness Process; gives you Problems Intensive techniques, that sort of thing. And if you'll notice that these are all assessment type things, they're meter reading type things – to use the word *assessment* very carelessly – they are meter reading type things – in other words. It requires auditor decision on the meter. And in the whole body of Class II skills, there is only one fatal error that can be made in reading a meter.

This meter error is fatal because it brings about an ARC break of magnitude on the part of the pc, and all ARC breaks spring to some degree from this area. And that is the missed withhold.

So you could make a pile of errors in Class II skills. You could make a lot of errors of one kind or another, and your pc would go on getting better. Now the pc would recover and you'd get rid of this as long as you didn't miss any withholds. Well, the way to get over that one, of course, is to constantly be asking the pc, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" don't you know.

And of course, underneath your – your Model Session skills, you can miss a rudiment, I didn't think this was possible, but you can miss a whole rudiment with considerable consequence.

You know, you ask the question, "Well, is it all right to audit in this room?" And you just miss it clean. And it's not all right to audit in this room, and then you'll have trouble. And it isn't the type of trouble usually which causes the pc to go out and commit suicide or anything, but this is your screaming ARC break, the pc becoming very furious – all of these various mechanisms come straight out of the general classification "missed withhold," subclassification additional is "a missed rudiment."

And the reason for this is that you get an invalidation of the meter, an invalidation of what you're doing. You evidently don't know what you're doing because you can't read his mind. Pc evidently makes the demand that you're able to read his mind at any given instant, particularly with the meter. And he then is made to withhold, analytically, something that was a reactive withhold, and it's a half-know. And he, in trying to withhold this but trying to give it at the same time, keys in his reactive bank, and he caves in one of these dramatization things. So you find the pc dramatizing immediately after this because you've knocked in what? A Goals Problem Mass valence. See, you just can knock one in just like that.

So although you could audit all of Class II in total ignorance of a Goals Problem Mass, you should know what happens when the pc ARC breaks.

Probably a vast mystery to some Class II auditors – why the violence of the ARC break on some pcs? Well, there are two reasons for this. One is the modifier going into action. But that reason, of course, is because the pc has had to withhold, which has keyed in the Goals Problem Mass and then, having had to do that, then he dramatizes the modifier. In other words, he dramatizes the package actually. And he sits back watching himself do this, and he said, "How can I do this?" Well, he can do it very easily. Actually, hell become quite – can be made to feel quite ill.

It isn't ill because he has overts on the auditor, worse luck. He feels ill for another reason, is that you keyed in a valence hard. And the way to key in a valence hard is to miss a withhold – and subcategory, miss a rudiment. Just the mechanics of the thing. That's enough to know. All you've got to do is miss a withhold, miss a rudiment, and your pc is dramatizing. He is not now in-session, and you have, in his mind, apparently attacked the pc and have supported the reactive bank.

It's all under the old *Original Thesis*. You see, you – the pc – a thetan – plus the auditor is greater than the reactive bank, you see? But the – delete the pc from it totally, and you have the auditor probably a little bit less than the reactive bank. He can do quite a bit in that direction, but it's not an optimum session by a long ways. And now let's get the pc versus the auditor and the reactive bank, and of course, you have a situation at once in which the pc – now that the auditor has sided with the reactive bank, you see – is totally incapable of holding it. And he goes into a flat spin. Because look, walking about in life, he has trouble keeping this reactive bank under some kind of control, you see? And now the auditor has turned on him. So you have a condition where the auditor is on the side of the reactive bank, so now the thetan thinks he has to handle the reactive bank plus the auditor. And he knows he can't do this, and so he just goes *zzzzzzzooooooooom*, see, and he just keys in all over the place, and it makes him quite ill.

But that's about all that can happen in a Class II skill. There isn't much else can happen. You can't make a person – you can't key them in permanently or damage them to any great degree. You can miss within that framework. You can miss the withhold. You can – you miss the withhold and you miss the rudiment, you're in trouble, but you can miss all other kinds of things, you see?

You do a Problems Intensive. All right. The auditor just doesn't get the word. He runs the thing on other-determined changes. He makes a long list of other-determined changes.

He says to the pc, "All right. Now, when did you decide to change?"

And the pc says, "Well, well the biggest change in my life was when I had a tonsillectomy."

And so the auditor puts it down, "tonsillectomy," you see.

"And when was another big change in your life?" The auditor Qs-and-As to this degree. And he finally has a list of engrams. He doesn't have a list of postulates to change at all, you see. So he's got a long list of engrams. So he goes ahead and assesses these things, you see. And, of course, if you've got just one engram in the list, it'll assess. And you'll come up with the engram, of course, and that isn't what you're trying to do at all. You're trying to get the prior confusion to the problem.

Well, then, of course, we – he says tonsillectomy is what assesses out. "Well, what was the problem connected with that?"

"Well, the problem was how to keep the doctor off me ruddy neck, that was 'ow." That was the problem. So that's fine. The auditor can put down, "How to keep the doctor off of his ruddy neck," you see, and he's all straight.

And he says, "What was the prior confusion to that?"

"Well, kicking the doctor in the shins and screaming." And, you know? You could get a lot of things. And he goes ahead, and he runs an engram. Of course, he's kind of surprised at the other end of this. It hasn't done much good for the pc. But he hasn't damaged the pc. He's even improved the pc slightly. In other words, it can be that sloppy a job of listing and metering. See, that could be sloppy, and you could still make it very nicely.

You get missed withholds of one kind or another. Well, you pick up the missed withhold that the pc thought was missed. You pick that up and you clean it up. And if you keep those things cleaned up, then you could even make a boo-boo like "Were you ever dissatisfied?" Let's think that's a Security Check question, you see? "Were you ever dissatisfied?" And the auditor tries to clear this, and "dissatisfied," and he can't quite clear it up, and "were you ever –", he decides to compartment. He's heard someplace you compartment questions, so he compartments "dis-" and "satisfied." And things keep reacting in some fashion, you see, and he fuddles around and falls on his head.

Asks the pc later if he's missed a withhold, "And well, you have missed a withhold. I was dissatisfied while you were doing that." And this might straighten it up, see. He's – he still will get away from it with his life. That's just very inexpert, but it isn't going to kill anybody.

Now, of course, in such a thing, "Were you ever dissatisfied?" – well, probably the reverse of the thing, and an auditor who really knew his business, would say, "Well, have you ever made anybody dissatisfied? Is that the way it is?"

"Well, yes," the girl says, "as a matter of fact, that's my specialty." [laughter] And we're right into the middle of the case with a crash, you see, and we pull a lot of stuff off by the yard and so on.

But the Class II Auditor skill, done by somebody who is in training for Class II or something like that, why – it could be done sloppily is what I'm telling you, see? It could be done sloppily beyond those ramifications. You'd still get away with it. Now, that isn't true of Class III. We have immediately crossed the Jordan. And you start getting one of these things wrong, you're just in endless trouble.

Now, we're – in handling 3D I've tried like mad to minimize the amount of difficulty that an auditor will have. And we have a pretty good job of it. Done a pretty good job of minimizing the amount of difficulty, minimizing the lack of consequence. I'll tell you, the amount of consequence to the pc – worked on that hard. And we have patterns of assessment here which arrive with something.

But I'll give you here, at first glance, some of the errors that you might immediately and directly run into in handling a 3D Criss Cross.

You get a test item, and the rudiments go out, and you don't check it thoroughly, and your test item comes up as the wrong item on the list. The odd manifestations will be mostly disinterest on the part of the pc. The pc really will be rather disinterested. He's not sure that this is – this is doing him any good or something like that.

Now, you assess an oppterm from this test item. You get a list, you see, and the list goes null. And you get the rudiments in, and the list goes null. And you get the rudiments in, and the list goes null. Well, you just went up the wrong bank. That's all. You just went up the wrong track. You see, whenever an item is wrongly assessed, you get slackening of interest on the pc. It's a sort of a cousin to a missed withhold, you see? And you get a slackening of interest on the pc. The pc won't be terribly interested in listing this next list, and it'll usually go null. And you're suddenly – you've lost a channel. It's just gone, you see?

Now, if you did this clear across the top after your – all these types of things by which you could get a test item – see, after you've done all of these things; supposing you did a care-less assessment all the way across the top? See, every test item, let us say, was done with a Pasadena-type assessment – supposing every one of them, see?

Well, the auditor down along the bottom line would suddenly wind up with no items, everything null, the pc very bored and a little bit upset. And the auditor would wind up with the conclusion that, well, it just didn't work. Or something didn't work and he wouldn't quite understand why. You see, it just all evaporates in smoke because of the inaccuracy of the thing.

In other words, inaccuracy on a 3D Criss Cross results in no attainment, see? Class II, you can make a mistake and you still get a little win or a gain. Class III, you make a mistake, you wind up with exactly no attainment and you're fortunate if you don't wind up with a negative attainment.

Now, let's say we had five wrong test items, and then we had this auditor with vast enthusiasm force items in along the line, you see – you know, demand that they go in. Or have them reacting because he suggested them to the pc or something like that, you see? And he winds up with some offball items that have nothing to do with the case. And now we run an oppterm from that. And all of a sudden the pc starts getting very dizzy or upset, or a somatic

starts keying in but won't relieve. Nothing passes through. Then supposing, as the auditor went on, assessing from a wrong item, forcing an – a wrong oppterm, then gets a new list and forces a wrong oppterm onto that list. You spin somebody in.

And if you were to take one of these in 3D, without the Criss Cross, if you were to take an improper and incorrect package, you'd beef up the whole Prehav Scale. Your pc walks around, he feels like he has a head like a pumpkin. He feels in terrible condition. The key-out on it is probable in ten days, but I've known that one that went on for three months. Improper assessment, improper run.

Well, that had more liability. In a Criss Cross, you're not going to run these things, so it cuts the liability down. See, you're not going to run them, so it's all right. And you won't wind up with a package unless you do it all wrong and backwards.

Now, an item will continue to react if it is invalidated or ARC broke. If the pc is invalidated on an item, it will continue to react. What you're reading on it is the ARC break, not the item. So all you have to do is a 3D Criss Cross with the rudiments out, forcing some incidents on the pc, running with ARC breaks, and you've had it. You'll get items continuing to react, and you can walk into a totally incorrect and totally erroneous 3D package. That could just be a dog's breakfast.

Now, if anybody started to run this totally incorrect and erroneous package, God knows what would happen. Because you're right into the middle of the whir, you're right in the middle of a hurricane. And this would just be *blow*.

If you run a lock valence with 3D, you're going to beef up the Prehav Scale. That's for sure. It has to be a main chance. It has to be right on the main games of the pc. If you run a subordinate valence to this which is simply locked up on it, if part of the package has in it just one of these locked valences, you're going to beef up the whole Prehav Scale. You won't know which end you're standing on.

And the odd part of the hidden error – the hidden error in it – is you can actually audit the terminal with a wrong oppterm, and the terminal will bring the Prehav Scale down to maybe eighteen or twenty levels, and the oppterm over here will be beefing up all the time, all the time, all the time. And because you're not running it on the Prehav Scale, you never find out about it. The pc just feels horrible.

Now, that the pc feels horrible is not an indicator that you're doing something wrong. You see how we lack an indicator? Because he feels horrible any time you run a 3D package, as you know very well. He's running out somatics and – God help us, what else? You see, it's a mess.

So the amount of duress that the pc is experiencing is not an indicator that you've done anything wrong. So an inexperienced and inept auditor, having heard that the pc goes through the knothole and everything, and seeing the pc run all upside down and backwards, will simply continue to audit an improper and incorrect package.

In other words, there's this wide difference between Class II and Class III. That Class III done wrong is catastrophic, and Class II skills can be offbeat – possibly even to the degree

of a missed withhold without killing anybody. And the pc will only be upset if you do miss a withhold or miss a rudiment.

Now, that doesn't mean you should do Class II carelessly. The thing you sacrifice and lose in Class II is case gain. And when you see a lot of people who are going through Class II skills, Twenty-Ten particularly, and they're not getting anyplace, well, just figure it's being done more or less wrong and upside down. There's some gross auditing error involved in this because even indifferent auditing can give you case gains, you see. Some gross auditing error is involved.

You have to know that in training auditors. Don't start grabbing at the moon and handing out extraordinary solutions in Class II skills. It's something like he holds the meter upside down, you see, and tries to read the sensitivity knob, you know. I mean, it's gross auditing errors. Very gross. Or has heard, has heard that a latent read is the thing which you read. And if it reacts instantly at once, why, then you ignore that, you see. And you only act after it's gone one minute and fifteen seconds after the thing. You could get some kind of craziness.

It'll be something so wild that you, in training Class II Auditors – as your Instructors right here could tell you – at first glance miss it. It's the easiest thing to miss in the world because you're making the supposition that there's a house there, you see, and it's just a bare lot.

It's something or other. So you're telling somebody how to arrange the furniture in the living room, and that's all dandy, but you find out belatedly that they don't know you were talking about that because they don't have a house or a lot, much less furniture. So they think it's all theoretical.

And when you try to tell them this ... You can watch it. You're training an auditor on Class II skills, and this guy – it's all sort of foggy, and he doesn't quite get it. And he's agreeable all right, you see. He's socially agreeable, yes. Well, that's right. He'll do that. If you get to be an expert – and you particularly, because you'll be training so many students, and you too – you'll get this, you can sort of feel the fog back of their eyes, you know. And right about that point get inquisitive. "Now, what did I say? And what are we trying to do? And just what *are* you doing? And which is the needle on the E-Meter?" You see? Sort of – things like this, you know. It's almost impossible to outguess them because it'll turn up to be something absolutely fantastic.

The guy has got a log crossways, you see? And you think you've got some toothpicks to arrange, and you've got these logs that are twelve feet through at the butt, you see. And he's just got them sideways. And you watch it because when they are foggy about Class II, they've got something awful wrong, real wrong.

So therefore, you don't want an auditor who would be groping around in Class II skills, doing a Class III. He hasn't got time to learn how to run an E-Meter while doing listings and assessments. See, that's not the time to learn anything about it. You teach the person all about this kind of thing in a zone and area where it is safe if he makes a mistake. Then all you've got to pick up is some missed withholds, you know. Keep the missed withholds picked up, then you're all right. You can go along very nicely.

So that's the area to teach them how to use meters and everything else, and those are the skills. Don't ever make the mistake of thinking you can teach somebody to assess by – just hand them a meter and they've read in a book – they read the title page of *E-Meter Essentials*, you see – because they're going to have their hands more full of hurricane than it will have happened for a long time. See, they can just cave somebody in, *crash*, you see. And you'll have a hell of a time bailing them out of it. You get the differences here?

Well, now, the basic differences of all these skills – and this is not a lecture about Class IIs so much. I'm just trying to show you what it takes to run a Class III 3D Criss Cross. 3D was much more difficult. The basic nature of these skills depend on two operations only. And this is true of all auditor skills – two operations only – is reading a reaction on something within the perimeter of reality of the pc. That is the basic skill by which you do a Security Check, a Problems Intensive, get a rudiment in, and all that sort of thing, you see?

Well, naturally, if you can't keep rudiments in, you can't do a Class III skill, that's all. So if a person hasn't got that fundamental, that fundamental skill – and the fundamental is that he has to be able to detect a needle reaction on a thought that is in the perimeter of reality of the pc. See, he's got to be able to detect that, and if he can't detect that, he's no auditor for Class II, you see. In other words, he's got to read that needle. He's got to know what that needle's talking about. He's got to make that meter talk, you see, on the pc.

All right. Now, that is a basic skill. Now, selection – now, you've got a shadow of this in your Problems Intensive at Class II. Selection of an item by assessment – this is another skill. Slightly different. And it's very fortunate you have a Problems Intensive in Class II skills because, you see, the guy won't get accustomed to doing that kind of thing, you know, before he has to collide with a list.

Now, the list requires absolute precision. Now, we'll stop talking about Class II and talk about Class III only. The precision of selection of an item depends on getting the pc to communicate with the auditor so that the pc is in good communication with the auditor. In other words, you've got to be able to get the rudiments in extremely well, and get the pc interested in listing this list for you, and not do it all on a little – well, toss it off.

Well, you say, "Who do I dislike? Well, you, me, the Instructors."

"All right. That's a list. Good."

No, I think, this type – this type of thing, you see, it requires a more suitable auditor presence, shall we say, you see. By the time he gets down to the list, he should know whether the rudiments are in or out.

Now, in addition to having the rudiments in, in Class III, you have to know this about rudiments. You're handling dynamite called the Goals Problem Mass. And this stuff is highly explosive. And the rudiments go out like scat.

You ever see one of these greyhound races, you know? Did you ever see the greyhounds take off after the rabbit, you know? You were sitting there in the grandstand, and it was a beautiful sunshiny day, and the parade was all lined up in front of you, and all of a sudden there go the rudiments, you know – *swoosh!* [laughter] You had no warning. There they went. You look up, and not a thing reacting. You don't know whether the pc did anything.

You don't know what he said, why he said it, what he did to himself, what you did. Nothing. They're gone. And they go out that queasily because you're dealing with microscopically small reads. You're dealing with tiny reads. And that you can just make up your mind to – that you have to be able to read a meter small.

It's very nice to find out that the fellow has just killed the cop on the corner and get a three-dial drop. And after the fellow was all accustomed to this type of E-Metering, all of a sudden he will collide with this other thing, and these meter reads can just be absolutely microscopic.

You have a list that is not very hot. You have a Goals Problem Mass which is totally pulled in and twisted on itself so that you've only got available lock valences. The amount of charge on the whole thing is in the order of one-millionth of a grasshopper power, you see. And you're walking into the mass on indicators of that size. And boy are they small.

Now, that isn't true that they are always small. Sometimes you get good, healthy reads. But don't expect that a Goals Problem Mass listing is going to give you the kind of reads that you are fond of getting in Security Checking because you're not. And frankly, no squirrel meter, no meter that has been made before the British Mark IV, is up to reading it. That is just – just that. That's it.

Now, these tiny reads at sensitivity 16 are assisted by square block magnifying glasses dropped over your E-Meter plate. You just drop them over the needle. You read the needles through them. And it'll help you. It'll help you. Sometimes – Reg gave me the other day a big crane-neck magnifying glass. That's a very nice one. That's very assistive.

But just get out of the notion of two things. One, that more powerful detectors of bank restimulation are going to be immediately available off the assembly line, because you're awful lucky that it can be detected at all. That's it. You're just lucky it can be detected. And get out of your mind the idea that you shouldn't bother with those little reads because, of course, you're – every time you're assessing a case, you start going in from test items and so on. Bum show.

Now, it is much easier for you to hold with the microscopic reads that you get on test items and so forth, than it is to do a Goals Assessment.

Now, here was 3D. Well, here was Routine 3, Routine 3A – Routine 3D original – a type of assessment. Fifty to seventy-five hours with absolutely no gain and often no goal. You just sat there and sweated it out for that many hours, winding up at the end product of no gain and no goal. And if you did all this kind of on an ARC breaky basis of some kind, what did you finish with? You finished with an unhappy pc and a waste of fifty to seventy-five hours. And I frankly don't think that you like to waste fifty to seventy-five hours.

But if you did find the goal, then you could expect fairly healthy reads. These reads were pretty good, ordinarily – Routine 3 reads. Because you were stabbing into the middle of the bank. But you might have wound up with no goal at all.

If the person had ever lost his goals list or somebody had thrown it away or something like that had happened, what have you got left? You've had it, because he very often now has his goal buried, and he doesn't come up with the thing again. These things are serious, you

see. This means that every preclear who gets any auditing is at the total mercy of somebody else's administration. And a case shouldn't be that much at the mercy of administration. That's a fault or a flaw that was in 3 and 3A and, frankly, original 3D. They all came to the same thing, you see.

Now, you're going to do something else. You could always take a case, get the rudiments in, find a test item, and proceed from there, and walk on into the Goals Problem Mass. Now, that is what's designed here. And all the time you're going, and everything you're finding – providing you're listing and your – your auditing is smooth, your listing is complete, and your nulling is absolutely accurate; given those things – you are going to wind up with a case gain every session. You just will not miss. You'll have a case gain every session.

It will be almost unbelievable to you when you get this thing rolling. Right now, even you who have been doing it, you're sweating it out to some degree with the mechanics of this thing, you see. It looks pretty complicated, and you're trying to put it together and so on. You haven't had time to look up at your pc. You haven't actually looked your pc in the eye and seen where that pc was going. But you yourself in being audited on some of this, even though you might have only had two or three sessions on it and so on, you know something's happening. Something's happening.

Well, something happens to the degree that the auditing skill is excellent. The amount of gain is almost directly monitored by the excellence of the auditing. In other words, you can find 3D Criss Cross items. We're talking now only about 3D Criss Cross. You can find 3D Criss Cross items one after the other rather heartlessly and stupidly and out of communicationally – you can find the same items, without getting the same case gain. Isn't that interesting?

Now we're up against a factor that I first faced in 1949: The fact that a pc knew he could talk to me and was perfectly free to talk to me and therefore could blow things, being in a high morale state, which, if he didn't feel free to talk to the auditor and was all inhibited, didn't blow. You see, it's the difference between blowing the valence and not blowing the valence.

Confidence in the auditor, a feeling of power or freedom on the part of the preclear, gives you a gradient, and the totally mechanical auditor will get case gains and will carry a case through, see. He will get case gains. He can't help this, you see. The auditor who inspires the pc's confidence, and to whom the pc can talk easily, and when they're being audited, they feel beefy and hefty, you know, they feel that's fine. They'll get right on through. They're being helped and so on. Man, that guy will get case gains the like of which you've never seen with this thing. Because they just blow these valences, and they just blow them clean, *pooom*.

Now, let me orient you with regard to this. You think you are looking, possibly, for *one* item, and you think the magic of all this is predicated on the discovery of one item. That is not the case at all. The end product is the discovery of one item in any listing and assessment. But *every item* the pc gives you for that list with very few exceptions is a lock valence on the Goals Problem Mass. And every item that he gives you has added to the Goals Problem Mass. He gives you fifteen items for a list. Thirty – that's more usual. Gives you thirty

items. You go over and differentiate it with him, you're left with twenty-one items. He decides it's that other.

But remember those original thirty items. See, he gave you thirty. Now, you go over the list with him carefully, and he decides there are only twenty-one. He asks you to strike out nine of them. What happened? Why did he ask you to strike out nine? Well, when he first told them to you, he knew those were in opposition to the terminal, but all of a sudden, just a few minutes later, he's telling you to strike them out. Well, what occurred? He blew them.

You understand that every one of those that he blew is a whole package of aberration? All by its little, old, homely lonesome? It's got enough admiration to keep a psychoanalyst or a psychiatrist baffled for the next umptydozen trillennia. Any one of them. You just look over one of these lists sometimes.

I haven't got a sample list here, but let's say this – we're getting oppters to a – to a railroad engineer. Getting oppters to a railroad engineer. We have a stationmaster. And that's one of the items on the list. We have a ticket seller. We have a passenger. We have a roundhouse foreman, see. We've got this, that, the other thing, and he's going down the list. Well, you've got the list written now. Now you're going to go over the list with the pc. And here you say at the first thing, "All right. Now, just how would a" – any wording you wished to use – "How would a stationmaster oppose a railroad engineer?"

"Well, so-and-so. You know, he'd make the trains go before they were supposed to go or after they were supposed to go, and might make a mistake one way or the other and crash in the terminal. Actually, he wouldn't oppose a – wouldn't oppose a railroad engineer at all. Ah, you can strike that one out. All right."

What happened? Do you realize there was a whole little, in-vignette game. See? There was a whole game involved here. There was – he'd been playing this game as a little side game. You know, like – like you place side bets at a crap game, you know. You're not shooting crap, but you're over in the corner someplace basing side bets on how many players will stay in the game or something of the sort. You know, one of these little games that had nothing to do with the main chance. And shooting dice, you know, and "Stationmaster? Railroad engineer?" Boy, you got – every time he'd get anywhere near this kind of an attitude, he knew there was a big game going on there and so on. He's just blown it. That easy.

But you don't pay any attention to that if you don't know the workings of this sort of thing. You say, "Well, he's – there, we got that one out of the road, and we get another one, and we get that one out of the road. Let's see, what is the real item here? What *is* the real item here?" If you're asking that all the time, they're all real items. Every single one of them is a real item. But of course, as they blow off, they get less and less important and have less and less influence, because they're just lock valences.

But before you found them and listed them, before you discovered them, they weren't just lock valences. They were totally capable of being dramatized a hundred percent. Until they were recognized, differentiated, separated and nulled out, any one of them was a marvelous opportunity to go round the bend. And yet you could blow them off like that. Why? Because you're peeling off toward the Goals Problem Mass. And you're usually left with one item that won't blow. That's because you're in toward the Goals Problem Mass.

He actually gives you something that might look to you like a grapefruit with innumerable warts, or an apple in a bag of raisins – only that's not quite as good as a grapefruit with warts. The way it looked to the pc is any one of the warts were bigger than the grapefruit, until you've audited them, and then all of a sudden they get down to wart size. And the next thing you have a perfect grapefruit, which is the final item.

Now, if you assess very, very well, when you do a list of items from a test item – when you do a list – differentiate the list, null the list, and check it out (which is, of course, just more differentiation), you take the final kick off of any one of them; the pc is just left with a very fascinating conviction that that is the item. He knows that's the item. And he maybe is taken aback by it, but he knows that item belongs on the main chance.

Well, do you know what held that item into the 3D mass? All the lock valences that you blew. And it was only charged up because of an earlier, different item, which is even more pertinent to the 3D Goals Problem Mass, even more pertinent. So you wind up with this thing, and you got a "ticket seller," or something stupid like this.

All right. And we've got – that was the item that was – wound up. Well, that item is stuck. Now, what you've done is taken the warts off of this grapefruit, but this grapefruit is stuck on a pumpkin. And by the time you've taken all the warts off the pumpkin, what do you know? This grapefruit loosens up and is no longer associated too closely with the pumpkin. Might require some auditing, and it might require something else but is no longer as charged.

When you first find the item... You will miss this now that we're not listing on the meter, so I better call it to your attention. When you first find the hot item on a channel that's going straight in toward the Goals Problem Mass, you get consistently about a dial drop on your meter. Because you're so busy writing, you seldom notice this fact. You see, you're busy auditing, busy with the pc. But it goes *BOOM!* It's very easy to assess one of these 3D Criss Cross packages if you were just doing that. If you're just looking for items, this is the way you'd do it.

You'd just list it, and at the end of the list have noted how deep each one reacted, and it will be unmistakable.

There'd be one fall a dial or two dials or three-dial drop. And there'd be another one fall half-a-dial drop. And that would be out of the running, you wouldn't pay that much attention to it, and you'd just take that three-dial drop, and you'd say that's it, and you'd be right. Wouldn't do the pc any good.

When you first listed that thing, you got a heavy drop. The key 3D Goals Problem Mass item that you're really looking for reacted very heavily the first time the pc said it and you wrote it down. There was *charge* on it.

And you will notice that the next time you see it and go over it, it's still more charged and still falls more than the remaining items. And it gradually peters down and the charge goes off the remaining items so that they all become null, and this one that was so heavily charged at the beginning is now dropping "tick." No longer a charged item.

Well, in view of the fact that you're blowing without the meter when you list, you miss this point. If you want to check it sometime, list on the meter. Keep the pc thoroughly on the

meter as you're listing, and watch it each time he mentions the item. See, he mentions the item for the first time. Don't be looking at your paper and ballpoint, see. Keep your eye on that meter and say, "Is there another one?" And keep your eye on the meter. And he gives you that. Notice it's a degree of reaction.

Well, that's charge, and that charge is coming off the case forever. That charge is disappearing off the case! And when you've finally got this item, it is not seriously charged. In other words, he'd have a hard time dramatizing it. Just finding an item removes it from the perimeter of immediate dramatization. He won't dramatize it anymore, providing it's assessed in the fashion you are now assessing. It has to be assessed that way.

Now, if you assessed another way – as we were doing a few months ago; if he were assessed another way – and you just took it, and you found the one with the high – with the steepest drop and you said that was it and you audited it, it would be your auditing that would be discharging it, and it would be hard to discharge because it had so many lock valences which were holding it in place. In other words, the lock valences were keeping it charged up.

In other words, this is a series of batteries if you want to call it that. And you know very well that if you start taking batteries off of a pile of batteries, you start reducing current. And these things, as you take off these lock valences one right after the other, you see, you've got less and less voltage. And eventually the thing hasn't got enough voltage to push a baby carriage. See, there's nothing there.

Up to this time, any one of those valences were sufficiently charged to run the pc all over the universe. He became a railroad engineer. The moment he became a railroad engineer, he went into a wild, manic enthusiasm and then came down with cancer. Fate, see.

All right. After you've properly listed and assessed all the oppterm to railroad engineer and all the items before it that led to railroad engineer and so forth, you talk about railroad engineer, he said, "Yeah, yeah, railroad engineering. And that's real interesting. That's real interesting It gives me a little somatic in the jaw, that's all. But that's real interesting, railroad engineering is. You just sit there, your arm out of the cab, you know, and you whiz along one way or the other, and so on, it's ... This stuff they're running on this planet though isn't so hot. We had much better locomotives in ... " so on. He gives you some stuff like this. He's quite interested in it. You can get him to discuss it. But the funny part of it is he has some idea that he might be able to go down and climb in the cab of a train and drive it. Drive that engine, see?

Well, you know he's never been able to think of doing that before? He'd think of that with horror. When he was a little child, maybe a time or two he thought, "Well, gee, it'd be kind of nice to ride in a cab or to touch the throttle. Yeah, it would be very nice to do that," a little kid. And of course, the thing charged up, and he's never been able to think of it since, you see. That's just a shutoff. Total.

And one day he's walked down the depot. He can't stand riding on trains. He'll give this terrific dissertation on trains and how bad it is, transport on trains and all of this. This was before he was audited, you see. Trains? Oh, he can't stand trains. "You mean you ride train travel? I always fly myself. I ah – " so on and so on. "I – well – a train... cinders, you know,

dust, and so forth. Actually, I have a sinus condition. And I get around the dust, I can't take very much of that," and so forth.

But this goes further than that. You can never even get this fellow to meet you at the depot. And as he's gone back over the line, the thought of somebody having a job on a railroad has made him feel absolutely, fabulously ill.

This is where you get most of your socialists, by the way. They have these Goals Problem Masses and the idea of work puts them into a total belief, you see, that nobody can work. That is the thing that you can't do. And "the poor worker," you see. And it's all based on the fact they can't work. It's quite interesting.

It's very funny, your own attitude toward – toward some of these skills and work at large, and so forth, when you've blown some of this charge.

Anyway, you went down the line, and you null this thing. All right. He doesn't have to go down and climb aboard a train to prove it to himself. He doesn't have any compulsion to do it. He doesn't have any compulsion not to do it. He doesn't necessarily get terribly interested in trains. He doesn't necessarily totally abandon trains. He doesn't have to do anything about trains. But if somebody suddenly said, "Drive this engine down to the roundhouse and get it turned around," he'd sure give it a whirl, and he wouldn't come down with cancer and sinusitis either, see?

In other words, he can *be* this thing again because it's discharged. And watching the charge come off on the meter is something that you should pay some attention to just to get a reality on what happens. It's quite fabulous. But you'd have to watch it while you were listing because just the fact of listing is getting rid of about 75 percent of your charge.

The biggest amount of charge comes off on the original listing. Then the next biggest surge comes off on differentiation, going over the list with the pc. And then knocking it out the rest of the way is very easy.

Now, pcs have lists that stay in almost forever. Some pcs have lists that just seem to stay in forever. You just can't knock them out. Got a missing item on it; you haven't bled it down; key item isn't on the list. And if the key item is not on the list, you wind up with a non-discharge of many of the items on the list because, of course, these items you're trying to null are dependent for their charge on the charge of the main item. And if the main item isn't charged up, they can't be charged up. But if they remain all charged up and you just can't scrub them out, see... Your rudiments are in and you just – you say, "Waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck. Thank you. Tiger, tiger, tiger. Thank you. Huh, *ohohoom*. Waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck. Thank you." In.

"Tiger, tiger, tiger." In.

"Waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck." In.

"Tiger, tiger, tiger ..." you know. What the hell is happening here?

Well, what's happening here is you got – you got the thing missing.

Now, the funny part – thing about lines, which we'll take up in more detail in just a moment. The weird thing about lines is this, is you can sometimes get an item on one line

which is holding the other line up. See. You can have a half a dozen items still alive and they won't rub out on one line because the exact terminal, differently worded, has already been assessed out on another line. And you've got line C. You've got line C with "a roundhouse keeper." And line B has in it "railroad tender," "water tender," and "track roundabout man." And you got them on two different lines. And you just can't scrub them out. That is why you do an item on line A, an item on line B, an item on line C and an item on line D without any oppterming, until you've got all the lines filled.

Then do your oppterming. And you go across. Now, you finally broke it down and just bludgeoned it out so that you were left with a water tender, see, on that line. And then you went over and your next line to it was a roundhouse keeper, if you were so knuckleheaded you didn't combine these two. And of course, it just went *pfooot*. It's heavily charged. See, you assessed down to it, bang! You get it. Now the next time you go through C, you know, on your way to D, you see, you're oppterming from each line in column – the remaining charge blows off everything. This final item that you're – you oppterm to, oppterm very easily and it all evaporates up in smoke and you come out with some different item.

In other words, you're charging one against the other, you see? And where they start to nearly coincide – you have line B and line C, and line B has an item on it that belongs in the mess on line C. Very easy for a pc to do. This is the paean to confusion, the song of utter spin, when you're doing these things as far as the pc is concerned. "Nothing – nothing makes sense because it all makes sense. Yes, it's all very reasonable, but there isn't anything about it at all. Yes, I am very confused. I see it all now. It's very clear except it's so confused," you see?

So they very easily list the wrong things on the wrong lines, and they crisscross them up one way or the other. And if you don't take these lines – A, an item for A line, and an item for B line, and an item for C line, and an item for D line, and an item for A line, and an item for B line, and an item for C line, and an item for D line, you see – you're going to get funny hang-ups.

In other words, you're blowing consecutively on different approaches into the Goals Problem Mass. That's all that's happening here. And the discharge of major items brings about the easy discharge of minor items. You see how this goes?

Frankly, what you're doing – if you want to say you're looking for something, fine. I'm very glad you're looking for something. You will wind up eventually with a 3D package that can't be argued with. It just *is it*. The pc knows it, you know it, everybody knows it. You know which the oppterm is and which the terminal is. You go ahead and find the goal to it and the modifier and the rest of it, and you put together that package. But there's no question in anybody's mind by the time you get to the package. And of course, the bank is tremendously discharged by this time, and the package will run rather easily. What you're really doing is in approaching it, you are discharging it.

And it – what it gives you is gradient discharge of the Goals Problem Mass by assessment – if you want to be very, very technical sounding – gradient discharge of the Goals Problem Mass by assessment, see? And this thing can't keep its charge. It can't charge itself up again, that's all. There isn't anything to charge it up, unless you get a bunch of wrong items and try to run them, and then the charge of the item is increased. See, you get the wrong item,

so therefore you get the phenomenon of the whole Prehav Scale livening up. You get an improper item, you get a lock item, the charge will bleed over from the real item into the lock item, but it isn't releasing, and the pc's attention is forcefully held on this wrong item when actually his attention should be on the right item, you see. And you – withdrawal of his attention on the thing brings all of the charge over in this thing but doesn't as-is anything. Nothing you're running applies to what you're running, don't you see, and he's left in a terrible confusion.

Similarly, on a misassessment, when you misassess, your pc gets very restive and very disinterested and very upset. He's liable to be very queasy about the whole thing because you're not bleeding charge. You're going over items which are not properly discharging. All the stuff on the line is somewhat charged up. And that's because you're proceeding from an improper item. The item was never proved out, it isn't on the main line, it's just a lock item of some kind or another, and you're proceeding from there.

And the pc goes over the phenomena of ARC break, upset, beefed up bank, increased dramatization, terrific dizziness and so forth may ensue, or fantastic somatics that don't do anything, and nothing moves. It all – everything sort of hangs up in the thing. And he feels very confused, and he feels very distraught, and he doesn't know whether he's mad at you or what. You're doing an improper lineup of some kind or another. You've departed from the wrong side of the wrong whatnot.

But all of these wrongnesses are totally occasioned by improper technical assessment. Every wrongness is occasioned by not assessing right. Just according to the rules. And the rules of assessment are very simple. You list, you differentiate, you null them out by repetitive reads, you check it out to get off any remaining charge on any remaining items, and you've got it. And that is the right way to assess now for 3D Criss Cross because it produces such a tremendous amount of charge blow.

You do those things correctly and come up with a correct item, and there it is, and you know it is it, and there's no worry about it. That's it. That's good. That's fine.

Now you proceed to oppterm that item. In other words, list what would oppose that item, and you go on from what would oppose that item and get another list. List it all. Differentiate it. Null it with repetitive reads. And then check it out against all the items on the list so that they – any remaining charge disappears, *bang!* You know, very proper assessment.

Now you can oppterm from that one, and the pc will just be climbing a steep staircase. He'll be going up, up, up. He'll be feeling better and better. And everything's fine, fine. Everything's blowing, and everything's beautiful, and you'll go right along swell.

All right. Oppose this, too, list it on an ARC broke pc that doesn't give you much – he doesn't give you many; he doesn't give you anywhere near the list. And then you null it out, and then it all goes null, except one item in it, railroad engineer, is terribly ARC broke because when he said rail – railroad engineer, you went "Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha, ha-ha," you know. "Do you really want that one down?"

So of course, that's the one that remains in. As you read down the list, of course, it knocks every time you say it because you're reading an ARC break. You're not reading the item, you see.

And you wind up with railroad engineer. Now you cross-list to oppterm to railroad engineer. You're over in left field someplace climbing the fence. You're leaving the ballpark. You haven't anything to do with auditing. No telling what you're doing, and the pc will sort of be upset and irritated and won't think anything's working, and so forth. You get the difference here?

Now, you could make the pc worse with wrong assessment and bad assessment. Just make up your mind to it. You can make him worse. Any reason for me to hold your hand and say go ahead and be brave and audit him because nothing bad will happen to the pc. I'd be a liar if I told you that. You can practically spin them in with bad Routine 3 assessment, see.

Well done, it just shoots the moon. Wham! You'll never see such results in your life. Chronic somatics, things they're worried about – they'll have a new package of somatics every session. They'll have a new bunch of things that they're all concerned about.

Fellow comes in with a callous that has suddenly appeared on his thumb during his sleep. He went to bed, he didn't have a callous on his thumb. He wakes up, he's got a callous on the thumb. You assess him out. The terminal, "archer." Callous disappears. Really fantastic thing, you know.

You're assessing something down the line – you're assessing what really is oppterm. We're using this word oppterm carelessly. The line of stuff that would become the oppterm in the final 3D package makes the pc dizzy and gives him sensations. Sensations of various kinds – dizziness, wogness, and so forth. And when you're assessing terms that would eventually become terminals on the goals 3D package, the final thing, he gets pains. He hurts. He feels like somebody's shoving pins in him and chopping off his head with an ax, and cold masses turn in when you're running the terminal line and almost never turn in on the oppterm line. So he gets cold, and it's cold, and then he says to me, "Why don't you turn some heat on at Saint Hill?" and so forth. I cooperate *if* the furnace is out, you see. I'll cooperate like mad, but very often these chills and so forth ...

People are in these things permanently, by the way, walking around in the streets and in life and so forth. They'll be right in the middle of one of these 3D valence cold packages. And they'll be just ice-cold all the time. They feel cold to the touch. Their fingers and hands and arms feel cold, and so forth. Sometimes on an assessment like this, running some Havingness as you go and that sort of a thing, all of a sudden it goes *whooooosh* and that's the end of the cold package. And they're overheated now in the rooms where they've always frozen to death in. Very, very tremendous difference of temperature takes place on these things.

Anyway, in listing and assessing and nulling, anytime the pc gets a sensation, write "SEN" after the item, and anytime the pc gets a pain, write "SOM," somatic.

Now, somatic technically covers both pains and sensations, and so forth, and makes a little bit of a twisteroo on the line, and probably much more accurately to just say "pain."

Maybe we ought to change it right there and keep you from getting messed up, and keep from calling me a liar of years ago. Write pain – "PN." A SEN and a PN.

All right. And then when you look down your goals lines and so forth, and you know what to look for, you will find that what you finally find in the package – when you finally get the package assembled, you'll be able to trace it back through all the lists. And it's the one that hurt. And the oppterm is always the character of thing that gave him the dizziness and the sensation. In other words, you've already run your proofs out. You've already proved your items out long before you're going to run them. You know what they are.

It also is very amusing to know which side of the bridge this pc is on. It's very, very amusing. The pc comes up with something like a ..."space pilot," you see. Nothing to do with the pc. Wouldn't know anything about that. Only trouble is when it came up, why, there were these shooting pains of meteorites going through his head, you see. "*Errra!* There was another one. *Rrr*, there was another one, and there was another one," and so forth. And every time you read this thing to null it down, you see, "Oooh, there was another one," you know.

He says, "Well, it's not me because they're very immoral people, those fellows. I've never been one, you know. But a control tower operator, yeah. A control tower operator – that... I've always been sending those fellows out, yes, as a control tower operator." We know more about it than the pc, see. That's an oppterm. Winds of space blowing his head off, you know. Dizzy sensation and so on.

Now, I haven't quite made up my mind whether grief or other emotional responses could be classified as a pain or a sensation. To my way of thinking, all – I know this about all emotions – they are secondaries and have their root in an engram. And unless there's pain in the engram, you don't get the secondary response. In other words, you don't get grief unless the person has been hurt on the same subject. There's always the engram precedes the tears, in other words. The fear is always underlaid by pain. Now whether this has anything whatsoever to do or an indicator on the Goals Problem Mass, at this time I can't tell you.

All right. Now, let's go a little bit further on this, and let's give you a very graphic picture of exactly what you do in order to assess out a Goals Problem Mass.

Line A probably should be "disliked."

Line B, "liked."

Line C, "Who or what would you treat that way?" I'll give you this trick in a minute.

Line D, "Dynamic Assessment."

Line E – if you wanted to make one and you may find it necessary – "Withhold item search." I'll go into that in a minute, too.

Now, these lines actually form a list. And if you wanted to make a list of items for the pc, the very best way to make that list so that it's very graphic and everybody understands it in the code, take and put these line A, B, C, D, E at the top of the – of one sheet of paper, or on both sides of one sheet of paper with lines A, B, C on one side, and C, D or E on the other side, you see. And make a zigzag going down from the A, you see – a zigzag forty-five degrees off the vertical, and then zigzag back the other way ninety degrees, you see, so it's still

forty-five degrees off the vertical the other way, and zigzag back, back, back, back, back, back.

In other words, to the right, to the left, to the right, to the left, to the right, to the left, a zigzag, you know, like chain lightning going down the page.

That gives you a graphic picture of from which, and from what, the line proceeded. You see, now you know from what the line proceeded. And every time you get an opposition, see, you – thereafter you never get anything but oppositions to these things, you see.

When you go down to the next zig – down to the first zig, you might say – you've got the opposition to what was at the top, see. And then you go down to the next zag, you've got the opposition to the one that was at zig. And now the next zig, of course you've got the opposition to the last zag, you see.

So you've got your zigzag, and you just write a series of terminals down that line. Now, those are all found items. Those are found, checked out, proved out, they are items. Every one of them. You write nothing on that graph, if you want to keep your plot for the pc, you write nothing on that graph but found, proven items.

Now, of course, you have to start these with test items. So the first line only would be possibly not part of the 3D package. They would possibly be locks of some kind or another. They're indicator items. We call those test items. All the rest are called 3D items by proper terminology. A test item is something that we – we're just using in order to kick off from. But if you get anything to stay in on a list and check out, I can assure you it's part of the Goals Problem Mass, not a lock. It is right on the main line.

So you're liable to get an idea, because there are so many of these things, that you're actually just getting test valences going here or something. And it's not true. Any one of those levels, as you could add it up, could be called a 3D package and run, except the test level.

You'll find oddities, however. You'll find somebody will give you several terminal items and then only one oppterm item on your first lineups. So you can't take them at any one level and say that these things directly and immediately oppose each other. You'd have to ask the pc which one opposes which in order to make up a 3D package, you see. And then you'd have to run some kind of a check, and if you'd noticed the sensation and the pain indicators, as you listed some items, you would then know which was a terminal and which was an oppterminal.

You could go ahead and find the goal, you could find the modifier, you could find the opposition goal, you could make up the whole 3D package at any one of those levels, and it would run. It would run – run perfectly well using the auditing commands of the 26th of December 1961.

But there are faster ways to bleed these things than running them. As long as assessment can be made to carry forward with reliable packages, you're really finding package after package after package trying to walk in toward *the* package which won't blow unless it is run.

Now, it is characteristic and peculiar of auditing that you never audit unless you can't get it to blow. In other words, two-way comm. You ask the pc, the pc says, "I have a present

time problem." You ask the pc, say, "What is the problem? Who's involved with it?" and so forth. "Now, do you have a present time problem?" That's always your first action. The thing doesn't knock all of a sudden. Fell off the pin a moment ago, and now it doesn't do a thing. You discharged it, so of course you don't audit it.

You only audit things you can't make to blow by inspection. So therefore, obviously, the first goal of auditing is blow by inspection. You're trying to cause an as-isness by inspection only.

Now, you're bleeding – if you can bleed charge that way off of a case, you, of course, would. Oddly enough, you could sit down with a Prehav Scale and ask the pc every consideration he had on every level of the Prehav Scale. Just take it up and discuss it with him. You know, take level after level of the Prehav Scale, and it'd just – two-way comm it with the pc, see. And you would wind up with a gain. Of one kind or another, you would wind up with a gain whether you liked it or not.

It's not auditing, is it? You sit down and you read this Prehav Scale off to the pc and it starts in at the top, and you say, "*Buh*," and then, "What do you think of that?" and so forth. You had him on a meter at that time, you'd see the meter go – occasionally the meter would go *whooooowh*, and go over, you know, and then it'd be down. And as he talked about it, just charge disappears. In other words, you, it's – that's by inspection.

So if you can bleed a Goals Problem Mass by inspection, God 'elp us, let's sure do so, please. Wouldn't that be a smart thing to do? Well, so let's go as far as we can possibly go by inspection before we have to audit it. And if we do it very slippily, we'll find out in some cases that we will – depending, by the way, on the skill of the auditor and on the state of the case, of course, and the accidental combination of how the 3D mass is twisted and some other things – on some cases I think you will find that you just get a blow by inspection of the whole 3D mass. You just walk through to the other end of the thing and all of a sudden this guy is flying. He looks over at the table, and it levitates, you know? Or he unthankingly reaches over and hands you your E-Meter at the beginning of session, but he didn't use his body, you know – this type of action.

But this is then auditing and don't get it tangled up that it's not auditing. Otherwise, you won't care to spend time on it to bleed charge, and you will go at it with the impatience of "Well, we got to find the item, see. We got to find the item." And then, therefore, you'll find yourself with this anxiety – occasionally just bludgeoning the list, bludgeoning the list, you know. And trying to knock the charge off of the list just to find an item, you see?

It doesn't seem important to you to get the charge off. Well, if the list is discharging very, very poorly, and it's just all hung in, and it's all hung in, and it's all hung in, well, let's bleed the meter. See, let's be smart about this. Recognize where this comes from.

"Are there any more things that would oppose a railroad engineer?"

"Well, I've thought of several, but I didn't bother to tell you because it seemed so obvious. The president of the company. Well, that always seemed obvious to me." You've got the item now. But sometimes the person doesn't even see what the item would be until you've got the thing about half nulled, see?

So don't be of the opinion that if you just find the item, it's all right. Then you can chalk it up and Ron will be happy with you, and everything is fine, you see. No, you want the item discharged.

And if a list isn't discharging, there's something wrong here. See, you haven't got all of it or something is wrong. So you're actually auditing. It looks like assessing. It looks like a search for needles in haystacks and all that sort of thing. Funny part of it is if you're doing it right, doing it expertly, and got the pc's rudiments in the whole way, why, glory, glory, glory. We're all set because the pc is – man, he's making gains the like of which you will never see him make in any other way. And you're walking upstairs to what this character really is.

Now, the actual Goals Problem Mass will start unburdening, and the terminal he is really in, in, in – and before we would have audited to it, now we will assess to it – is actually unburdening because we're taking locks off of it all the time. We're blowing charge. And you will find that when this thing finally shows up, and you've got it, that he will become more "it" for a little while, and then he'll become less "it," and then he'll be able to operate in the field of "it" and he will feel much better about the whole thing.

But this is auditing by unburdening. This is one of the oldest systems there is – auditing by unburdening. I think there's about – I don't know, I don't remember exactly when that was taken up. I think 53, 54. I think – I don't know. I think it was mentioned, I think it was mentioned in the *Creation of Human Ability*, isn't it? Isn't unburdening mentioned in the *Creation of Human Ability*? Well, anyway, it doesn't matter particularly. But this is an old auditing skill, but we didn't drive it very hard because we didn't quite know exactly which direction it went. But this is how you unburden.

So you write up at the top of the sheet here, line A, line B, line C, line D, line E, and you get your thing. Now, your first item is "What kind of person or being have you liked?" I think I said the first one was "dislike," didn't I? That's best, by the way, because you get a reversal, see.

All right. "What kind of being have you disliked?" All right. Now, we go ahead and make a long list of this thing, and we go right ahead and operate with that list. Now, the pc may slip you a few that they liked. Occasionally, they will do this. That's kind of unfortunate, and that's sort of unneat, but put them over on another list. Put them on another sheet of paper because you're going to take up "like" next anyway, see.

Now, a pc would audit longer, and you'd get more list if you got a liked item and a dislike item and a liked item and a dislike item, and a liked item and a dislike item, and you'd get the two lists completely complete. So there might develop two schools of thought about this. Maybe you ought to do the two lists first, all at once, before you assessed anything. And it might save you trouble. I personally wouldn't bother to. You see, I'm just saying there's two schools of thought about this. That one apparently violates the line a little bit.

Because they're opposites, he's going to run a two-way flow. And you're going to free something up with this. And he's all of a sudden going to remember things and all that sort of thing.

Well, you want a 3D item on that list. That's all you want. And that's all you're demanding of that list. You're not demanding that he run the whole track with that first assessment list, and so on. So actually it would work if you just got disliked items, and then went through your usual regular routine on this, which has now been very standardized, which is to say you list. You ask him if he's got any more coming – this is all without a meter, by the way – you and – you list them all. And then you go over the list with the pc and ask him how each one would oppose and if he cares to keep it in or leave it out or what he wants to do with it. You see, it's his session and his list, and you simply consult him about this. And he'll strike a few of them out and he'll add a few in at the end of the thing, and he'll expand the thing one way or the other. And finally the list is in some kind of shape.

Now, ordinarily you would differentiate the list with just one read down the list. You could, of course, do a second differentiation down the list if you wanted to. And eventually, if you kept assessing the list in that particular fashion and got him to explain "how each one," he would eventually turn up with and give you the final item. But it would take quite a while to do so. This is a longer, longer type of action.

But if a pc's items were nulling poorly and the pc seemed very withholdy on items, and a bunch of things of that sort, I would then bleed the list with a meter. I'd go ahead and bleed the list with a meter. I'd then pick up my meter after I'd made the listing, put the pc on the meter directly and bleed the meter if there were any more, and "What was that?" And then make sure that I wasn't getting ARC breaks. And I'd stretch this list as far as I could stretch it every time, you see. And then go back over and differentiate and get them knocked off and get them squared around.

Of course, your next one is the nulling, and that is your bark, bark, bark, leave it in, take it out, you know. And just ordinary, routine, very sharp, very rapid nulling, and the pc will sit there, and he'll watch them go in and out, and what they are, and which way they're going, and he'll be very happy with all this. And you finally wind up with *an* item. And there's only one item in, and then you check that item out very carefully. Well, you check that item out against the remaining list.

In other words, you say the item, say other parts of the list, say the item, say the other parts of the list, say ... You know. He'd say the item and other parts of the list. You'll find out some of them have come live, and then they go dead again. That's because when you found the item and identified it, the pc has all of a sudden concentrated his attention on it very heavily, and as you're checking it against the other items they then discharge out, and his mind resolves and settles down on that item. Of course, his mind was on it all the time anyhow which is what the trick is.

All right. You wind up with that item, and you've got an item and you enter it at the next zig or zag on that particular line. Now, when you come back to that, you're now going to go on to the next line, you see? You're now going to go on to the "like" list, you see?

That's going to sit there. The best way to handle this is just let the test item sit there rather than oppterm the test item the way it says in the first mimeo. Ah, it's more profitable. I've checked it out a bit. Not very thoroughly, but it's more profitable. Just to leave the test item there and get another test item for the next list.

And you're going to do B. And then you're going to do your C, D, E – all done the same way. You've – that is to say, you're going to make a list, and so forth. No matter how you get that list. And then you're going to write the item down on the next zig or the zag. Then you're going to come back to A.

Now, these items are never crossed over. That is to say, because you found one in A, you don't now enter it in B and so on and so on. That – it's not that type of arithmetic. These lines are all independent. They are totally independent until they collide, and you can do anything but let them collide. You try to keep them from colliding, by the way, by inventing new types of lists and lines to keep the pc flying, you see? Don't let these things collide and lose a line if you can possibly help it. But if you do lose a line, then figure out a new way to get a test item, get a new line going Got the idea? Try to keep a minimum of four lines. Absolute minimum. I would much rather audit with five or more lines.

So you just keep these lines going, and once you have found the test item of A, then you want to know a list, "Who or what would oppose that item?" Then of course, you do your list, that is write your list down, differentiate the list with the pc, null it down, bark, bark, bark on the meter, get your final item, prove it, then prove it out by checkout, and so forth. That's your next item. You put that down at the next zig or zag on the A list, you see.

Now, after you've done the other lines, you come back to that again. When you pick that one up again, now you go and you say, "Who or what would oppose a (whatever that item was on the A list – A line)?" And you make a list, and you differentiate it, and you null it, and you check it out, and then you write that down on your A line, you see, and then you go to B. Same way each time. Actually, it's a repetitive package and is a very neat piece of geometry or action that you're moving in toward.

Now, this much order is moving in toward, God knows how much confusion, see. It's fantastic confusion that you're walking into, so keep your order very good as you're going into the confusion, see. Because, boy, this is confused.

All right. Now let me give you very briefly how you get additional lists. You got your "like," "disliked," and what was the next one I gave you there?

Audience: General O/W

Yes, that's it. You run General O/W on Self on the pc – General O/W on Self on the pc. "What have you done to yourself? What have you withheld from yourself?" you see. And you write these answers down. It's not a therapeutic process at all, you see. You don't care if it's flat or unflat or anything else. You just want about fifteen answers or twenty answers. And then you go down this, "Well, who would you treat like that?" is what you want to know. And you go over these answers, and you read them back to him. You know, "Who would you treat like that?" see. And you just get a nice long list on who would you treat like that, you know, using his different answers.

"Well, what have you done to yourself?"

"Well, I've kept myself up late and not put myself to bed early."

"Oh, yeah."

All right, well, that was part of the list. So when you come back, "Who would you consider it an overt to keep up late?" See, that's the question. See, that's what's obviously inspection by eye. It shows you at once that – well, this is an overt on self, is it? Well, what kind of a self is self? Don't you see?

And the pc'll say, "Well, a sick person. Of course, everybody'd know that." So you write down, "a sick person," you see, on the list.

And, "What have you withheld from yourself?"

"Well, candy," and so forth.

The obvious question that you ask is, "Who couldn't have candy?"

And the pc says, "Ha-ha. Well, what do you know. Uh-uh-uh-uh – a – a little child couldn't have any candy."

Well, that's kind of surprising, too, so you write that down on the list, and you get your long list going with this. Sometimes, sometimes this is quite a short list. It all starts becoming "A sick person, a sick person, a sick person, a sick person," you know. All right. Then you null it out the same way.

All right. Now your next one is Dynamic Assessment, and I won't take any time to tell you how to do one of those because the data is all over the place. You just simply find your Dynamic Assessment item and having found the item, you use it as a test item and proceed on down a line with it.

Now, your withhold is "What should be..." or "What should you withhold?" It's a list of what you should withhold, not to self, but what should be withheld. And you just get a long list of the things that the pc tells you what should be withheld. It's quite remarkable the numbers of things that should be withheld.

Now, when you've got that withheld list – it doesn't have to be complete, anything. Maybe sixty items on it is absolutely adequate. Now you make your potential item list, you see. And, "Who would have to withhold that? What kind of a person would be withholding that?" See? See, very slippery.

See, "Talking too much."

"What should be withheld?"

"Talking too much." Well, when you find that on the list, you ask the pc – you don't make one for each withhold. You write as many as he gives you for each withhold, you see.

"Who would have to withhold talking too much?" you see?

And he says, "Well, a ringmaster in a circus."

"Anybody else?"

"Well, yes. An opera singer."

And you almost can get dozens of lists out of this thing, but that's perfectly fine. A very fruitful source of stuff.

All right. Now, there are five systems by which you can get test items and this beats the seventy-five hours to no goal of Routine 3 and 3A and early work, you see? Because you've got all these test items, and they're all a ball to the pc, and you all han – handle them all the same way, and you do – it's a very pattern from that time on.

Now, it may be that you have to get inventive later on as to how you find some test items. Perfectly all right because you've got a pattern. You've got the Prehav Scale. You could assess the Prehav Scale, find the level the pc's stuck in, and find out what kind of people or beings or so forth would be whatever that stuck level is, see. Or take several levels of the Prehav Scale and do the same thing with it, or anything you can think of.

"Who do you have problems with normally?" You get the idea? See. You could get – there's dozens of ways you could get lists and so on. But try to keep that many lines going, and if a line peters out on you or goes null, the first thing that you should do is go back and see if the item before it might have gone flat. Something like that. Try to trace the line back and salvage it so as not to have an error on the thing, but don't spend much time doing it. It's actually easier to scrap the line and start a new one.

Okay. The net result of all this is terrific therapeutic gain, potentially faster than any other type of auditing I've ever had any development of. Terrific therapeutic gain on this, providing it is done well, providing it's done with a high-spirited pc, providing it's done with a pc with the rudiments in. Providing it's done expertly and the right items are found, there's nothing in the world can beat this one.

Now, the speed with which you do it comes into consideration even though you go rather easily with the pc and the differentiation. The pc does a lot of talking and that sort of thing. Let him talk. Don't worry about it. Just keep him on the subject. It apparently is a little slower but actually the greater amount of time spent in the differentiation of the objects means the lesser amount of time in nulling, so you make up in nulling what you waste, apparently, in reading the list to the pc. And you'll sometimes find that the list has just gone *brrrrrrr* – it's just evaporated, and you've just got one item sitting there. In other words, you've nulled it down. Well, that's a high compliment to your presence as an auditor because this pc is well in-session, and he's as-is-ing like crazy, man. He's just knocking the stuff out *boomityboom*. And he winds up with one item. Don't think this pc was in that condition before you read him the list back.

Okay. Well now, that's 3D Criss Cross. That's pretty well how you do it. Those are the liabilities of it, and where it winds up, you're not ready to worry about yet. But there you are.

The questions that you can ask about 3D Criss Cross, and so forth, are rather normally solved in just applying your gray matter to – you know. You, a thetan, you got some gray matter. You might have something to do with it. You never used it, you see. Apply it to this one, huh? And look over the thing and see just about how does this figure out because actually it's a very, very sensible little package of tricks. And it always goes the same way. It always winds up with the same answer. You always make the same mistakes if you're making the mistakes. And there it is. And if your eyes get too strained reading the meter, why, use a magnifying glass or something like that. But find what's there and oppterm it and you'll really get some gains on these pcs.

Now, you can audit almost any kind of case on 3D, but it is still much, much better to prepare the case to be audited with decent Sec Checking and so forth, before you start in.

We've bypassed the necessity now to have the case in perfect condition before you can assess, see? But it's much easier to do if the pc has been set up and this lifetime has been sort of cared for and everything is running a little better.

Well, that's 3D Criss Cross, and I wish you good luck with it.

Thank you.

BASICS OF AUDITING

A lecture given on 23 January 1962

Twenty-third Jan. 62, AD 12. And how are you this week?

Fair. We have three good people from California. I hope that you don't get as chewed up as the others do in their first week or two. That's very insincere. [laughs, laughter]

The first action a new student has, they've been auditing all this time, they've been doing wonderfully, everything's been going along fine and of course there's nothing to learn. And then they collide with the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. *Crash!* And somebody says, "All right. Now, what is the confusion and the stable datum," and so forth.

And they say, "Well, the confusion uh – is uh – that was uh – *mm-hmmm-hm-mm-hm.*"

And the Examiner says, "Flunk!"

And they say, "What? You have to know this stuff? That's something new." And then they eventually say to themselves, "You know, I wonder why – if this was possibly why I've missed on a few pcs here and there, that I might not quite have duplicated something just right. I always thought before that the auditor held the cans and ..." [laughter, laughs]

Well, it's not quite that bad. It's worse. [laughter]

All right. Well, that's all due respect. But everybody who comes to this course learns sooner or later that there is something to learn here. After about three weeks of griping, why, then they decide to buckle down. And there's a way to cut short your time on course, is take the first three weeks of griping, scrub them and buckle down now. But this is a rough one as you will find out.

All right. Well, now, today I haven't the least idea what to talk to you about. You know everything there is to know. There's nothing left, and probably nothing I could teach you at all, at all – except Scientology, of course. That slight reservation.

Now, you're about to have – we've been upstairs... People think I work all the time. I don't. We've been upstairs loafing this afternoon, testing around on the new TV setup and you will shortly be seeing live sessions on TV. And the reason it's on TV is not because the BBC wants it, but because pcs never respond like pcs when being audited in front of an audience. And you audit the pc with television cameras, one going on a meter and showing up on a television set, and the other one showing up on the session. And you audit the pc just as you would run a session. And you run those things which the class is working on or struggling about.

But you actually audit the pc and you'll be able to see then what it might possibly look like. And this might help you out a lot. That is something we haven't ever been able to do.

Frankly, nearly all sessions are very artificial when they're demonstration sessions because the auditor has to hold down the audience, has to hold down the pc, has to get something done at the same time, has to be careful of the pc's reputation and all that sort of thing. You really don't get into a good auditing situation. So any auditing demonstration you've ever seen is actually an artificial demonstration, unless it's at long range such as this one.

And we've just had a very lucky win here. We have a Grundig camera that apparently it was – it was photographing just fine under the light shined by my cigarette lighter. So the pc, in this particular case, won't even be blinded by the lights of the television room.

The auditing room, of course, is quite remote from here. It's upstairs on the first floor and several – oh, I don't know, one hundred and twenty-five feet from here or something like that. I don't know how far. And the auditing session goes on there and you hear it and see it and so forth, down here on two screens.

Now, because it's difficult for a class that is this big to see it up, we have two pictures of the session on twenty-three inch screens and we have two pictures of the E-Meter on, I think, seventeen-inch. Isn't that the way it's supposed to work out or are they ... ?

Male voice: Nineteen.

Nineteen. And two nineteen-inch screens that show the meter in full view and two twenty-three inch screens that show the session. The only thing that you're going to see that's a little bit different about it – of course, you won't see the green color or the red of my hair. Otherwise, it will be fairly real. If you can mock those up and fill them in, you'll be all right.

And the – Fowler and Allen has just undertaken to build a Mark IV with a black rough face so that it won't reflect and a gray card. And they didn't like leaving off the glass because they said some dust will get into that element and it'll all of a sudden cease to work and we'll have had it. But I think we can do it with the glass on with a gray and a black faced meter. So that looks just like the meter you're using except it's duded up for television so that it registers well.

Well, that's what's in the immediate future. This will probably be in operation within – certainly well within presentation operation within two weeks. We'll have it done before that actually, probably. But it all depends on the second camera that comes from the North Pole apparently and has a small wait on it of eight or nine years. You know, the usual manufacturer's delay. That's the only bug on it. Everybody's working on this at the present time. You'll be seeing men down here stringing wire in all directions shortly. Cable in all directions and so forth.

Well, now, that's the – that's the immediate view. This of course doesn't supplant any other training that you're getting or doing. We just add the other hour or two on to your training day and you do everything you're doing now and then this other comes on, too.

In a month or two – in a month or two we'll probably have motion pictures going which give you meter reads. And we are already on a scout of that camera so that we can photograph meter reads. And you'll have a mile or two of film and you can sit there and the Instructor can say, "What's that?" And the thing is falling badly.

And you say, "A rock slam."

And he says in – he doesn't say flunk, he says, "Infraction sheet." [laughter, laughs]
And you can get a – you can get a good hasty review of what meter reads should look like.

One of the things that's most puzzling to people when they show up here is what is a null needle. That seems to be a very controversial item and so forth. And other such things as that and we'll have those things taped, too.

So we're moving up to it and I'm – we're hoping to get this in and operating so that those who are leaving mid-February get a week or two of viewing of this sort of thing so they can straighten out some little thing they may have been doing themselves such as sitting on the pc's lap. Spitting at the pc. Little odd tricks that they've developed unbeknownst to themselves in training, you know. Like throwing – throwing the E-Meter out the window to demonstrate that they're dissatisfied with the pc's answers, you know. It's these small bugs that a person picks up in his auditing procedure that possibly could be ironed out.

Now, we're very interested in you being a good auditor. And a good auditor's auditing begins first and foremost on an understanding of his basic data. It's quite a fundamental statement of fundamentals. And an awful lot of people pick up a datum and they sail at ten thousand feet with it, you see. And they've never landed with this datum and they're still up in the air with this thing.

And you'd be surprised how many data can get in crosswise. We're just now learning this in Central Organizations where morale is suffering because people are making them duplicate bulletins. And they are writing us to find out how we keep up the morale in the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And I'm writing back and saying, "Well, it's a very simple answer. We don't."

But this tells you at once that if they have a morale problem, then this tells you that they have never enforced duplication in their Academies. So that somebody's walking into something brand-new when he's asked to totally duplicate a bulletin or totally duplicate a tape or understand exactly what is on this. Or perhaps their examination is buggy. The examination might be poor. The examination might be on the basis of "What are the last seven words of the fifth paragraph of the HCO Bulletin of 22 December 1961?"

And the fellow can't answer that and so they say, "Flunk," you see. It's the data you're supposed to know on the bulletins. Of course, if you antagonize the Instructor, the Instructor has a perfect right to ask you what is exactly on that particular bulletin regardless if it contradicts some other bulletin. What is *that* bulletin?

All the auditor is expected to answer is what is on *that* bulletin. Not what is the right answer to the question, but what is on *that* bulletin, which is quite different, you see, than studying things.

You find out, then, they will develop an acuteness, an alertness to what the – what is being demanded of them. And they can measure up to this.

Anyway, when you're studying and you don't have good auditing going forward at the same time and when you're under this much duress and there's no auditing going forward, I don't think it could be done.

So of course, that makes an instant criticism of staff staff auditing in Central Organizations, see. If there isn't good auditing present by staff staff auditors on staff, why, of course their morale would suffer because you realize that if your ARC breaks with the Instructors were left even for twenty-four hours without being picked up by your auditor, you realize your whole bank would cave in. You recognize this – . Joke. They take it seriously. [laughter] It's almost true, you know?

And it takes good auditing to carry forward hard training. And that's something for you to realize sometime when you start in on a small group of auditors someplace and you're going to make Class IIbs out of them, something like that. And you're really going to fix them up one way or the other and you're doing it while they work at the filling station or something of the sort. And they're all out of your sight and they aren't getting much cross auditing and nothing much is happening in the way of results. Their auditing is so poor that no results are occurring. And then you hit them with this much duress, this much insistence, this much this, this much that, they're going to go up the chimney. They can't take it, that's all.

The reason why you can get this high a velocity of learning in is just one little reason and that is because you are applying that learning at the same time and you are getting case gains while you learn, so that you're getting a reality on these various things – at least some are.

And the person, of course, who has no basic reality on Scientology itself, who is still in a big question mark, of course, is actually stuck in some kind of a ridge, usually, of just no reality, you know. Big question mark. You recognize that.

You ask him also – the way to test that one out is to say, "Well, do you think medicine works?"

And he will say, "Well, I doubt it."

"Well, do you think that car repairing works?"

"Well, I doubt it."

"Do you think that anybody ever painted a picture?"

"Well, I doubt it."

And you begin to spot that the circuit hasn't anything to do with Scientology. He's just going on this way. When you run into that problem in learning, there's no sense in trying to shove it down the person's throat one way or the other. It's simply such a case problem that there isn't very much you can do about it except audit the person.

That is the only real problem that anybody should ever encounter in an Academy. Somebody who comes around and says he has no reality on Scientology and then you try to give him one and he can't get one and all that sort of thing – well, most people's reality on Scientology consists totally of having read something about Scientology. They recognized that was true and that was all there was to it.

But this other person is making a big fuss out of this, see. He has *no* reality on Scientology. He has *no* way – he doesn't *know* whether – and so on and so on. He's right in a ridge. You'll find out that you have to run negatives and positives on that person because he's sitting in the middle of a maybe. Of course, his whole life is in a maybe. Is he alive? No, he doesn't know that. See, he's doubtful.

This is about the only problem you'll run into in education is the ridge of doubt. There is another one which is rather easily overcome and that is pretended knowingness. And that, of course, is another downscale mockery of knowing, is pretended knowing. The person has a horrible sensation of pretended knowingness occasionally. You yourself have had this once in a while, I imagine. You all of a sudden recognize that you were pretending that you knew something or something like this. And it gave you an odd sensation. And then that was gone.

Well, think of somebody leading their whole life with that sensation. They're going around pretending that they know they're here and insisting to everybody they know they're here why they – while they know themselves that they are not here, you know.

And it's a funny sensation. They just feel like fakes all the way through. That one, however, is not as difficult – that, because it doesn't buck your data. It doesn't fly back in your face. It's only this – the person who doesn't have a reality on (blank) or can't get a reality on (blank) that you really worry about in instruction.

Now, when you have that as a chronic thing, it is, of course, a very low case level. This is the "What wall?" proposition. I'm not being essentially hard on this particular person. I'm just regarding it with regard to training people and training in general and that is a tough one to jump.

Now, that's also very tough to jump on a pc and you'll occasionally see that in an auditing session. The pc will set goals, sometimes very extravagant goals. You want to watch a pc, by the way, who sets extravagant goals for a session, see. Wants to be Clear by session end. Wants to be OT by session end. You know, a person wants to be Clear, that's a perfectly normal goal. But this session, that's got to make him OT, you see, and so on.

That person is in an obsessive games condition with the auditor and is attempting to give the auditor loses. That's the whole works about that. If you want to know if a pc is in an obsessive games condition, well, you look at those goals. And if they're too extravagant and they're just beyond anything that anybody ever could possibly have anything to do with anywhere, why, just recognize to that degree that the pc is in a games condition with you. And watch it because this pc will go out of session at the drop of an electron. And to try to run very much on them is very hard because they're scat. They're insecurely in-session. They're indifferently in-session. They are not under the auditor's control. And you can actually plunge them in over their heads and then can't control them in the session and then they get all upset and, you know, this kind of stuff. It makes a messy session.

And the thing to do with that pc is, of course, is run very easy, very fundamental processes – very, very fundamental. Audit him lightly. Audit him with a feather.

If you want to knock over a pc who is a no-effect pc, of course, audit him with a feather. Don't do what the psychiatrist does. The less effect the person can have, the more effect the psychiatrist tries to give them. Don't do that.

The way to handle such a case is give them the breath of air from a slowly wafted feather and you will just be absolutely amazed what will happen.

Such a person can very often run 8-C. Oh, man, they'll touch those walls and they'll march over and they'll touch the other wall and turn around and they just go on and on and on. Never a comm lag, no change of any kind. Just do it. Nothing to it. Well, why couldn't they do it? They're not there. It doesn't bother them any. Doing it on the auditor's determinism; they have no reality on it at all. Perhaps many of you have seen this phenomenon in running 8-C. Well, apply that to mental reaction. In other words, 8-C, as simple as it is, is too far up scale for this person to run. That's all.

Now, you sit down with a very tiny, microscopic object. I'll tell you a good gag for this person that can't run 8-C like that. You sit down with a little microscopic object. Very small. Smaller than a cigarette lighter and sort of dull. Well, actually, this piece of chalk would do just fine, see. Dull and can be seen and so forth.

And just ask them to get the idea that the chalk is there and that the chalk is not there. Total process. And just do that one after the other, something like that. Man, you pick up more confusion. More randomness will fly off

"How can you say that the chalk isn't there when the chalk is there?"

Ah, you just say, "Well, get the idea the chalk isn't there."

"Well, all right. I can get the idea maybe that the chalk isn't there, but the chalk actually is there and you can see it right in front of you," and so on.

"Well, go ahead and do the auditing command. Get the idea the chalk isn't there. I'll repeat it for you."

"Well, nobody can get the idea the chalk isn't there because the chalk is there, you see, and that defies all the laws of reality and so forth."

"All right. That's fine. Now, just get the idea the chalk isn't there. I'll repeat it again."

"Ah, well, you can't do anything like that. You'd see the cloth through it if you got the idea the chalk wasn't there and so forth. And that would violate physical phenomena."

And you say, "Good. Well, I'll repeat the auditing command. Now, get the idea that chalk isn't there."

Man, you go on like this for about a half an hour, you know, and you finally get it answered. I've even gone to this degree.

I've said, "Now, look-a-here, see that – see that piece of chalk? Now, you see it right there right now. All right. Now watch. Now, can you – can you see no chalk? Can you see no chalk? All right. Now I'm going to put the chalk there and now you look at the chalk. Now get the idea there's no chalk there. Can you do that? No. All right. Well, I'll do this again now. Now, here's your chalk. Now, you see, now you're supposed to get the idea the chalk isn't

there and if you did that and this is what it would visually look like, see. No chalk. Now, just watch that. Watch that. Good."

"By God, you're right, you know."

"All right. There's the chalk."

Work with the person. Work with the person until the person could actually take over the automaticity of not-ising physical objects. And all of a sudden the room starts to go solid on them, you know, and things like this supposed to happen. Just keep on working.

"Get the idea now the chalk is there."

You haven't told him to see the chalk. You told him just get the idea the chalk was there. You haven't told him not see the chalk. And you'll see the confusion blowing off on something stupid like this. That's what I mean, just take a feather and waft the wind off that feather very gently past one ear at a distance of about a yard, you know, and they say, "God almighty, turn off that Pratt & Whitney engine."

See, you have an effect. What you're dealing with there, of course, is the old Effect Scale. And as the person goes down, down toward total effect, the effect that can be had on them is a breath of air. See, that's a terrific effect. But if you were to blow them up, if you were to drop a building on their heads and so forth, they'd never find out about it. See, that's too much effect.

Now, we see that clearly in our overt-motivator phenomena. The overt that the person has, we think it's a comparable motivator. No. The more motivators that the person has earned, the less motivator the person can have. So you'll be astonished sometime to say to somebody, "Sneeze" and the person has said, "What is the idea of killing me with that terrible, piercing scream which you just uttered?"

Let's take last year's or last lives' *Murders of the Rue Morgue* character. Man, he had bodies strewn from one corner of Paris to the other. We pick him up in this life in the auditing chair, he actually taps his toe with the faintest of taps – you see, just a slightest tap, see, against it – in avoiding your toe, see. Your toe was there and he didn't step on your toe, but he tapped his toe against the side of the chair. Boy, is he upset. That's the motivator. That's a motivator. That is enough to practically kill you for. Do you get the idea? And it's just nothing, nothing for a motivator.

He thinks everybody is against him, as they go by him on the road because their wheels are going round or something, you know. That's enough motivator.

Well, the more overts a person collects, the less motivator it takes to blow him to pieces. That's an interesting principle. If you look this over, you'll understand auditing this no-effect pc rather easily. The greater the person's overts, why, the less motivator. The motivator can be just absolutely, fantastically microscopic.

Let's take this girl, she's gone out with other men. She's stolen all your money. She's sold everything out in all directions. She's acted in a most outrageous fashion, you know. And then you give her a bunch of flowers and the petal of one flower is bruised. You hear about it. That's enough motivator. That's a motivator. Got the idea?

But frankly, you could throw her the length of the block and run over her head with a truck and it wouldn't be much of a motivator, you see? That's too much effect. It is – it's simply that she doesn't notice it. She can't perceive that much of an effect. So you get the idea of people perceiving large, explosive actions and people perceiving very small actions. Now, who could perceive a large, explosive action?

Well, it'd be a person in fairly good shape. And he'd say, "Look at that, you know?"

And somebody else sees the large explosion and notices that a little puff of smoke, see, came up at the side. And they'll tell you about the little puff of smoke at the side, but not all the debris and the arms and legs flying through the air. See, they won't tell you about that. They take up that other. And that would be enough. That's a terrible explosion because of the little puff of smoke. And you say, "Well, how about all the arms and legs and the factory chimneys that were flying through the air?"

And they'd say, "Well, where were those?"

You get the idea the person wasn't viewing the same view that you viewed. The person probably wasn't in the same universe or something Well, evaluate it just on this: Their automatic not-is takes care of all large effects. And the little tiny effects are left on the fringes. So they can really get upset with small things.

Well, you'll see this in a session. And the funny part of it is you probably could give somebody no auditing. I mean, gross auditing error, see. Just no auditing. You know, I mean, do something or other. Crank up the E-Meter, ride him yappety-yappety-yap through the rudiments, you know and then say yappety-yap to him, and miss a half a dozen of this and don't do anything of that and then end rudiments and end session and that sort of thing. Just a clown, you know, a total clown type of auditing with a bunch of crash in it, you know, a bunch of crushers, you know. The pc didn't instantly answer the auditing command. "Are you withholding anything?", And you say, "Why the hell don't you speak up? Come on. For Christ's sake, you know." Swear at him.

But really no auditing at the same time because you don't care whether they answer or not, you know. Just a total no-auditing session. And this person doesn't think anything has happened to them. The person doesn't think anything bad has happened to him. They didn't get any auditing, but that's all right. The auditing is so gross, you might say, the errors are so gross that they don't notice it's bad. All right. Now, let's take the reverse. They get a very good auditing session, somebody's going through perfectly all right and they miss one tick on an ARC break or something of the sort, you know. That's enough motivator. See, they take off like a startled gazelle. Doesn't have to be a good session particularly, but a mediumly good session. But just – it's the little tiny error that they will notice. They won't notice the rest of it.

Well, we see this in critics of auditing. They're always looking for the little error when the whole session is missing. Pc hasn't even sat down in the chair, you know, that sort of thing. We see somebody trying to straighten up an auditing session on this. Well, what would he consider a motivator? That's what he finds wrong with the session is what he would consider a motivator.

Therefore, a critic of a session is also indexed, frankly, by his own ability to have an effect.

Now, you get along in life with this and you'll notice that the Spanish people, the Mexican people, regardless of their reputation with revolutions, of a bombastic and brutal governmental action, banditry, tortures, imprisonments, civil abuses of great magnitude and we think maybe that they're vicious people or something like that.

No, basically they're very good people. You could probably leave a bicycle lying all day in the middle of Madrid and nobody would touch it. Maybe not Madrid, but Sevilla for sure. And you – nobody'd touch it. You leave your wallet on a counter in a store or something like this and my God, the manager himself runs five blocks to return the thing to you and make sure that you see that all the money is still in it and all that sort of thing. Fantastic, you see, their level of honesty, as you would call it honesty and so forth, is utterly fabulous. And this in the middle of countries – a country which tolerates enormous criminality in its government, atrocities in its wars and actions, exclamation points in its banditry and so forth. People don't object because they don't see it. See, it's not a motivator. Doesn't have anything to do with them.

A democracy is only as good as people can observe what's going on. And a democracy goes to pieces promptly that people cannot see what's happening and get onto this enough-motivator kick.

Oh, my, you should see though what happens in a Spanish family if little Juan or something like that, accidentally loses a penny or a peseta or something or takes one off the living room table, you see or fails to sit for four hours in the sun waiting for his father to come in from fishing and so on. My God, you'd think the empire had just been torn to pieces, you see, just fantastic crimes have been committed here. It's something that everybody goes and cries about quietly in the corner, and Aunt somebody-or-other goes and – into the convent, you see. It's just – it's just enough motivator, you know. It's just "Oh, my God, how could they do such a thing?" you know. He didn't sit there for four hours in the boiling sun. He went and sat in the shade. Terrible. Terrible.

And yet their bandits, their governments, their supersystems of some kind or another. These things are utterly just *blaaaah*. Just total uncontrolled criminality from the word go. That's Mexico. That's Spain. That's the way an old empire has gone. It gets down to enough motivator. What's enough motivator? What can people see? Well, "What effect can they have?" is all this adds up to.

And in auditing pcs, in auditing pcs, this shows up very strongly so that you in auditing low-level pcs could have a perfectly fine time auditing some spinning psycho. Oh, you could sit on his head and sit all over him and make him answer up one way or the other and push him this way and that way and he might get some big gain out of it, you see. With gross auditing errors, you could audit this psycho, see. I mean, it could just be fantastically bad auditing. And he'd take it. It's perfectly all right.

Now, you take a person in the middle band of sanity, something like that and it's a different proposition. It goes from low-scale cases can be given; shouldn't be given by you, but could be given without their noticing it – I don't advise this, of course, but they could be given

without their noticing it – very bad auditing and take it. All they'd notice is that it just wasn't happening very good. Nothing much was happening.

But you could just knock their heads off, you know. Run everything backwards, upside down. And just be a complete, colossal mess. Do you see that? You could just give them a *horrible* session and you'd have no objection of any kind whatsoever. You'd have no objection.

Now, that's something for you to look over. You wonder why you don't get objections in some quarters and spheres and so forth, in auditing clinics or something like that, when very bad auditing is done by some auditor on low-scale cases and you got no objection to it.

Well, that isn't the reason. It wasn't that it – wasn't bad auditing, don't you see. It's that the pc couldn't tolerate that big an effect. Couldn't tolerate that big of an error.

And if the pc were asked to criticize the session, if pushed very hard to find something wrong with that session, it's actually not even, you see, that the pc is in propitiation. The pc just doesn't see it, that's all. And if he was asked very hard to search over the session very, very hard to find something wrong with the auditing he had had, see, he would come up with the fact that the auditor one day was five minutes late for the session. And that was everything that was wrong with the auditing, see?

It's quite fantastic. Actually pitiful.

But in your middle-range auditing, people who are not in that kind of condition, the little tiny errors are registering and the mediumly large errors are registering. And it'd be pretty hard to audit wildly enough so that they couldn't see it. So that they'd see auditing errors, don't you see? And these do have an effect on them. And as they come up scale, then they see the whole of the auditing error, you see. They see everything in the error that – in the auditing that is in error. And actually, it has less effect on them than it would have on the lower-scale case, you see.

Don't make the mistake of thinking because the person didn't observe the effect that it didn't have an effect. It did have an effect on them, see.

But you get an upper-scale case that audits pretty easily and so on. Man, he can see everything wrong with an auditing session from the word go. He could criticize the whole living lot of it.

Therefore, as you audit people up the line, your auditing has to *improve*. See, if you get them off the launching pad while sitting with your stocking feet on the windowsill and puffing a cigarette, you see and looking at the E-Meter now and then, don't you see and never starting the session and never ending the session and never cleaning anything up that happens and always Q-and-A-ing with the pc, auditing will still give some gain.

All right. That person will come up to that gain point and your auditing would have to improve. Do you see how that would be?

All right. Now, you give this person – at your improved auditing status – you give this person a lot of wins and they get better and everything is fine along that level. And now to make them any better, your auditing has got to improve. You see where we're going with this?

Now, we're not monkeying around with improving your auditing while the pc is improving. We're trying to put your auditing straight up at a high peak right now because there is no sense in Q-and-Aing with this. Just audit well always. I myself don't particularly follow that maxim. I've given lousy sessions. I've gotten cross and upset in sessions over the years and so forth, but when I sit down to give a session, I give a session. And unless I'm involved in some particular way trying to clean something up that doesn't have anything to do much with auditing – you know, using auditing to do something else with it – but as far as the sessions go, sit down to give a session, yeah. Well, I'll give something that's very, very close to a letter-perfect session.

Well, what do you mean a letter-perfect session? Well, it just takes up what's wrong with the pc and handles it and pushes it along through and ends it up with the pc improved. That's a perfect auditing session. You couldn't be more perfect than that because that is exactly what you are trying to do, don't you see?

It is – perfection does not necessarily derive with how you hold your little pinky in the air. You know, your little pinky up here and you must hold this finger as you hold the E-Meter, you see, this, this – the posture of this finger is important. Whether or not you have the index finger and the little finger up while your thumb is on the tone arm, you know, that kind of thing. It doesn't matter. It's whether or not your auditing communication with the pc is effective at the pc's level of case. That is what is it.

Now, of course, in the forms which we have today, you have Model Session. And Model Session has been very arduously, very carefully worked out over a long period of time to pick up the maximum number of pcs and the maximum numbers of upsets that pcs can be prone to and the maximum numbers of things that upset sessions. So that's there and that's well tailored. But you come along, you knucklehead, and you lean on that. And you got a beautiful tool, you see and there you lean on it. And you say, "Well, this will see me through." No, nothing will ever see you through but auditing. That's all that will ever see anybody through a session as an auditor is just auditing.

Now, the second you start *leaning* on the Model Session [speaks in an extremely dull, fast and nearly inaudible way] – "Start of session. Is it all right with you if we audit in this room? All right. Good. Talking about (*mumble*), *hmm?* Withholding anything? Oh, well, you don't want to go into that. All right. Have a present time problem? Huh? Oh, well, hm? Hm? Hm-mm. Ah, hm. Let's see, what are we going to audit in this session? Oh, yes, Security Check. All right. Have you ever raped anyone? Thank you. That's clear. There ..."

What's phenomenal is without paying any attention whatsoever to the pc you can make a gain on the pc. You don't have to pay attention to the pc or get mixed up in his nasty old case.

You see? What's carrying you through there is just the mechanic. See, the ritual. And if you went through the ritual and went by the meter, you would wind up at the other end of the session with having done a session. And what do you know, you would have something done with the pc.

Now, immediately you think, "Well, if that isn't good enough, if I'm not just supposed to sit there and reel off Model Session and read the E-Meter and take up what I see on the E-Meter and come out the other end, what the hell is auditing? See, what's that?"

Well, that you would ask the question shows that you have defined auditing as a Model Session going off in a certain unit of time monitored by an E-Meter. That's what – what you've been defining auditing by if you ask that question.

No, auditing – auditing is a science, definitely a science, not an art, contrary to old Joe Winter. He used to stand up and tell students, "Auditing is an art." Joe used to watch me audit, didn't have a clue what I was doing and it all appeared different to him every time he saw it, you know? So of course, to old Joe auditing was an art. It was rather fantastic.

There was nothing scientific about auditing because it all looked different. Well, when we start TVing these sessions, you're going to get some of that reaction around here. You're going to say, "My God, you must have thrown away the whole rule book." That's why we're going to have to run a tape every time we do one of these things. So the arguments will cease. And you go back through and you'll find a Model Session and you will find the E-Meter and you'll find the readings of the E-Meter are taken up and you'll find it's all going off and after you get all the auditing off the top of it, you will find a Model Session and an E-Meter. Got the idea?

I'm not talking to you about how wonderfully I audit. As a matter of fact, my auditing could improve. There's no doubt about that. As a matter of fact, right now because we're going to televise these things and so forth, I've got to learn the end rudiments perfectly. [laughter] I had – I had them down perfect in the old version, you know and since I – since I rewrote them and worked them out, I haven't got these new ones taped. It's very funny. Even in my auditing now, I say, I always have to say to the pc, "Well, you'll have to pardon the lack of end rudiments here, but are you withholding anything? How's your havingness? Anything you'd care to say before we end this session?"

I've gone completely off the old rudiments and I haven't picked up the new ones. But you can expect that to happen to you too, see? The end rudiments weren't something I suddenly dreamed up. The end rudiments were a whole bunch of errors that were being made by auditors that were worsening cases and there was a wonderful opportunity to scrap the end rudiments as a repetition of the beginning rudiments and put all those beautiful stopgaps in at the end. And they were simply worked out rather arduously of what is the wording that works and what sounds good and what carries it in and that sort of thing. They're all perfectly worked out.

But working them out wasn't memorizing them and I was caught right there. But if you took my auditing, if you took a session and you took all of the auditing off of the top of it, the bones that you would find would be an auditor, a pc, an E-Meter, Model Session and the TRs. But you'd have to take all the auditing off the top of it to find 'em, see.

Now, get the idea of a very, very, very skinny girl. A very, very skinny girl, you know. You'd have to stand twice in the same place to make a shadow. And now, if she had a little flesh on her, she'd just look gorgeous, you see. Well, your auditing may be looking like the

skinny girl. Even the best of your auditing right now kind of looks a little bit like a skinny girl. It hasn't got any flesh on it, see. Those bones show through.

The pc is very, very aware of the fact that you are taking up beginning rudiments. Well, isn't it interesting that a pc even though he's a trained auditor is aware of your taking up anything? What's the pc doing listening to the auditing bones? See? Well, he must be out of session. He's supposed to be interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor and there he sits watching the bones rattle. See? Now, if you want a test of good auditing, did you know that the auditor was using Model Session? If you didn't he either wasn't using it or it was a perfect session. [laughter] *Smooth*, man, *smooth* is the keynote of this sort of thing.

Auditing a pc the other night. Now, think what you would do in this situation. The pc's havingness isn't working. We've run the pc's havingness, we've given the can-squeeze test – all standard, you see, all perfectly nice – and it isn't working.

All right. Now, what's the textbook solution but not necessarily the textbook solution? What would you do in that particular case? Think what you would have done. You'd have bridged out of what you were doing and you would have tested for a new Havingness Process and then you would have bridged out of that and run it. And a half an hour later, you would have gotten the session going again. Wouldn't that – isn't that the way it looks?

All right. That's fine. And I wouldn't for a minute take away any ability you have to do this because you often have to do it.

All right. But what about this as a situation? Watching this session I was running, you would have – you would have been – "What the hell is this?" you know. You're sort of alert that something else was happening here that you hadn't quite noticed.

Pc ran it – can-squeeze test. Run Havingness – can-squeeze test. Five more commands – can-squeeze test. Five more commands – can-squeeze test. Pc has a long history of having had Havingness run. What's wrong here?

So, without breaking pace and the pc never even noticed this, I just asked the pc how many Havingness commands the pc hadn't ever executed. And the answer was "thousands". The pc had never done a Havingness command in the pc's entire history in Scientology. Had never done a Havingness command. Had told some early auditors, two or three of them, that this was not possible to do. And it cut loose on the Havingness Process and run it that way.

All right. Here's some thousands of commands never done. Thousands. Here's maybe three, four auditors, whole sessions, upsets, unanswered auditing commands, ARC breaks. Here's the whole mess, yawning wide for the auditor to dive into and get lost, see.

Cleaned the invalidations off, shifted to a Havingness Process that was elementary – just an elementary Havingness Process, having gotten the invalidations off havingness. The unanswered commands. Having attacked that. And simply asked this other command and got the can-squeeze test and it worked and went on with the Havingness session. And the total lapsed time was 2.5 minutes to straighten out a pc's whole history of Havingness. And the pc never noticed this, but thought that was very nice that Havingness was now operative, you know? They just thought it was nice, but never noticed that it was nice because the auditor had done it.

In other words, there's no gears ever got shifted. There was no difference in the reading of the speedometer in the session. The pc never noticed any change of pace. This was a discussion between can-squeeze tests.

This was apparently to the pc just a little two-way comm that went on and the auditor interested in the pc's case, you know. No more important than that. No big resurges. No bridges. Nothing. All in the middle of this.

All right. Now, you should be able to know the right way to go about things and find the Havingness Process and straighten out that sort of thing. All right. That's fine.

Well, how about this other thing? Why make a production out of it? See? How come each one of these things has got to be a production? That's what I would like to ask you. How come? See?

So the pc's Havingness Process isn't working and it was working yesterday. Well, you can find a new pc's Havingness Process and you probably should if it's some esoteric process like "Tell me the cubic inch capacity of that – what the cubic inch capacity of that wall might be." If it's something this complicated and esoteric, why, certainly you'd better be working on it gradually, session by session, to improve their Havingness Process till it's something very simple like "What can you have here?"

See, I mean, that's the essence. You're trying to work toward a simplicity, by all means. But the pc is already running "Point out something. Point out something. Thank you. Point out something." The pc's running on this and it loosened the can squeeze – on the can-squeeze test yesterday and it isn't loosening on the can-squeeze test today. Well, why the production?

Isn't it perfectly obvious that the pc has invalidations or withholds on the subject of havingness? Isn't that all that would make that Havingness Process cease to function? It's too – it's an elementary process. Yes, we can see that other things, such as "What is the emotion of that (indicated object)?" We could see that that, for God's sakes, let's get off of it and get on to something else because that's a complicated process and we'd love to better it.

But why make a production out of improving something which is very simple already? This is a perfectly satisfactory Havingness Process. "Point out something. Thank you. Point out something. Thank you." Auditor can just sit there and yawn. It's very easy. The pc thinks it's marvelous. Everything is going along whizzingly.

Well, it ceases to work, what should you do with it? Well, let's patch it up. How long does it take to patch up something and get an invalidation off something? If the pc is in-session, doesn't take very long to find it. And the more the pc is in-session, the faster the pc will blow an aberration, the less afraid they are of things, the less they duck and dodge, the braver they feel. And they'll take on large masses and blow them and blow holes out of engrams and they're just brave as hell, you see, because they've got confidence in the auditor and they know the auditor will take it up if they go wrong.

So why the production, see?

This pc comes into session. This pc is saying, "Natter, natter, natter, yap, yap, yap and it was so-and-so and so-and-so," got a roaring present time problem. The pc is right on the top of the present time problem, has nothing else but a present time problem, what are you going to do? Yank the pc's attention all over the room and on the floor and the ceiling and go through this and talk to you about your difficulties? Why, hell, they're talking to you about your difficulties and so forth.

I'd handle the present time problem then start a session. See? You're auditing a case that's in front of you, not something else. The pc is stuck in a present time problem, it's perfectly obvious the pc is stuck in a present time problem, what are you doing handling anything else? What are you doing starting any sessions? Session got started someplace. Lord knows where the session got started or why it got started or something like that and if you want to square it with your conscience, why, just mutter, you know, "Well, start of session. What was that again?"

But even that might distract the pc. All right. She says, "Oh, my, this garage mechanic. My God. And it took my car and I mean they took the rear wheels and put on the front wheels and they got the flywheel off and they put on the steering wheel. And they just poured oil all over everything, right afterwards," and so forth.

And you're going to say, "Start of session. Is it all right to audit in this room?"

Going to say something like this, are you? Well, how many ARC breaks can you handle at once? How many can you handle? That's all. Now, you've got the present time problem and an ARC break. You've got an ARC break with life and an ARC break with the auditor. Let's see if we can't dig up another ARC break someplace. Two doesn't seem like enough. Two ARC breaks and a present time problem and the auditor out of session – yeah, this'd be good, this would.

No, the obvious thing is to say, "Well, what are you withholding from him?"

"His payment. I'm not going to pay him a dime!"

"What else are you withholding from him?"

"Well, I've got the car. I've got the car outside."

"What were you withholding from him before that?"

"Well, it was a wreck."

"Well, was there any earlier withhold on him?"

"Ha-ha-ha. Well, I wasn't really going to pay for the repairs anyway."

"Oh, is that so? Well, all right. Any other withholds on that? Any other upsets, withholds?"

"No, no."

"How do you feel about that now?"

"Oh, I feel all right about it, I guess. I guess."

"Well, were there any other withholds?"

"Well, withhold from you that I had withholds from them."

"Well, all right. That's fine. Okay if we start this session now? Start of session. Look around here ..." There we go. That's auditing. That's auditing. It's auditing the case that's in front of you.

At the time you do that, however, you are not absolved from any of the obligations of the auditor to have a proper Model Session running. You're not absolved from any obligations whatsoever, but you audit the case that's in front of you.

You're just about to ask the pc, "Are you withholding anything" and the pc dopes off. You say, "Hhh ..."

Well, what's the matter with you, that you can't shift gears at that point? You know the pc's Havingness Process. All right. Your classic method of starting that would be to say, "Is it all right with you if I run some Havingness now?"

But if the pc is so dopey he couldn't even hear it, I don't waste the English. I would just say, "Point out something. Thank you. Point out something." And the pc does, you know. [laughter]

Get the pc back up into session again and say, "Well, all right. Are you withholding anything?"

"Oh, well, that's something else." Here we go.

A lot of you are saying, for instance, "The elements, the items found – the items found – are going in and out." Why do you say something like that? That's an odd thing to say.

No. Elements never go in and out. For them to go out, they would probably have to be audited or blown in some fashion that would be very arduous, so these items are not going out, but rudiments are. Rudiments are, which is cancelling the read.

In other words, rudiments are going in and out if an item goes in and out on its read. The item doesn't go in and out. The rudiments go in and out and cancel the item's read. That's all. You get the rudiments back in, the item is reading again.

Well, that doesn't mean that the *item* was going in and out. It wasn't, which gives you an entirely erroneous picture. You now – you now present the fact that an item is not the item. Why isn't it the item? Well, because it's disappearing and appearing. Well, that would be characteristic of a bad item, a poorly assessed item, sporadic read. You're not dealing with that at all. The rudiments are going in and out and cancelling the reads.

No, you don't say even that the item is being cancelled by rudiments out. You say rudiments are cancelling out the meter reads. See? The rudiments are cancelling the meter. That's proper. That is to say that's factual. That's what's happening.

So you're whizzing on down the line – you're whizzing on down the line auditing somebody – what are you going to run into? Well, how many parts are there to a human mind? And how many thinks can a person think, particularly if he's a thunky kind of thinker. Hm? How many?

You're liable to run into any one of them. You're either going to handle him with TR 4 as an origin or you're going to have to take them up and keep your session going. That doesn't mean you Q-and-A all over the place. You have to know whether or not something is out of session or in session or going to throw the pc out or something. You have to have an adjustment. You have to have an idea of what you're doing.

In order to accomplish what you're doing, however, move heaven and earth to get the pc down that particular *slot*. See, just do anything you can do to get the pc down the slot. The pc's trying to move away and you say, "There's the slot, see? That's the cliff and we want you to go to the edge of the cliff and jump off."

And the pc is saying, "I don't like the cliff and I don't like the edge of the cliff and it's going to take a lot more than an auditor to make me jump off the cliff."

And you say, "Good, well, how deep is it?"

Pc says, "Well, it's quite deep."

"Where you looking at it from?"

"Well, from up here at the edge," and so forth. And the pc says, "But I'm not going anywhere near that because another auditor ran that at some time or another and had a lot of trouble with it."

"Well, you got any withholds from that auditor?"

"Oh, yes. That I didn't want to run it. I just pretended to run it before."

"Good. Now, how deep is it? All right. *Jump. Thank you.*" [laughter]

No, sir. A pc hasn't got a prayer if an auditor is a good pony wrangler. He hasn't got a prayer.

Now, if a – if an auditor is that good so as to keep a pc rounded up at all times and headed in toward the slot the auditor wants him to be headed into, don't you think it'd also be a good idea if the auditor knew what slots to head the pc into? Don't you think that would be a good idea, huh?

If an auditor possesses all this horsepower that he can head the pc down this particular slot, then he certainly ought to know the slots. That's why you duplicate bulletins and things like that, so you get some idea where the slots are.

Of course, you take somebody that's been eighty-nine years a member of the Theosophy Society and two lives ago founded it, says, "Well, uh... *tsk!* Hubbard's a little bit wrong here. Actually, what he's talking about when he's talking about these black masses, he's talking about astral selves, which have begun to haunt the pc. And I know that, and so forth. And so obviously the thing to do is every short distance in the auditing session, why, we will put in this cancellation thing so the astral selves, you see, will dissolve and so forth and that will make it all work." And then he uses auditing techniques to head the pc down toward the astral selves slot.

Of course, there's no slot there, so the pc doesn't know where to go and everybody winds up in a – in a horrible bash. No, you've got to have a slot there for the pc to go into and

you got to know what the slot is and then you ride him into it and through it. And it's very easy to do if you're doing that.

Now, I'll give you an idea of auditing on your feet, auditing there on the spot. I've just given you a flow process.

All right. There are four flows.

One is outflow. And the other, of course, is *restrained* outflow, which you know as a *withhold*. That's all a withhold is, is a restrained outflow. That's number two. And then there's an inflow and there's a restrained inflow. That's very simple. These are all self-determined flows. They're the most easy flows for a pc or a thetan to self-determine.

Now, we have heretofore looked on the inflows as motivators and the prevented inflow as a sort of a motivator side of it. And that was very easy to do because these things are very snarled up. But mixed up inside the motivators, there was a pc self-determined action to make the inflow occur and a pc self-determined action to make the inflow not occur.

And of course, also, the pc's self-determined actions to make the outflow occur. Now, flows 3 and 4, which is the inflow and the restrained inflow, are not as important as the withhold and outflow.

Now, you handle the withhold and outflow all the time in a Security Check. You ask – on one hand you're asking, "What are you withholding?" and on the other hand you're asking, "What have you done?"

In other words, you've asked for the outflow and you've asked for the withhold. So you've asked for flows 1 and 2.

Now, you've got flows 3 and 4, however, still available; and although these are fainter flows, they nevertheless can be self-determined flows. A pc self-determines an inflow. Now, oddly enough, a pc can self-determine a bad inflow and can practically force you into making an auditing error because he has to have a good inflow. Good, nice ARC break is what he needs at the particular moment and he'll force you to inflow something. But he has something to do with it. In other words, however, the action is so much yours that you seldom notice that there was a self-determined action involved in it.

Now, he might have done this so he could thereafter outflow a make-you-guilty. So you've got these little, tiny inflow and braked inflows which are self-determined which are operative in a mass.

Now, you have this in the Flow Process.

You run the Flow Process fifty minutes. The reason you can't run it less, particularly early in sessions, is because it cycles too hard and it's too ridgy and it's too beefy. You can't run it slightly. It's got to be run heavily. I already tested that out. I originally thought that it would be ten minutes of the Flow Process and twenty minutes and ten minutes. But I've underestimated entirely the power of the process and the power of the process kicked it up that the minimum length of time the process can be run is about fifty minutes.

Now, that's all right because that gives you fifty minutes of that and it gives you twenty minutes of Sec Checking and ten minutes of Havingness and twenty minutes of Sec

Checking and ten minutes of Havingness and you've got ten minutes worth of rudiments before and after and you've got a two-hour session, which is fine.

Now, that is all very well, but understanding this mechanic of the four flows... Of course, you know, there are some more flows. That is, it doesn't exhaust all the flows there are. There are the flows from left to right and right to left and there are all four flows for somebody else – the pc determining the four flows for somebody else. And you could be determining them for England.

In other words, they could occur on the – on the third dynamic, you see. The pc's busily running "What should be outflowed? What should be inflowed?" and so on and he's running them for England. He isn't running them for himself. "What should be outflowed? Exports. What should be inflowed? Dollars," you know? "What inflow should be prevented? Jamaicans," you know. All kinds of wild things. Actual answers that came out of a session. Pc was running what should be inflowed, you know, and that sort of thing, and I was – and the answers were well, food, you know, all logically. And then exports. Exports? What's this, you know?

And three or four commands later, I suddenly realized the pc was running these for England. This was England. The pc ran out the whole British Isles in about eighteen or twenty commands. It was quite remarkable.

Now, you got a principle of four flows. I said there's the principles from right to left and left to right and the principles from bottom to top and top to bottom. And there's a lot of weird ones in that particular line. You could run into those on the basis of "What are you holding down?" and "What are you keeping from being held down?" And you see, you could get terribly involved in all this, but it isn't necessary to get that complicated to get an effect – get a proper auditing effect.

Supposing you were to use these things in session to keep the rudiments in. I'll show you something on the order of auditing on your feet and auditing by basic principle.

This pc says, "Well, I'm very tired of being audited."

And you say, "Do you have a withhold?"

Well, the pc – yes, the pc has a withhold. Withhold themselves from the session.

All right, good. We got that session withhold off and a couple of seconds later we have another session withhold and a couple of seconds later we have another session withhold, and there's just more session withholds than we can easily take off of the case.

Well, if there are four flows, don't you think that it would be a simple thing if you tripped one of the other flows that was causing the person to withhold?

So let's take as an auditing question, "Well, are you outflowing anything?"

"Yeah, auditing answers. I answer just one more of – these list items, you know. Just one more and you keep asking and asking and asking me these items. I – I – I – I – I – I – and I give you all the items there are and so forth."

"Well, good enough. Well, did you withhold any?"

"Well, a ton or two, of course. Had to," and so forth.

"All right."

Now, all of a sudden you'll find the pc isn't going to get a withhold every two seconds. See, you tripped the outflow that was causing the pc to withhold. See, it was actually the being demanded to outflow – the demand to outflow, you see, was what had the pc withholding.

You keep picking up the session withholds and getting the reads back in, but you had to keep picking them up all the time. And you're just mopping your brow, you know and "Aw, all right. There they went again," you know, and you've gone down three lines, null, null, null. They weren't null before. And one of those items didn't even vaguely look like it was going to null. All right, that's out.

Now, if you just say, "Are you withholding anything"

"Yes, well, I'm withholding. I'm just – well, no, no. Just – yes. A few minutes ago I thought..."

"All right. Good." Get it in and you're reading again, see. Well, you have to keep doing that unless you balanced up the flows someplace. There must be something else he is upset about.

All right. So we say – we say, "Are you outflowing anything?"

"Hell, yes. Can't you hear me?", you know? "I just had to outflow about four more of these things."

"Well, when did you decide that it was a rough thing to have to outflow?"

He said, "Well, early in a session. I don't like to mention this, by the way. I don't like to mention these – this particular item. After all, it isn't nice for a young girl to have to list a whole bunch of opposition terminals to a policeman. It's not seemly."

"When did you first think that?"

"Well, I just thought it ... just it was a bad thing to do and so on."

Of course, it is a specimen of withhold, isn't it? But nevertheless, it's the outflow they've been objecting to. All right. You get the objection to the outflow off and of course the tendency to withhold vanishes.

All right. Now, let's use another one of the flows.

You say, "Are you inflowing anything?"

And the person says, "Yes, auditing commands. If I just get one more auditing command ..."

And of course, your tendency is, of course, at once to ask why and to be concerned about your auditing, but that just shows that you're ignorant and stupid and a knucklehead and were born that way.

No, the person says auditing command – yes, they're inflowing auditing commands. One of the troubles people have with auditing is they don't realize that these things *blow* and they take them up after the pc has got rid of them.

In other words, a pc says, "Are you with – ." Auditor says, "Are you withholding anything?"

And the pc says, "Well, yes, I was withholding a critical thought about the nasal twang you were using in your auditing commands," and so forth and so forth.

And you, you knucklehead, all too often say, "Well, what is wrong with that?" or "What does that associate with?"

Look, the pc spat it out, there it is, you've got the withhold, it is now lying on the floor and it's totally doggo. If you jumped all over it, it couldn't be more dead, you see. And you carefully pick it up, attach an air hose to it, you see, and pump it up and put it back in the session.

See, it's just the basis of the – you don't believe the pc ever blows anything. The pc mentioned it and it's gone. The auditor is very often left stonied, you see, because the auditor gets in a bit of a games condition with the pc sometimes.

Well, he ought to take this up. The pc objects to his nasal accent, how in the name of common sense could he audit the pc? Well, it's all gone, you see. There isn't anything more on it. Let it lie. The Shakespearian phrase of "Let sleeping dogs lie" is "Let blown withholds and overts expire." Don't keep beating them to death because they're already dead. The pc blew 'em.

One of the ways to stop a pc from blowing is to take up everything he has blown after he has blown it. This is one of the nice ways to keep a pc from advancing because it's so innocent. Nobody ever quite notices what's happening.

The pc says something and the auditor takes it up. He doesn't do a TR 4 on it, you see. He takes it up. The pc says something else and that's blown now. He doesn't express an interest in it or something like that. The auditor doesn't. He wants to know, now, how he can remedy this situation.

This is the way you really stop a session, see: The pc has just had a cognition. Now, the auditor wants to know how he can remedy it. You almost train the pc never to have a cognition after a while because the auditor is going to take it up. That's what's called Q and A, normally.

Q and A is – covers a multitude of situations of this particular character and that isn't exact Q and A. But you watch; it's a specialized kind of it. See, "Well, I just was having trouble because a nasal accent always upsets me."

"Well, when did you first withhold that?"

"Oh, I don't know. I thought that several days ago."

"Well, all right. Have you thought it often since?"

"Yes, yes, I have."

"All right. Well, that's fine. Thank you."

That would be everything that you could do. That would be sort of polishing it off, you know and buffing it up and putting out a piece of velvet and setting it in the middle of the velvet, you see and turning a couple of spotlights on it, you see.

Everything you could possibly do is done in just that little phraseology I just told you, see?

Oh, no. Some auditors won't do that.

They say, "Well, did you ever know anybody that had a nasal accent? Did anybody in your family speak with a nasal accent? When you were in the army, did you ever notice anybody with a nasal accent? Do you yourself ever use a naval accent?"

And then the auditor suddenly wakes up and realizes he's talking about naval accents and the pc is talking about nasal accents and it's all – it's all bogged down somewhere. And then the auditor has an ARC break and the pc doesn't take it up and that's the end of the session. [laughter, laughs]

See, but that is a common error. Sometimes even the best auditor is startled into this error. He's just momentarily startled. It just took him a little bit off guard. It was something new and he has a tendency himself to satiate his own curiosity with regard to this sort of thing.

He's sometimes trapped into this one, but my God, don't make it a habit, you know, that every time the pc blows something, hand it back to the pc and say, "Did you lose this?" [laughter, laughs] Anyway, in handling this sort of thing, you could say to a pc, "All right. Now, have you inflowed anything?" Or "Have you prevented an inflow in this session?"

"Yeah, I'm sitting here waiting for that picture – that picture to – to move the other way."

"Oh." The pc hadn't mentioned this picture before, see. Prevented an inflow. There's the picture.

"Well, how long has the picture been there?"

"Oh, well, I don't know. It's been a long, long time."

"All right. Well, when did you first start preventing that inflow?" Not "What is in the picture?" I'll clue you. That's wrong. That's wrong. That's a gross auditing error. It'd be, "Well, when did you first prevent that inflow?"

See, on any flow line, you want to know when is it first and has it been going on for very long. You just want to know this in order to get their attention to pick up the – an early one. You don't want the first one. If you're auditing withholds or something, for heaven's sakes, get the first one. Get the first tiny glimmering as it came out of the divine ether into the pc's left eardrum, see. For heaven's sakes, just *hound it down* with the meter, *pin it down* in time and find out what color the clock was painted.

In other words, go the limit if you're doing something that is utterly dependent on this. If that's the channel you're driving the pc into and no other channel, well, for heaven sakes, be thorough.

But you are going down into channel Q and you're trying to get a list assessed. And all of a sudden you ask the pc something like this and the pc says, "Yes and it's that picture and I'm trying for that."

"Well, have you been preventing that long? All right. When was that? Yeah. Have you done it many times since? Thank you very much. All right. Thank you." And go on with the list because it'll now be reading. You get the idea?

In other words, when you're driving them into channel Q, don't change your mind and try to get him over here into this other channel. You weren't heading for that way. That's what Q-and-A really is.

Pc dives for channel G and the auditor, who has heretofore been heading for channel Q, immediately reverses his monowheel bicycle and goes clear across to the other side of the plain and heads down what he thinks the pc's channel is, you see.

In other words, he doesn't keep on with what he's doing at all. He does something else. Now, these are the lick-and-a-promise sort of thing and the way you handle the flow on a lick and a promise is just *bang, bang*.

All right. "Are you?" see? "When?" "How often?" "How is it?" That's just about the limit of it. You don't go any further into it than that. That's it. It's blown.

Now, you've actually got four flows that you could monkey with on this basis of keeping rudiments in and you'd find every one of them would trigger some kind of a rudiment.

Pc who's sporadically getting rudiments out has got a flow off that you were not asking about. Now, that gives us a question. On beginning rudiments, do we do something on this order? Do we say, "Well, all right. Are you withholding anything? Are you outflowing anything? Are you inflowing anything? And if you – are you holding off any inflow?" Yeah, it predicates that you very well might do something like that.

It would certainly give you all the pcs you would ever audit. Pcs have to outflow. They have to inflow. They have to prevent inflows, you see. And they often think they have to withhold. So that's the score.

It'd be perfectly legitimate, in other words, to balance out a person's flows with a simple question. Or with two questions. Or with all four questions relating to those flows. It's just what is this pc doing that he isn't communicating about? That is what the final analysis is. So it all comes under the head of a withhold.

But which direction is the withhold? See? Don't get lost on this and think that it is because the pc is outflowing that has got everything upset. It is because the pc is withholding his resentment and expression of that resentment that he is outflowing. You got that? See?

It is not that the pc is inflowing your auditing commands. It's the pc has not bothered to communicate to you that he sometime since has started to resist the inflow of your auditing commands, that he has not communicated. That is the button that is off, see?

The pc has noticed for some time that there was a cold draft of air coming in some portion of the room and the pc is trying mentally to hold off the cold draft of air and it is not holding off the cold draft of air that is going to do anything to the session. It is the fact that he has not told you about it and that you haven't found out about it that has got the session off

So you'd say there are four flows you could find out about in clearing up things and making lists read. And those four flows will just be the four flows that are the four flows. And of course, it's withholding data about any one of the four flows that is the most aberrative thing to the session. So withhold is still king, but you have to remember these other things that go along with it.

All right. You could straighten up a pc and keep a session running under almost any circumstances providing one thing were present: an actual desire to assist the pc and to keep the pc in communication with you. Not necessarily to communicate with the pc but certainly necessarily to keep the pc in communication with you. That is more important than communicating to the pc, although that has some importance, too. You see, you can be communicating to the pc, but the pc isn't communicating to you.

Now, an auditor can interfere with a pc's communication to him in various ways. There are things called obsessive withholds on other people. The cop is totally inspired in all of his duties in restraining people from undergoing dramatizations of these mad impulses known as kleptomania, homicide and other Latin phrases which all mean "a mess," see? And those are all getting somebody else to withhold.

Now, the tax collector, of course, is up against an entirely different problem and he has to get people to outflow. So if you have an auditor who has a tax-collector background, why, probably they keep the pc talking forever and if you have an auditor who has customarily been a cop, why, he won't let – ever let the pc say a word.

And actually an auditor can function so as to shut off the pc's communication line. Not to keep the pc going down a channel, but just because pcs mustn't talk.

Now, auditors always talk too much. That's one of the earliest criticisms I ever uttered of auditors. They always talk too much. An auditor always says too much. This is – this is true.

You look back over a session and you won't be able to find places where you didn't, ordinarily, speak when you should have, but you will find several places where you should have kept your ruddy mouth shut. If you'd just kept your mouth shut, it would have been all right. You can always find those as you review a session. So the point of the thing is, is some nice adjudication on the part of the auditor.

Havingness is defined as that which a person believes he can reach. And no-havingness is defined as something that a person can't reach or doesn't permit itself to be reached. So an auditor who is talking too much, too roughly, too crossly, interfering too much with the session appears to be a confused area into which the pc cannot reach and therefore the pc cannot talk into this confused area and the pc simply clams up. It doesn't matter how (quote) "interested" the auditor appears to be. It doesn't matter how the pc this or the auditor's

this or that or the other thing or whether or not the auditor is monitoring the session with his little finger raised forty-five degrees or sixty degrees. None of those things would count.

It's just that the auditor appears to be such an enturbulated area that the pc could not possibly reach into that area. If the pc has this sensation about the auditor then the auditor is simply making too much confusion for the pc.

Now, in that pcs very often can't have much anyhow, a slight confusion and too much yap on the part of the auditor can cut the pc's havingness down and the pc will dope. See, any communication was almost too much communication for the pc.

Well, that means the auditor is out. "Who would I have to be to audit you? What don't I know about you?" Processes of that kind. Clean this up, you see? But it's a very bad thing for an auditor to use the auditor's body in any way in the session, by the way. That's a good tip for you. It's just bum, bum auditing for the auditor to call attention, for instance, to his body as a part of Havingness. For instance, you're running "notice that" and so forth and call attention to the auditor's body. That's just poor auditing in general.

However, regardless of that, a rather interesting phenomenon can be observed with a pc who has believed the auditor is too enturbulative to reach into.

Just tell the pc, "Put your hand on my shoulder. Thank you. Put your hand on my shoulder. Thank you."

All of a sudden, the pc smiles and that's fine. You say, "All right. End of that process."

That's never good to use the auditor's body in this lineup at all, but I'm just giving you that as an example. Give the pc the illusion of being able to reach the auditor and the havingness of the auditor picks way up. And what is more demonstrable by that than the fact that he could put out his hand actually and reach into the auditor's zone.

The pc finds this out and all of a sudden he's got an auditor. Now, when you have people around who are terrified of anybody coming into their zone and they say or attempt auditing, of course, they put the pc on – in an odd frame of mind.

Now, the auditor who is trying to make the pc obsessively withhold "because everybody should withhold, because we know how to control life and we know how life should operate. If everything withheld everywhere, then life would be okay, wouldn't it?" Well, anybody who is operating on that as a sole modus operandi, of course, makes a poor auditor because every time the pc speaks, the auditor makes the pc guilty for speaking. And "Boo," you know. "How dare you?" you know?

"All right. How tall is a bear?"

The pc says, "Six feet."

And the auditor says, "HMMMMM. Are you sure you answered the auditing command? Oh, you are. All right. Good."

You know, builds up high ARC. [laughs]

Now, just as you have that mechanism, so you have the other mechanism, which is the auditor to – into whose zone nobody must ever reach. Nobody must ever reach into the auditor's zone because the auditor should run away. You see, the proper thing to do is to run away. And you will find the auditor changing the auditing process as a symptom of running away and doing many other things, all of which are classifiable under running away.

See, punish the pc for reaching or run away to keep the pc out of your zone of area. These are all basic auditing error mechanisms. And where those are going on, you will discover that the pc is more aware of it than the auditor. The pc just knows he isn't getting an auditing session. That's the way the pc sums it up. See, when he says something, it's never taken up. When he tries to do something, it's somehow or another handled. And when he tries to speak, he's prevented from speaking, you see? When he asks the auditor something, the auditor isn't there.

And all of this sums up to is, of course, out of communication in some fashion which then sums up for the pc of an inability to talk to the auditor which is unintentional. See, he's on an unintentional withhold all the time because he can't talk to the auditor. The auditor's putting him on a continuous withhold.

Well, if he's into that kind of a condition, why, of course, the auditor doesn't have the pc in-session and we get rather poor auditing. There's numerous mechanisms I could mention in this particular line, but those are the principal mechanisms which make an auditor have trouble. It's not that the pc gets these ideas but that the auditor fosters them.

Oddly enough, a pc – how you could ever have trouble with a pc, I wouldn't ever know. That does exceed my reality. When I tell people to sit down and do something, they always sit down and do it. Whether I have to pick them up and put them bodily in the chair or fast-talk them into the chair or sweet-talk them into the chair or whatever I have to do and then to get it done, they always do it, see. And it just never enters my head that they won't. So therefore, it really never enters theirs.

I'm perfectly willing to carry out the auditing command on the pc, see, whereas perhaps other auditors are more willing to have the pc carry out the auditing command. Now, I'm perfectly willing to carry it out on the pc. I have no illusions about the pc's bank. I know I have more control over it than he does. It doesn't scare me, so let's roll.

And the only thing that ever upsets me is when a pc starts out intentionally to give me loses. And I can even cure a pc of that. But I think that's the one thing that pcs do occasionally. They just set out to give you a lose, you know, give you another lose, give you another lose. I don't like that. And I'm not above punishing them. Drop them in an engram and say, "Well, it's getting awfully late. Don't you think we ought to end session?" But that's a bum thing to do. But then, I'll be human someday.

Anyway, the difficulties that you have as an auditor actually are basically of your own creation and they stem from using ritual to avoid auditing and various things of this character. And there is no substitute for just sitting down, taking the pc, sitting there and you audit his case and you use what you know about the human mind and so forth and putting it in the most optimum form and the most optimum presentation you can for that pc, just get that session

rolling, fix it up, find it, what it is, tape it all out, square it up, *bang!* There it is. Write it down on the auditing report.

The pc always says, "Boy, that was a wonderful session, you know. And *woooooee*, you know."

Ah, it wasn't any different from any other session, but it was for the pc. And auditing was intended and if that's all you intend to do with a pc is audit them and improve them, *voilà*, you'll always have good sessions.

But if you've got other considerations entering your mind continuously, of pcs should be better than they are, they should be worse than they are. This pc is too tall; we will make this pc thinner, therefore and so on. And we're not really auditing the pc but sitting back in some long stream of criticism of the pc of some kind or another. Well, I don't know what could happen. There'd be ten thousand things that you could do. It'd be impossible for your Instructors to enumerate the number of ways of doing auditing wrong.

The easiest thing in the world is to articulate how to do auditing right. Audit. Only one word. And it all really comes out all right. And you vacillate from trying too hard to not trying hard enough and so forth. And when you get too baffled and too confused and you don't know what to do about it and you just think it's all up in smoke every way you possibly can think of, why, just remember what I've told you. Well, audit and I'm sure it'll come out all right.

Thank you.

TRAINING: DUPLICATION

A lecture given on

24 January 1962

Thank you very much. It's not deserved; I've been very mean to several of you in the last day or two; very, very mean, with good results.

Okay. What is this?

Audience: 24th.

It's the 24th of Jan. AD 12 – 1962 – in the Year of Our Travail, especially yours.

All right. Now, I have some good news for you.

Going to sit down in this lecture, if you don't mind.

But I have some very, very good news for you, some excellent news for you; that if you were beaten over the head, tortured, treated with sarcasm, hammered and pounded and generally abused, you eventually decide to find out – you go past, you see, merely attacking Ron, you see, that breaks down and you go past that, and you say, "Well now, if this much fuss is being made about it, maybe there is a right way to do it," and so you try that for a while and nothing much happens. And then if you are hammered and pounded and beaten some more, then you decide to do it right, and then all of a sudden there's tremendous dawning on every hand that there was something here. And that has just happened on this good day of our Dianetics in 1962. This just happened.

Several of you in just the last session you ran discovered that 3D Criss Cross worked like crazy; just discovered it – brand-new discovery. Some of you have not made that discovery yet, but many of you – the majority that were having any difficulty with this – all of a sudden it dawned that there was something here and that it did work and that the session ran like a hot bomb, and all became suddenly well.

Now, the old-time student here who has had a great deal of training – I will say this, a great deal of training shows up along these lines – got results with 3D Criss Cross at once. The second it was presented to them they started getting results with 3D Criss Cross, which is quite interesting, see. They looked it over, they said "That's okay," they started listing and everything, and the next thing you know, they were getting results with it.

But those of you who have just come up to the nervous state of newly created IIb didn't measure up this well. And you've been floundering and falling on your heads now for the better part of two weeks. It has been pretty gruesome. I mean I have actually suffered for you. I didn't suffer for the PC. I can always straighten out a PC. If I can straighten out a PC, why, I don't worry about the PC particularly. But I suffered for the poor auditor, sitting there doing

exactly what he was told (if doing it backwards), and with Ron shouldering the total responsibility of it all going bad because it probably didn't work, suddenly waking up, deciding to do it right, and then the second step: finding out that it worked like mad.

Now, that is quite a win. That is a win for me. However, it tends to validate this system of activity, a system of activity which begins with apathy. See, you confront somebody in apathy, "Nothing works anyway and there is no way to do anything right anyhow. But if you did do it right nothing would happen, because there isn't any way to do it right because nothing would happen if you did do it right."

Now, it is sometimes necessary in action to throw a bit of a hand grenade into that particular type of activity and just say "Yow, yow, yow!" outrageously, you see? Say, "Well, look a'here. You're only writing on one side of your auditor's report."

And the person says, "Well, yes, of course I'm only writing on one side of the auditor's report, and all auditors do, don't they?"

"Well, they mostly do, but you shouldn't, you see?" And then, "You should have known better than that, see? It has never been published or released, so you should have known about it." Expect the student to have picked it all up telepathically, expect the thing to have sort of leaked in through the pores by association with the tile, or something like that, you see? Doesn't much matter.

Now, this is very pertinent to you in the training of Class IIs. When you start training Class II auditors you should recognize this for what it's worth, and it's a little lesson that I could teach you on the subject of raising hell. That's the title of the lesson, "Raising Hell."

Now, there are two ways you could get somebody out of apathy, see? They don't know and there is no right way to do it and there are probably no results anyway. Now, there's two ways to approach this problem. One is on the route of making auditors and the other is on the route of auditing. Now, the way you make auditors differs entirely, of course, from the way you audit PCs.

There are two routes here that we employ, not necessarily for the betterment of cases but for getting the job done. Of course the net result of all this is the betterment of all cases, but there are two routes that we actually employ and you should recognize these as distinctly different routes. And the first of these is where a person is concerned as an auditor. And we have always had a bit of line on this, and you found in an Academy in the old days where they didn't have this policy in force they made very bad auditors. Wow! Terrible! And that was this type of an approach: "Well, we know you can't audit because you have a case, and we'll try to patch your case up, and if we get your case up, why, then maybe some day you will be able to audit." That type of approach does not work in the making of auditors. Just write it down to that.

You see, if we admitted that the auditor had a case then nobody on this whole planet would ever be sprung. Do you see that? So this is just a piece of arbitrary snarl. Do you see? This datum must not be true! It isn't that it is true or isn't true, it just must not be true! See, there's no logic to it at all. It just must not be true, because otherwise you would never bail anybody out of anything because there would never be anybody to audit him. And true

enough, over the years watching Academies that practiced the idea, "if we..." – the D of T, if he had the idea that "If we just processed all these students and somehow or another if I just gave them all a little bit of a case gain, and I got them all in shape so they could confront their PC and if I could get their cases from getting in their roads, why, then I could make them into auditors."

And this goes out as far as this: "If we only let 'good' people into the Academy..." We don't know what this "good" person is. He lurks out someplace under the rhododendrons or someplace but he never seems to have come near any organization to date, this "good" person, you see? "Now if you could just get 'good' people," that's the other song you hear, but that's just a little bit of a downgrade. Immediately after you hear this "good" people action the next tune that you hear being played on the out-of-tune street piano is "If we just could audit all of the cases in the Academy, why, then, you see, they would all be able to audit." And they of course have propounded a piece of nonsense.

You see, if there's nobody to audit all these cases in the Academy, how the hell are they ever going to get audited? And you don't have an Academy at all, you have an HGC. So this quickly defeats itself as a philosophy.

So very early, I think it was about the 7th ACC, this philosophy was entered into the training of auditors. And the philosophy is workable; it is not necessarily true, it is not necessarily easy, it is not necessarily kind, sweet or good. It simply works and it is in a workable line, true. But it's only a workable truth. And that is, simply, "Auditors do not have cases," period. That is the one thing that we must insist on.

Now, it goes as far as this, that if he's slightly warm and you can see a mist on a mirror held against his mouth, [laughter] he or she is in shape to audit. If they can be dragged to the chair and if an E-meter can be propped up in their vicinity, they're in condition to audit. This goes to a total extremity. They could be sitting there with both legs cut off from a street accident, but they are in shape to audit. That's it. That's just it.

It's like when nations get down to the last – they're getting the conscripts from their 14-year-old class, you know, and the 72-year-old class and the 14 year-old class; anybody who dares walk back in through, you see, from hospitals or anything else, anybody who dares come anywhere near the assembly officers who are putting together new regiments, you see, is instantly just stamped hugely "FIT FOR COMBAT," see? We don't get it from that particular thing, but it just gives you the idea.

Now, when time goes on and a nation gets more fit to work, they start then saying "Well, this person is not fit for combat and should be audited," and that sort of thing. But let me call something to your attention: that we are not a nation but we are certainly a people, and this is very germane.

We are not in that condition today where we can say "Well, let's take this person and let's audit him for a while, and maybe he'll learn how to audit some day and – you know, if we get his case out of the road, why, maybe he can audit." We're not in that condition. We're not that wealthy. See, we're just not that wealthy in people, nor are we that far advanced along the lines. So this datum not only has been true but will be true for quite a while.

Now, oddly enough this is a workable philosophy, totally workable as a philosophy. It does work, and today is one of those days when I have seen this philosophy work. Some people with Class IIB who are so far from clear they would have to have a moonshot to comprehend it (I'm talking about cases now, see, just casewise, bluuuhh! see?) have actually been driven in toward the absorption of data, the regularities of practice, to an actual recognition that what they were doing ended in a very, very powerful, fine gain for the PC, and that they could do it. That's much more important. Now, this is one of those days when that philosophy has worked out.

Now, I don't say that you're in horrible condition. I'd say when you get some processing and so forth you will probably get up to being in horrible condition. [laughter]

Compare the way you – the condition that you were in a couple of trillion years ago, or 500 trillion or something like that, whatever the outrageous figure might be, and you're not in such good shape these days, you know? And for you to actually start putting together a being – not a human being, anybody can put together a human being. You just take some electronic shock waves and some implants and kick him and destroy all their self-determinism, then destroy other-determinism, and then racket him between destroyed self-determinism and destroyed other-determinism, and you fix him up real good and get them to accumulate all masses and never as-is anything, and you've got a human being.

All right, so you just – it'd be no virtue to make one of those. Let's move it up just a little bit further – but to make a functional being, to take a big seven-league boot stride in the direction of making a functional being. Now, that has happened, and that's just happened just in the last couple of days. This sort of thing has been coming up. I'm very happy about this because it's far more significant than you might realize at first glance. It means that the thing can be bootstrapped.

Now, we expect somebody that's been under training for a half a year of heavy duress and so forth to be able to pick up a process and be able to do it, but I was very proud when those older students just did that and were able to do that and just kicked it off from the starting line and that was it.

Well, that was a little victory in itself, but it was not particularly a victory for this other philosophy because they have had good case gains and they are a long ways from where they were. The other people who have just come up to Class IIB had not had very significant case gains yet and they were able to do it. Now, that was very important.

Well, you see, this philosophy works, and it's a distinct philosophy: If he's warm he can audit. Get the idea? And that you can actually bring enough pressure to bear and enough training to bear on an individual so that he actually can do a properly laid out comprehension and action as far as the PC is concerned and arrive with a tremendously significant result.

Now, that's a victory, because if that weren't true we as a people would never make it. We'd just never make it, that's all. There would be a few able guys and they would quickly go out the bottom through auditing seven and a half hours a day. I've already scolded two or three Saint Hill graduates who have left and who all of a sudden sat down to a grind of auditing of about seven and a half hours a day and just didn't do anything else, didn't really bother to train anybody or try to pick it up or push it through. They were just going to audit people,

audit people, audit people, audit people – well, they can't audit enough people to do any good. It's just a spot in the ocean.

Now, if you looked around you would find out that there aren't on earth at the present moment enough auditors to give enough sessions to enough people to make any significant gain in the society at large in the next century. The mathematics are all against it. If you never made one more auditor, if we just took the auditors we had at this particular moment and everybody audited hammer and tongs, seven and a half hours a day for the next ten years or something like that, you add it up and you compare it to the world's population and you get a drop in the bucket. It's a discouragingly small amount. And if we never trained another auditor, the auditors that had been trained would have long since gone by the boards before they even got halfway through the population of New York City. You see, the mathematics are dead against it.

Don't think that you, with your auditing, cannot make a change in the society. You certainly can, you certainly can, but you would be making actually a rico and a pobre society. In other words, you'd be making the society of the rich and the poor, the aristocracy and the slaves, and so forth. It wouldn't help but do that, because of course you could pick out people here and there and put them into terrific condition and never fix it up so they're ever backed up, see? Well, they – oh yeah! They've got a big zone of influence, that's for sure! And they'll get things done, that's for sure; but let me assure you they would not, all of them, be tempered by the peculiarities that I suffer from which is that man should be free. Not even after you'd audited them would they suffer from that peculiarity uniformly, let me assure you. That just wouldn't be done.

And give it a decade, give it two decades, something like that, and they would be starting to get a little bit impatient. Enough victims would have been deposited on their doorstep for them to start erecting the stocks and the whipping posts. The next thing you know, we'd find we had two or three classes of citizen. We would have the clear and the slave, you know? We'd divide the whole society up in some kind of a line. It would just be forced upon us to do this.

That is actually a very dangerous direction in which to proceed because that direction has always led civilizations into decay and chaos. There is no such thing as a successful civilization which is made out of slave masters and slaves. I assure you that it is not successful. It's never been successful and it never will be successful. Now, it's attractive and it can be practical but it's not successful. It has no great duration and it doesn't make anybody much happier.

So this is quite interesting from a point of view of a long look. Very few of you ever give a long look to Scientology, you leave that up to me to a marked degree. Well, thank you; but when I look in the crystal ball and look up the line a century I can see a number of pictures presenting themselves, a number of aspects of what might come of all this. And don't think you can fire a shot of this volume and magnitude in a planet of this type without creating an effect. It might be a slow effect, just to the degree, you see, that it is practical. Its speed actually is determined not by the inertia of the masses but by the efficiency and effectiveness of what you're doing. And you can't let go of something like this in a society or a world of this

type or size without having repercussions that don't just go up a century. They'll be still racking up the line until this planet is a billiard ball.

Now, it might become a billiard ball sooner than you think. But not all of you will forget Scientology even if you go to another planet. So you see we've never fired this shot silently or without effect, you see?

I'm not degrading what you, yourself, as one person can do. But if you're going to do the job fully and wholly or do the job effectively, then the job will be done rather swiftly; and in doing the job relatively fast you save many of the cataclysmic aspects of what might happen because of the entrance upon this scene of Scientology. In other words, the more rapidly you do it the better the job is done. It's just like auditing a PC.

You see in one PC the world at large, you see? He is the microcosm and the world is the macrocosm; and you see that what is happening to a PC – you know that if you audit him slowly and poorly he makes thuhh, and he goes duhhh, and he gets a little bit better and in about two or three days he says, "Well, maybe I'll make it. Maybe I'll bla-bla-blah ..." and all of a sudden he doesn't feel so well, and so on; he didn't get much of a result and he slows down and goes into third gear, and he puts it all on the back burner, and so forth. Well, those fits and starts would be the fits and starts of the track of the civilization in which we live if we did not approach this problem effectively and do it with fair effectiveness.

And part of that effectiveness is make enough auditors. Now, you're not enough auditors. You just aren't enough auditors, that's all. There just aren't enough. We're not against a quantitative proposition here particularly, but when I say "auditor" I mean somebody who merely audits. You have to combine in your repertoire the ability to train auditors and then you're enough, then you become enough auditors, don't you see? Right away, just the people in this room would be enough auditors if they trained auditors. And providing you did your job superlatively well and you knew how to make an auditor do his job superlatively well, you see, if you knew that, then you – with that kind of progress you would wind up with enough auditors. Then you could do the job, you see? That could be done. But not otherwise.

I know I myself at times have felt rather muscular – mentally muscular – and have stood up baring my breast to the tirades and freakeries of fate and fortune and have said, "Well, this is enough. Just – I could do this all by myself, you know, just standing on my head, you know? No help at all. I'd just do it all by myself. That's easy, you know?" I just felt tough that day, you know? And before noon I didn't feel so tough. [laughs]

Now, in my particular levels of training and background I would have perhaps, not necessarily, but perhaps more reason than you to believe that I could do the job all by myself, see? I have done jobs all by myself and they were not necessarily easy jobs. Now, I did get away with them. I don't think I could do this one all by myself, see? Different type of job, it goes out in terms of longevity. It embraces many more lives and beings than anything else that's been attempted in this corner of the universe for a very long time.

Well now, the better it is done, the more rapidly it is done, the more effectively it is done, why, the smoother forward track it will have.

So therefore you are busy learning to audit. You are busy learning to audit and in that you are making progress and that's very, very good progress. We do not have here the facilities much to train you how to teach auditors, but by training you we can certainly give you a model and you'll know how to handle somebody else when you're training them, and maybe you'll profit by some of the mistakes we have made.

But don't try to profit in the direction of being kind. Don't try to profit in the direction of "If we just process him then he will be able to audit." Don't profit in that direction because there's no profit to be had there. If he's alive he can audit. He walked into the PE Course, he is a long-term Christian Scientist, until he got so many overts on Christian Science that he became a Rosicrucianist, and then had too many overts against Rosicrucianism to remain anything but a theosophist, and has arrived to prove that Scientology doesn't work. You can make him audit. You could teach him to audit; you really could.

But now we're getting to a dividing line: Why that many handicaps on the auditor, see? Why go quite that far afield to teach somebody to audit? No, there are people around you at once, in your immediate vicinity, that could be taught to audit well and those are the people to put lots of time in on. They are the people to put time in on, because if you make them very good auditors, of course they can make auditors. And it is better to have – right now, the way we're going – it is better to have a lot of crackerjack auditors than an awful lot of very mediocre auditors. See, that's better. And you sometimes look over "Who are you going to spend time on?" Well, the natural impulse is to take this bird I just described who has so many overts on Christian Science that they had to take off into Rosicrucianism, got so many overts on Rosicrucianism that they became a theosophist, and have wandered in to prove that Scientology doesn't work. Well, now this character...

Well, unfortunately you could make a tremendous error, and do you know that instructors will do this? Even an instructor here, now and then, catches himself; fortunately he catches himself doing it. He's so outraged by the performance he sees in front of him that he gives that person more time than he gives the apt auditor who needs just a little bit more coaching to do a very fine job. Instead of that he'll give this total dud, you see, a tremendous amount of time and pressure trying to get them up to a high level of mediocrity.

Remember that, when you're training auditors, take those that are very apt and give them most time. See, that's the way to go about it; and let the others drift along. Let them drift along. They've got a certain rate of absorption. And it isn't that you should let them go. You shouldn't let this fellow go; oh no, oh, nothing like that, see? You might put him... downgrade him a little bit in the zone or area in which he's being trained but you don't forget about him. But he plods along at a certain rate and that certain rate has very little to do with anything you're trying to teach him. He's just kind of slobby.

For anybody to assign the length of time it takes for somebody to learn something is adventurous. It can't ever be factual. I'll give you an experiment in this. Take one datum and try to teach it to somebody with the old educational processes of the 17th ACC. Those were very interesting processes, by the way. Try to teach him this datum. Take any datum in Scientology, say it to him and have him repeat it. This is the simplest of all these; just say it and have him repeat it, you see, and say it and have him repeat it, and then say it and have him tell

you what it is all about, you know, by giving you an example of it. You say it, he gives you an example of it. That is the wildest thing you ever did with anybody. That is quite incredible. As simple as this mechanism is, it has considerable horsepower and it is a very interesting thing. I have seen that datum move a very tough case, by the way. That was what was interesting about those educational processes. They were very limited in that they didn't move very many cases, but they could knock aside this "no effect" proposition on training.

Now, I recommend those to you. We actually don't have any students bad enough to start chugging in with these educational processes, and assign somebody to say a datum and he's supposed to say the datum back, and then he says the datum and they make an example, or any of the combinations of those processes. There were about three of them. But they're awfully good for the fellow you have despaired of utterly; they are much better than auditing. You assign a student to teach him with this system, you know? You of course don't have to use Scientology data. You can say, "The cat is black. All right, now tell me 'The cat is black.'"

And the fellow says, "Well, there are a number of instances I could think of where a cat wouldn't be black."

And you say, "All right, good, good. But now, now just tell me this one datum, 'A cat is black.'" And you'll finally get them to actually be able to – you say something, they can say something.

And then the second grade of that is you say something and they can understand it. In other words, let them duplicate the words and then let them duplicate the understanding. You in essence are doing this in training, only you're doing it live. You see, you're doing it all the way. You read a bulletin and then you go in and see Mike. Of course some of you – some of you wish you hadn't but that's all part of the game. And – I didn't manufacture Mike's 3D-terminal package [laughter], but I, I probably couldn't have done a better job than he's done.

But look a-here, he's not trying to be unreasonable with you; he's just trying to get you to do one thing – that's the one step of the educational process.

In essence what is happening is this: I have said something to you and then he's trying to find out if you can duplicate it. And don't think this isn't therapeutic. It is! It jolly well is! But we're not interested in it from a therapy line. We're interested in it from the basis of the communication of a datum, and you get, finally, so that you can actually take a datum and so on.

Now let's look at this. This process has been going on for six months or more with some of the older students here. And 3D came out incomplete, not well stated, just brrupt! you know, and that's it. And they did it at once and got results with it at once. In other words, it took them – oh, perhaps 10 minutes to understand it; this is length of time to look at it and read it. I mean it was that fast, you see, and they could put it into action and they could do something with it, and all of a sudden this happened. Well, this doesn't mean that they've become puppetized, it simply means that their ability to duplicate it has now gone over into a second stage – understand – because of course they weren't given any data to duplicate.

Now, you look at the original issue of 3D, of the original mention of 3D that was given to you. Why, the first mentions of it are just some scribbles in the case histories, you

know, in the case folders, the first mentions of it, and then there's a rather incomplete description of 3D Criss Cross that doesn't amount to a hill of beans, and then there's class rumor.

Well, what I'm showing you is there was practically nothing there to duplicate in the way of wording, and yet these people had actually gotten to this point, where they not only could duplicate the datum that was said to them but they could get a – what this was and they could understand what this datum was and put it into use. Now, look at that as a considerable gain, and look at it for just what it is, as a gain, a training gain. And that's quite remarkable.

Now, the comm lag on others who hadn't had that much training has been something on the order of ten days to two weeks, to first duplicate the wording – and complain because there wasn't any wording, don't you see? They were still in a step where they had to have the exact words. And then finally, it took an amplification of a bunch of exact words and a lot of individual notations in case folders for them all of a sudden to do what they were doing and get a result, and the understanding is dawning. See, that's slightly different action.

Do you see this as a training mechanism? Do you see where this winds up as a training mechanism? Do you see what its stages are? In other words, your first gradient of the thing is no comprehension of the words. This is your first gradient, see, no comprehension of the words. Now, it's quite shocking to find that morale is suffering, and all sorts of things are going wrong in some HGCs, by being made to exactly duplicate a bulletin. Do you see where they are there? Do you see where they are on the training step?

It would not matter, by the way, as far as their ability to learn was concerned – let's look this over. Let's say we were just trying to increase a person's ability to learn. Learning rate – that was the only thing we were trying to increase. Let's just think of that, see.

It wouldn't matter if we were teaching them automotive assembly books; you know, manuals used in Detroit for the assembly of automobiles, to a person who is never going to assemble an automobile and has never assembled one and hasn't even played with toy cars. See, it wouldn't matter if we were doing that. Or the "Works Progress Administration History of Socialism and its Development in the Northern Part of Arizona," you know, there's probably volumes of books on that. They paid them – they paid them if they got out some stacks of paper to – on the Works Progress Administration. They'd get somebody who was out of work, so they made sure he didn't do any because otherwise he would have been in work, and all he had to do was pile up old clippings and papers, you see? They didn't have to relate to anything. And then at government expense they were published between very thick covers in very heavy volumes, and they were quite available for a while. You could get them to hold up corners of desks where the leg was missing, you know, and they were very useful; but they were the most non sequitur nowhere as far as data was concerned you ever cared to cast your eye over. We could use that, do you see?

We could use the "Legal Code of the Early Church of England as Interpreted by the Catholic Church." We could! I don't care what you're using, as long as there's some data stated. Doesn't matter how much dunnage or how little dunnage as long as there's some data studied. Is data there to study? You would still do this. You'd still use this as learning rate.

You see where we are? See, we'd read it off. We'd have the individual sitting there and we would read it off to the individual. This would be the stylized auditor type of approach on

this, and we would say, "All the churches of Northumbria were deprived of their windows because of a window tax which was three and six per window per sabbatical." ("Sabbatical." That's what it said, see.) And we tell the individual, "All right, say that." You know? "Now, what did I just say?" you know?

And he'd say, "The window tax – window tax? What about window tax is this? What's sabbatical mean? What's this? Yeah. What book are you reading, anyway? Where did this come from? What part of Northumbria are you talking about?" You get all this confusion? And you've got an example now of your first step.

As you try to merely get him to repeat a line of sounds (you don't even call them words, you see?) he gets tremendous confusion. So your first step – your first state in which the person is in is one of tremendous data confusion which blows off at any attempt to duplicate data. So it blows off at once that there's an attempt to duplicate data on his part, he starts blowing off this confusion. "Northumbria? What Northumbria? What sabbatical? Two and six? Two and six window ta- but who would have been taxing them? Uh – who – what tax? What is a tax? Was there anybody taxing anybody at that particular time?" Now you get down to the communist level of this, we would have had a communist cell meeting to discuss whether or not capitalists should exist, you see, because we've mentioned tax.

In other words, it just would have hung up on some button some place or another, and would have come into a total collision with this button, and from there on we never would have moved off the button.

This is of tremendous use, by the way, when you're handling committees. You know, the art of getting something done through a committee has never been perfected. This has never been perfected in the history of man. If you don't want to get anything done, appoint a committee. And don't put anybody on it who has an individual responsibility for any piece of its work.

Just give it in general to the committee. Now, now we've really got malfunction in screaming exclamation points, malfunction from here on out.

Well, similarly, the way you can park any committee or any board – and some of you might want to know this sometime; it's sometimes of great moment for you not to have something discussed, and not permit them to come to any conclusion or pass a motion. Committees, being only a medium of half-thought-out averages anyway, generally will arrive at the wrong decision about most anything. You know, they haven't got much of the data, and they're not really interested, and nobody there is responsible, and they sort of just want to get rid of it all, you know? And they get into that state of mind, and they're suddenly discussing something that is a very, very important point that is going to affect the longevity and management of this company or group, and man, you just are not about to get something like that.

Now, the first thing is to introduce – the way you want to do this is just to introduce any button that will cause them to take zero responsibility. Just introduce any button that will reduce their responsibility. Anything! It doesn't matter. Give them a restimulative word. Just do it by symbols. You see, you're trying to paralyze this committee, that's what you're trying to do, you see, just overtly, so they won't make a wrong act.

They say, "Well, I don't know. Shouldn't the pay plan that is being brought up someplace – shouldn't the pay plan – this pay plan – maybe we could check with the guy – it's being prepared by the accounts department. Pay plan, shouldn't that be thought up by someone – pay plan?"

And you say, "Well, yes." You can just see it now, some outrageous damn thing that nobody could put into execution, you see? Nobody's particularly interested in this thing, so ...

One of the principal buttons that is used in this is the word "study", see, and that just hangs everybody. Just introduce "study" into the thing, you see? Bang! And it just hangs the works here. And just say, "We'll make a proposal that the matter be given further study," and hit "study" hard. And you get parked right there. It'll just stop. It's gorgeous! You don't have to introduce like that. You can say something, "Well, wasn't the last time this type of proposal was proposed, wasn't that – " you know, there was a fellow by the name of Bellham who was just hated throughout the whole organization, you see, just say this word and everybody went Eeeee! and so on – you say, "Wasn't that last proposed by Bellham?" Everybody of course takes no responsibility for it instantly, you see? And then they will get into a discussion about Bellham, and you're all set. [laughter] But they just derail on a button like that!

And you'll see somebody do this, you'll see it when they're studying like this. This fellow's got lots of overts on the Sabbath. So you say "sabbatical," he's wondering if this is connected with Sabbath, and you just get into a total discussion of "Sabbath. Is it right to have a Sabbath? Where was the Sabbath originated? Really wasn't it a pagan introduction in the first place?" and we go on and on and on. It has absolutely nothing to do with what we're studying. He'll derail right at that point. That's very interesting.

Now, you'd think this person would have to have lots of auditing to get rid of this. No, there is another system that gets rid of this and that is it sort of teaches him that he can ride past these hung points, see, that the hung points don't keep him from duplicating. And he gradually learns this, you see? These buttons that he's got really don't keep him from duplicating something. See, even if it's upsetting and he doesn't like it he can still duplicate it, and eventually he begins to see duplication in its proper light. Duplication is duplication. It is not running out buttons, it is simply duplication. It just is itself, that is all.

Now, you couldn't see at all unless you could duplicate. You've got to be able to look down that row of doors or something like that, you look down the row of doors and you see that there was a row of doors there. And – you can play this on some PCs in processing with the most fantastic results. You just say, "Well, what's over there along that wall?"

And some fellow will say, "Oh, uh – uh – must be students' lockers. Those doors don't fit very well at the top, do they? Well, they must be some kind of students' lockers. They were probably put in there for some purpose or another." Then all of a sudden he'd say, "Well, do you have a carpenter working for you?" What did you ask him? You said, "What's down that wall?" you see? Actually all he's got to do is look down the wall and say "There's some doors there," but he always does it the hard way. Just watch him at first glance and he will just do it the hard way. That's the way it will roll off of this whole operation.

You ask somebody, "What is over your head?" just ask them that sometime. "What is over your head *right now*?" Say it very meaningfully so that they really understand that it's

over their head, and you mean now. And brother, you're going to get some of the most interesting discussions you ever heard of. Things which are threatening them, and so forth; well, they're not quite sure. Some girl says, "Well, yes, I know my hair looks rather messy, but uh ..." You get all sorts of oddball, offbeat derailments of the whole thing. Well, what's over your head right now? The ceiling, of course, is what's over your head right now. They always manage to miss the obvious. And factually, it takes a lot of drilling before people will observe the obvious, and that is all there is to that step, is obnosis: the observation of the obvious.

"What is in front of your face?" just ask somebody sometime who has low havingness and can't reach much. Just ask that question, "What is in front of your face?"

Of course, the obvious answer is "You are."

But, you know, you can get some of the most conditional and oddball responses you ever want to hear of from simple questions of that particular type. Well, that's because the individual isn't really adding significances into everything, it's because every time he thinks of something significance plunges in and he thinks he's got to pay more attention to the significance than he pays to what was going on.

In other words, what is happening to him right now, you see, is less important than what might happen to him or what is coming in on him or the consequences of all of it. He's consequence-happy so he's really not in present time at all.

Well, when you take this parking button called "study," people tend to go sort of "Ummmmm," you know, on this anyhow, and that's a very good button to work on because it's inflow of data, therefore the duplication of data, and no more important than that, just the duplication of the datum spoken. You understand, I'm not now saying a datum like "there are ... a problem is postulate-counter-postulate."

I'm not talking about a significant datum. I'm talking about any datum, either significant or nonsignificant. You could say, "There is one Christmas in a year," and some people will promptly say, "Well, that is insufficiently important. Of course everybody knows there's one Christmas in a year." You'll get all kinds of chitter-chatter and so forth. The only thing you've asked them to do is repeat this after you, what you say.

You say, "There is one Christmas in a year."

And the person would say, "Of course I know there's only – any damn fool knows there's only one – what – what kind of a thing is it – you think – what – what is this all about?"

And you say, "Well, just rep- all right. Good. But – just – just – let's just repeat this after me, There is one Christmas in a year."

"Well, there's no sense in it. Of course, everybody knows that there's one Christmas in a year," and so forth. And they're into the terrible non-significance of it, you see? You stated something sufficiently non-significant that they can't do anything about it. There's nothing there to attack and they just get terribly disappointed, you see?

You say - you say, "Most men are male." You know, "Most men are male." Or you say, "Women are females."

"Women are females. Well, of course we know most women are fe – what are you talking about? Naturally," and so forth. "Naturally, of course, everybody knows that. What – what are you saying that for?" And you will get – all of a sudden the fellow becomes very curious about you, and what your motives are and what your intentions are and what you're trying to do here.

Well, it's a fantastic proposition. You just say, "Women are females." "There's one Christmas in a year." "Days begin at midnight." Some people would not realize that, you know, and they'd say, "Oh, really? Do they?"

And you say, "Well, all right. But 'Days begin at midnight,' I just want you to repeat that. Just 'Days begin at midnight.'"

"Well, that's a funny thing. I never knew that before, you see?" And they've just flown off into interest, see? And they're all stuck on the interest, you see?

And you're just saying, "'Days begin at midnight.' That's what you're supposed to say."

And the fellow says, "Ah, well... Why should I go into that, you know? 'Days begin at midnight....' What are we studying here? Is this a lesson in Scientology or about time? Or is time part of Scientology? Are there any axioms about time? Oh, I see! Oh, I see! Yes, I see! The days begin at midnight! And it's – oh, what axiom does that refer to anyway?"

And you say, "No, no. Just repeat after me, 'Days begin at midnight.'"

"Yeah, but why?"

You get the whole idea, see? In other words, they have an automatic reflexive mechanism. They're going on a total basis of stimulus-response and nothing else. Just total stimulus-response. But what's responding? The person or a bank? And this is just another way of digging up a thetan.

Eventually you get to a point where the thetan responds. You say, "The day begins at midnight." He says, "The day begins at midnight." It doesn't bother him any if the day begins at midnight or the day doesn't begin at midnight. Has nothing to do with it.

You just say, "The day begins at midnight."

He says, "The day begins at midnight."

"Good!" All right. You say, "Christmas comes once a year."

He says, "Christmas comes once a year." Right?

Now, people who don't like this and are still enturbulated on it say, "Well, you're making a slave there," you see, "that's slavery," or something like that. "That's something very deep-seated and very significant. There's something very significant about this operation. If you can get a person to do this, he of course thereafter is a slave, see, obviously!" – except the data is never borne out. The only time you really get a person to talk back sensibly is when he can do this, because he can observe what he's talking back about; and up to that time you get people talking back about things that aren't happening, and that's very disconcerting.

Somebody comes in and raises hell with you because of the hussars that are all over the front lawn. And you go and look, you don't see any hussars on the front lawn. And you ask him to go look and see if there are any hussars on the front lawn and he says, "Why should I look? I just know."

And you say, "Well, that's fine. Well, let's go look at the front lawn and see if there are any hussars there."

"Why should I do that? Are you doubting my word?" And now we go off into a discussion of whether or not you think he is a gentleman. Do you see the various excursions that we get on this?

He starts with some unreasonable premise and winds up with an idiocy. All you're asking a person to be able to do is simply duplicate a datum. You say, "Christmas occurs once a year," and he says, "Christmas occurs once a year," and it doesn't bother him and it doesn't not bother him.

Now, at the same time this individual can turn around and do something else which is quite interesting. This individual can cause himself to be duplicated. So, he has a brand-new thought all of his own little own, and he said, "I'm going to paint this house green." And he goes out and he says to somebody, "Paint the house green."

And the person says, "Um-hmmm-mmm. Viridian, eh?"

"No, no, just green."

"Oh, well. There's lots of greens, you know? Green, there's lots of greens. There's lots of types of paint, too. What paint store do you deal with? Well, I tell you what I will do. There is a house over in the next county that is painted a particular shade of green, and we will write them a letter and find out what paint company they got the paint from and what shade it was, but of course you will have to go over and take a look at that house first to find out what color that house really is."

And you'd say, "No, I want this house painted just common, ordinary, run-of-the-mill, just green."

And they will try again. They will say, "Some paints don't last as long as others."

If you can do that, you yourself have developed the ability to get yourself duplicated on your own ideas. And you'd be surprised; if you can do this well, you'd be surprised as your ability rises how the duplication occurs with the greatest of ease. You go out and tell somebody to paint it green, he pulls a color card out of his pocket and says, "You want this one or this one or this one? You want that one? That's it. All right." He goes and gets the paint and he paints the house green, does a good job of it and that's all fine. This cuts down randomness like mad.

In other words, by learning to duplicate you can get into a state where you yourself can be duplicated. Now, this is not exactly a processing activity. This is the process of life and livingness that is most significant. And it's havingness like mad because you start to have the things that you're surrounded with.

All right. Beyond duplication comes understanding. Understanding comes after duplication, not before. Now, how much understanding do you think this fellow did when you said "Christmas comes once a year," and he said, "Well, why are we taking that up? It doesn't seem to have very much to do with the process," and so on and so on. Well, you'll find out nearly everything he's asking you summarizes into not understanding, or trying to understand. You've told him the datum "Christmas comes once a year"; this is the datum you've told him.

Now, he tries like mad to understand that datum and he can't grasp it. He'll just work himself frantic trying to understand this datum, to understand what datum is there, understand your motives in trying to get him to understand this datum, trying to understand what the datum applies to, try to understand why there is nothing there to understand; and you'll find out most of his "Ooooooo-oooooo-ummmm" is just some kind of an effort to understand.

And this is why study is such an important button, because that's "getting somebody else to understand relieves anybody of any responsibility for understanding." Every government in the world at the present moment is totally seized with this as a mechanism. This is their operating mechanism. They don't have to understand anything because they can always have it studied, you see? And that just absolutely stops any progress in a committee or anything else. You've stopped it instantly and at once. You say "It's going to be otherwise studied so therefore you don't have to duplicate any part of it; and therefore you don't have to... if it's going to be studied, you don't have to understand any part of it and therefore all we expect from you is to execute something which you have no comprehension of and haven't found out in the first place." And you get the usual democratic processes when they are totally abused. They're pretty mad. See, democracy does not work in the absence of understanding. It can't work.

Now, here's your second thing, then. If responsibility for understanding depends on personal study – and it does – why, then of course you have raised the person's ability to comprehend, or understand. Not only does Christmas come once a year, but now beyond that point he is capable of understanding and studying "Christmas" and "once a year" and what this refers to. Only now he's capable of finding out that it's a totally unimportant datum.

Up to that time it might be important, it might not be important; God help us, we never would be able to find out whether it was something we *had to know*, or something that we didn't much care about, or something we're liable to be *shot* because we didn't know, or something that we'd certainly better forget in a hurry, or something that goes along with the fact that most peoples have shoes, the bottoms of the soles of which are dirty. You see that?

So classification of the importance of data is the thing which lies up there as the second step. Well, that's your third step. Your first is non comprehension, non duplication, confusion. Your second one is merely the ability to duplicate. And after that we get the ability to comprehend, to understand, and therefore get the ability to observe. Judgment lies in that field and this is a road to judgment.

Now, nobody has really ever bothered to teach anybody judgment before in the last 200 trillion years. And you're not going to find much judgment in any bank you've got. If there had been much judgment in it, you wouldn't have it as a bank. Let's look at that. If this

valence had been capable of enormous study, differentiation and judgment, you wouldn't have it as an aberrative valence. Isn't that so? So this has been a scarcity on the track.

So you have here in essence, a new skill. It's going to be very difficult to process it into somebody because they've never had it. They were capable of observation once, but how did they observe? They always put a curve on the observation in order to make a game out of it or something like that. Pure observation, pure study, pure duplication, pure comprehension, or pure judgment have never been a study in the field of philosophy. They just don't exist. You just will not find these things as subjects of discussion, even. They are touched on very slightly by the Platos and Socrateses and so forth of yesteryear, but just touched on very slightly. Totally avoided in religions and religious philosophies. Oh, they're just avoided like mad! Oh, it's just like showing them a snake spitting in their face, you know?

Huuuuuh! Comprehension, understanding, duplication? Oh, no, no, no, no, no! That's what you're not supposed to do!

And of course we know what the source of all this is. The greatest overt there is is enforcing a noncomprehension. That's an overt! You don't believe it? Take somebody sometime, you say, "What have you done?" Oh, this girl has got withholds, she's got crimes, she can't wear any of her frocks because they're so bloodstained, you know? She doesn't dare reach into any of her purses because of the asps she's stacked away at one time or another, you know? She can't even open up her own medicine chest with any feeling of security because of the arsenic coming out, you know? And we say, "What have you done?"

And she says, "Done? Well, I ate dinner."

And you say, "Well, what have you withheld?"

"I haven't withheld anything."

"All right. Good. Well, what have you done?"

"Oh, I sat down here a while ago."

"Good. Well, what have you withheld?"

"Nothing. I never withhold anything. My life is an open book."

And you go utterly mad trying to security check this person because you can't find any responsibility on which to hang the Security Check. You've got to increase their responsibility before you can find any withholds. They're there but they're totally muzzled, you see, by the irresponsibility of the attitude of the PC. You see, one of the ways you tell if a case is gaining is whether or not it's getting more withholds off. Well, that's just a way of saying "Is the case gaining in responsibility?" Yes, the case is gaining in responsibility, because they're getting more withholds off. Weren't withholds up to that time.

But you can take this same person, this same girl, and you could say, "What doesn't your family know about?"

"Oh, well, that is something else. Well, they don't know that I poisoned Joe, that I shot Pete. They don't know anything much about where I hid the body last month. They don't know what happened to the children. Ha-ha-ha-ha! They – ah..." see, and "don't know" is still

a button. All the way down "don't know" is still a button, all the way down and all the way up. It's a button the whole way.

You can always security check with "don't know" and "not know," when overts and withholds are passing right over the PC's head like these orbiting space flights that aren't taking off, you know? See, "don't know" goes all the way.

So a study of not-knowingness has been approached by philosophy by two philosophers – notably two philosophers: one is Kant and the other one is Spencer. And they've concluded that what wasn't known couldn't be known. Oh, how interesting! In other words, the closest approach philosophy has ever made to "don't know" or "not know" has been that you couldn't know. That's interesting, isn't it?

So, as I tell you, there has been no road to judgment.

Now, for many years I've been trying to teach you characters judgment. It has been a tough and difficult job. Judgment on the subject of another being, the ability to understand what was going on in a session, and operating with judgment so as to do the right thing about it. Now, do you know what bars you from judgment? It's just the not-knowingness of it all. Well, where's the not-knowingness of it all come from? It begins first with duplication. There is the entrance.

Oh, of course you could security check it out. "What don't people know about you?" and so forth, and smarten the guy up no end; but that's a processing approach, and we're not now talking about a processing approach because there is nothing there to process to. You see, processing processes to what is there, see?

Now, if a thetan ever got himself in bad condition, he's invalidated his own judgment, he's come off of his own judgment. The whole lesson of this universe teaches a person not to duplicate, just as it teaches him not to communicate.

You know, there are only two crimes in this universe that you have committed and that you have made others guilty of having committed: One is being there and the other is communicating. Those are the two crimes. There are no other crimes than that, being there and communicating. Now, if those two crimes are crimes, and those things have been made into crimes, then there's only one other thing that you can possibly make up your mind about it: A person has to learn, you might say, not really learn, but become comfortable with being there and communicating. And the way and the route one would take to bring comfort on the subject of being there and communicating would of course be duplication of a datum.

Now, a datum is a location which doesn't have to be pinned down. A datum is a location, a cousin to a thetan, you know? All data is a sort of a cousin to a thetan. You know, he's an idea, he thinks sometimes and he's got ideas and he can communicate ideas. And you can always put a whole stack of ideas into your thetan briefcase and have no mass at all. So it's ideally portable, most portable thing in the world is an idea, so thetans chased out of here and chased out of there begin to use ideas for location. They feel comfortable when they have an idea, you know. And that idea that they feel comfortable about is an identity. Even though the identity is mobile, they feel more comfortable with an identity than without one because it gives them the sensation of being located. They like this.

So what's the conclusion here? The conclusion is that you can learn to have judgment, and the way you learn to have judgment is just those two steps: duplication of data, and, pursuant to that, understanding. There's the duplication, the understanding. You don't get it this way: you don't get understanding and then duplication.

Now, what you should know about this is it's any data would serve as long as it is data, any data. "Classification of the Geological Formations of the Middle East as Observed by the Geological Department of - Serving After the Fact of the Appointments from the Rockmount Foundation, Appertaining only to Schists and Slides of the Lower Saudi Arabian Canyons," in 185 volumes, folio, see? That's data, you know? It's wild data, you know?

"Anamorphic schists are often found most closely blended with hornblende." You say to the PC, "Anamorphic schists are most closely blended with hornblende." Well, this would be a "fascinating" situation. He would wind up, of course, with a drill. He would wind up with an ability to do something, and he would also wind up with judgments on the subject of women, which I think is marvelous. You know? Nobody could wind up with that. I've been trying all these years. [laughter] It's impossible. And yet he could, by studying the anamorphic schists for the formation of hornblende. Very interesting !

Now, beyond that you cannot go in the teaching of judgment. You cannot teach a man how he should judge something and still have him judge something. You understand that you can teach a person data. Yes, by force of beingness in you, you can relay communication and understanding to people and they do understand it.

Well, I'll give you an example of that. One ACC I did nothing but lecture. Nobody processed anybody this whole ACC and they all had marvelous profile gains. I gave them two lectures a day and we went over all kinds of data and so on. Well, that was just a relay of understanding and comprehension, and they felt better and they had a bunch of cognitions on the thing and life looked better to them. You understand? So that was in itself a kind of a processing. That had one of the highest gain ACCs we ever had, which is interesting.

Now, this is totally possible, and without that possibility of course we'd never get anyplace. So that possibility natively exists.

But let's take the other one. Let's take the other one. Let's raise a level of skill on the subject of judgment, just overtly and directly create a level of skill on the subject of judgment. We would do that by duplication.

All right. What's this amount to here? What's this amount to? We are doing this – you do not see how this is working out according to the educational processes of the 17th ACC; first reason (to have no withhold from you, and so forth) is it wasn't realized or rationalized from those directly. What you're dealing with right this minute is – stems from prior understanding to the 17th ACC; 17th ACC is an outcrop of that understanding of how to go about these things. Nor are you dealing necessarily with a preconcerted effort to give you understanding. You're not dealing with that either. You are dealing accidentally with two different things, and one of those things is just the action of understanding and duplication, you're dealing with that, and at the same time you are dealing only with the data of Scientology which you can learn.

But incidentally the data of Scientology is being used to develop in you judgment, not on the subject of Scientology. Now, you don't notice this because you're learning judgment across a pretty high, beefy line. This is a high-voltage line, you see? So if you can learn judgment off of this line, marvelous! Because this line, of all others, would tend to destroy your self-determinism and judgment, wouldn't it? Yeah, you're not given any chance to think what life's all about. My God! Is there anything else to think about than what life is all about? Isn't that right? Well, I'll give you what life is all about, and then you don't have to think about it at all, and you're all set, and that's it, hm?

Well, the data is true so therefore it tends to stick, right? Do you know that a lot of you, unbeknownst to you, have run straight through having been taught it. And some of you haven't noticed that you've gone through having been taught it. You've come up on the other side of the thing into a realization of it; and now you have the realization of it, not because you've been taught it, but because you realize it. And this is what we know as "making it *your* data." You've often said this to a student but some of you perhaps have not looked too closely on what we mean by "make it your data."

In other words, he has to go along the line of duplication of the data to an understanding of the data, and with that understanding of the data he has the final step, which is the realization, totally self-determined, of the existence of the data. And when you're dealing with truth you always have this fourth step. You have the ability to realize and to perceive.

So you have first this "Thaa! What wall? Don't ask me to duplicate anything." Then you have simple duplication, and that's followed by understanding, and that is followed by realization or own comprehension. So therefore one's own self-determinism is restored on such a track.

Of course it's most rapidly restored on such a track by teaching the person the exact truth of something. There is the truth of something, he is able to duplicate the truth of something after many travails, and this truth of something is immediately pursued by the understanding of that something he has been taught. You understand that that is a stage; he's still dependent on you for the understanding of what's been taught. And your next stage up is a realization, which he reached at a sudden step up the line on his own bootstraps, so to speak. He regained an ability to understand, and so then he himself could realize. That's the route that you're taking. That route has total self-determinism and other-determinism and, of course, therefore, pan-determinism all mixed up in it, all at one fell swoop.

The person becomes pan-determined over the data. The person can not only understand why they learned the data but why the data was taught to them, and understand and realize – of course the realization includes the independent truth of the datum regardless of having been taught the datum. And with that, of course, a person has reached a high peak of the ability to judge something. A person then has judgment. There's no other route that I know of. I mean if this is not a perfect route, all right, so it isn't a perfect route. There is no perfect route.

Perhaps there is a perfect route, but there is no perfect route to hand at the moment if this is not a perfect route.

But there is this, that it is the first route through to such an end product. It certainly is that. And it is married in against an entirely different function. So you get a side play of the same thing. That is to say, you've got this thing doing two things. It wouldn't matter – well, your instructor has the horrible idea occasionally – he says, "All right. Now, what time span is there in an instant read? How soon must the read occur after the thing, an instant read?" I don't know how many answers you've got. I wouldn't set it right for worlds; not for worlds, I wouldn't set it right. Gives the instructor a marvelous opportunity. He can say, "Yes. But that tape, see? What does it say on that tape? *That* tape!"

And you say, "Well, actually, it's a half a second, a quarter of a second, a fifth of a second, a tenth of a second, it doesn't matter. I mean there – there it is."

"Ah, but which one is it on that tape?"

"Well, I can't tell you what that tape is. It doesn't matter whether it's a quarter of a second, half of a second, a fifth of a second, and so on, so on. I mean, all these answers and so on" – natter, natter, natter, natter.

And he says, "Flunk!" [laughter]

And you go back and snarl, and run up a whole bunch of overts against me, and so forth, and listen to the tape again. And you say, "Well, what do you know? Hang on, let's see, what was it on that exact tape? Oh, gorbliney! I never heard that before! A twentieth of a second! Twentieth of a second! Kaaa! All right," and you go in. "Twentieth of a second."

"All right, that's it."

Now, you see, it'd be totally pedantic (and we're not doing it on this other system) for the instructor to say "What are the first seven words in the fifth paragraph of the third bulletin written in 1959 in the month of June?" See, that is just becoming a memory contest, and if you'll notice, nearly all study is devoted to memory contests. And nobody is asking you to engage in a memory contest. Somebody is asking you to engage in a duplication activity. If you can duplicate the data your memory will come up sooner or later – even yours.

It's very, very horrible; some of you first confronting this thing, you find it ghastly! You find it utterly horrible. It's the most terrible thing you ever confronted. Recognize the mechanism you're up against, and recognize that not for a moment is anybody going to relent on this datum. Also find out, as you go along, all of a sudden you're able to understand things you weren't able to understand before, which is all quite peculiar; and you possibly have never noticed this, but you're now understanding things you never understood before that have to do with other things that have nothing to do with training, nothing to do with the subject matter you're training on, which is quite amazing. You get something going like this, why, you've made gains in another direction, and that's what an auditor has to have. An auditor has to have comprehension. He has to be able to understand what he is looking at. He has to understand what is going on.

An auditor who gets into this kind of a situation is a dead one, he's lost. The PC says, "Ah, women are such a bore!"

And he's pulled the same gag you might have pulled on the committee, as far as the auditor is concerned. He said that fatal word – two fatal words: He said women and bore. These things are not compatible, outrageous! One can't possibly marry up those two words in the same sentence. Whoever imagined they could become bored with women?

This is incomprehensible, and the auditor just sits there and he starts some kind of a natter, natter, natter, interrupt the PC, you see? "Women, bore? Women, bore? What are you talking about?" And instead of saying "TR 4" cheerily, and going on with the session, he says "Natter, sub-natter." [laughter] He does all kinds of things, says Q and A, "What did you say? Where are we going? What are you doing? Why? Why did you say that? Have you got an engram there? What's happening in the thing?" and so forth. In other words the auditor goes into a "trying to understand," do you hear that?

PC can sometimes put you into a "trying to understand," and you'll find yourself having a hard time auditing the PC for quite another reason. You don't audit PCs by telepathy, and this PC isn't talking very much or loudly, you see? And you say to the PC, "All right now, what is your opinion of women?"

And the PC says, "Ummm-ummm."

And you have to say "What did you say?" Not to understand what the PC says is a misdemeanor of the first water. The PC is sort of putting you on a point where you are made to think that you don't understand the PC because you can't understand what the PC's saying.

I remedy this usually quite well; PC goes – tips over, is all curled up in a ball, head is down in the chair, mouth totally compressed against the curve of the arm, and is saying "Ummm, ummmm," and so on.

I don't risk any ARC breaks on my part or theirs. I say, "Sit up. That's right. Sit up. That's good. Now speak up."

And the PC says, "Ummmmmm."

You say, "All right. Now, what was that answer again?"

"Oh, women are such a bore."

"All right. Thank you very much," you know? "All right."

In other words, I make the PC communicate to me, which may be tougher but you'll find out that you'll run up ARC breaks when you don't. You pay your money and you take your chance. In other words, if you leave him in that condition, you're going to have – soon you're going to be totally out of comprehension of what's going on with the PC. You're also going to feel that you don't comprehend what the PC is doing, and therefore you can't observe anything that's happening to the PC and all sorts of things go wild.

But let's get back on the other thing. Let's take an auditor who cannot happily duplicate a datum, a non sequitur datum, but always insists that he hang up on a button. And the PC says, "Women are such a bore," and he knows that this can't exist, and he himself has lots of trouble with women, and his immediate response is "Why is women boring? What is this?" and so on, and go squabble out of session here. "You've challenged me. I don't believe that. That hasn't anything to do with this. Just why did you come to that particular conclusion? I

don't see what there is in the auditing command that would make you come to that conclusion."

The PC finally says, "Well, it was just a cognition!"

And the fellow says, "Well, it's a cognition. That's a remarkable thing to say when you come to think about it, you know? It's a remarkable thing to say – just a cog...."

But the PC says, "But it's just a cognition. You know, I just said it, you know?"

He says, "Well, all right."

And the auditor goes on, you see, and audits him a little bit longer, and the PC says, "But all men are stupid, when it comes right down to that."

And "stupid", you know, that's a button, so the auditor says, "Stupid? Who? Oh? Who? Who? Who? What did – what did you say again?"

"All men are stupid."

"Why did you say that? Do you have a picture there?" and so forth. "What's going on? I mean, have you got an ARC break? Got some withholds? Are you withholding something? Is that what you're withholding, that all men are stupid? Just exactly how does this add up?" and so on.

And the PC says, "But it's just a cognition. I – I just – just – I – I – I just had the idea. I'm sorry. I'm sorry."

And you then have a PC who won't blow anything. You have a PC who is punished for cogniting. You have a PC who is punished for auditing and therefore have a PC who is punished for getting rid of pieces of the bank. And if you audit the PC in that framework the PC will make no gain because they're being taught not to blow anything, because they don't ever dare mention anything; and they're made sorry every time they open their mouths because there's no comprehension. They look up, the auditor's trying to understand, trying to understand, trying to hear, trying to hear, trying to find out what it is, what it is, what it is, where it came from, where it came from, wha – da-da-da-da – if you'll just – you don't – no, no – you've got the auditor on trying to comprehend, trying to comprehend, trying to comprehend. And of course you haven't got an auditor at that stage who is capable of duplicating what the PC said.

My God, I've heard PCs say some of the most outrageous things you ever heard of in your life. Now, this never startled me particularly, but once in a while I have been startled by something. You notice that you're normally most startled by overts or withholds the PC has which pertain immediately and directly to you, or to somebody you're close to or like, you know? You're immediately influenced by these particular overts and withholds.

Well, what if the whole session – supposing the auditor were in such poor state with regard to duplication that every bit of the auditor's auditing was as reactive toward the PC as your sudden Rrrrr! when the PC has just told you some fantastic lying withhold about you. Now, you know your own startlement when you've heard one of these occasionally. Well, supposing they're trying to understand – "Where did you hear that?" you know? You – right away you're just yanked out of it sometimes, you know?

He says, "Well I – I have a withhold. I – I saw you...."

You say, "Yes, what?"

"Well, I saw you up at the corner of the lane up there the other night with – well, you know who."

"Well, who? Who? Who?" you know, "Who? Who did you see me up there with?" and so forth.

"Oh, well – well, you know. We needn't really go into it."

"Well, what's this all about? Where did you hear that? I mean, did you see that yourself? Did you see it in person? Were you there? What time was it? Well, did anybody else see it?" you know? You'll get caught off base, and you will ask more questions about it than you ordinarily would ask about something else. That's your effort to try to understand because you're hung up on some kind of a button that concerns you intimately. Do you see that?

All right. Now, an auditor who can't duplicate runs the whole session in that frame of mind. Not just things that relate to him, but anything that relates to anything, the auditor has the same greeting of that – the same greeting from the auditor. The PC says, "It's been a nice day all day."

The auditor says, "What? What? Where? Where? Where? I mean, where did you hear that? Oh, you – you what? Today. Oh, you're talking about today, not yesterday. Well, I thought it was a nice day today, too, that is, this morning, early. Er, yes, let's see. What were we talking about? Oh, yes. The auditing command was – what was the auditing command? Ah – yes – yes. Have I withheld anything from you? All right. Have I withheld anything from you?"

You watch it, man. Therefore, if you get a zone or area where the auditors are having one awful time trying to duplicate a bulletin, what must you also assume? That they've been in there endlessly trying to understand the PC, trying to understand the cases, being hung up on all kinds of wild-ball buttons, and they're right down there at the first stage I gave you.

They're in that stage. See, if their morale is going down because they can't pass any bulletin tests, you would know at once how they've been handling PCs. Do you see that? So duplicative training is absolutely essential. And it is successful. Now, you can make up your mind to that.

Now, what I've talked to you about you may or may not have found very burningly interesting. Naturally, it doesn't apply to you personally. [laughter, laughs] But in training auditors you should know it. The baptism of fire that causes people to look so pale and so drawn under the thing is, for instance, duplicating under resentment. See, they go through all kinds of emotional bars on this particular thing. Learn like mad but it's all resented like mad, you see, because "Uhhhhh! It couldn't possibly be – uhhhhh!" and so on. Well, they pass through that one, too.

But sometimes you see a student here who goes around for the first two or three weeks, and they get paler and paler, and shadowier and shadowier, more and more hollow-eyed, more and more gaunt, things looking worse and worse. Or they look more and more

apathetic. You can hear them the way they start up their cars, and things. You can hear about how a new student is going, you know? At first, why, they start up their cars in a sort of a puzzled way; and then they start up a car, you know, *very* angrily indeed, you see? You can hear the gears crash about three times as they get up the drive, you know? And then eventually they wander up the driveway running into both sides of the verge; you know about what state they have reached, and so on.

That's all done by training, and it is not the route of processing. Don't consider it a processing route. It is just a route by training because it is a new skill.

You very often have been asked in the past to memorize "the structural components of a Mark VII space vessel with gyro rotators, complete, all number parts." I'm sure you've had to do something like this. I'm sure you have had at some time or another. And the funny part of it is you wound up at the other side being able to look at the space vessel; and on the other side of that somebody says to you, "Oh, well, these Mark VIIs – these Mark VIIs, they – they – they sure fly low, and they sure fly slow, Mark VIIs do."

And, "No, no, no," you say, "you don't really understand this ship, you know. You don't understand how to run one. No, when you first get them into the outer area of an atmosphere, you see, you turn on the coolers, you see, at that moment. See, you don't slow them down as you come in. Just turn on the coolers way out there, you see, so that you supercool the whole hull, you see? That's the way you really handle these things. And then you come in, hit the atmosphere on a skip, always hit it on a skip the first time, you see? And then sort of smush in, you know, with everything supercooled. Come in fast, don't lose your speed, you're all right, you see? And then have your counter-blasters in excellent condition so that when you come down toward the surface, and that sort of thing, right at the exact proper – and so as not to waste any fuel – these Mark VIIs, you really have to pour that blaster to it. And if you pour it to it very suddenly and very quickly you stop, you see? And then you land all right. And the reason they're having crashes with them is they just don't understand them."

And somebody comes out and watches you land a Mark VII, you don't land one that way at all, but you sure understand one. You understand how to land one; but every time you land a Mark VII you land it entirely differently than at any other time you ever landed a Mark VII. You never land a Mark VII the same way twice, yet you always land them and they never crack up and everything is fine. You got the idea? But you never drive the same ship the same way two days consecutively running. That's because you understand it.

Routine and rote, in other words, are a poor substitute for understanding. And the place I'm trying to get you to is a place where you can process by realization, process by comprehension, process by the exercise of judgment. If I can get you to that point, I will have considered it very well worth doing, no matter how heroic it has been on the way.

Thank you.

WHOLE TRACK

A lecture given on 25 January 1962

Thank you.

Okay. What do we have here? We have the 25th of Jan. AD 12. And here we go for a lecture on what? I know. What do you need? What don't you know anything about? Oh, Scientology. All right. [laughter]

Come on. What don't you know anything about? What do you feel foggy on?

Female voice: Track.

Traps?

Female voice: Track.

Male voice: Track. Track.

Track? Oh, wow. [laughs]

Female voice: The whole track.

Yeah. Whole track. I don't know. I haven't given a lecture on whole track for years. Do you want to hear something about whole track?

Audience: Yes.

Well, once upon a time there was a thetan. [laughter] And he was free and all-powerful and *stupid*. And he didn't have any judgment at all, because he had no experience of any kind. And he thought if he just kept battering out things and withholding things and keeping things from coming in on him, that he would then stay as powerful as he had always been.

And that was a mistake. Because the more he battered out, the more he felt he ought to withhold – because at the same time he was doing all this, he was making other people guilty of battering out and telling them they shouldn't have done it. And then he duplicated those he told he shouldn't have done it. And the final analysis was that he was withholding. And here you are today. [laughter]

Oh, it's very intriguing, the ideas of the whole track, but it'd be a nice – it'd be nice if you had ever lived before but, of course, this is just an idea. This is just an idea.

I'm reminded of John Belusha and he left here in pretty good shape. That was a good win for us, but I think in all of the twelve years of arduous processing and hammering and pounding or something like that – I think it was just the educational process had just made a little dent on his case – 17th ACC. I think in all those years there wasn't a single process that had ever been brought out that had ever made a dent on him.

And he got over here and he started running into Routine 3A and 3D and Security Checking and a few things like that and all of a sudden, why, he blew off the first terminal of the Goals Problem Mass and found himself upgrading rapidly into other things and he was really flying.

And – give you an idea how he was flying: he cancelled the plane which would have gotten him home by Christmas to his family in order to get another session from Norman. He did, didn't he, Norman?

Male voice: Yes.

And Norman tied into it and found "an obstructionist" as the upgraded terminal of "a menial," and this was tying into the teeth of "a cruel person," and in between "an obstructionist" and so forth, there had been a hidden terminal called "a troublemaker." And in that session he became absolutely certain that he had been "a troublemaker" (which he had never been). And that blew in just that one session, didn't it? And then he found this "obstructionist," and I think went home with that package. Isn't that right? I'd think if he – he was smart, because if he had left here just teetering on the edge of tipping over into a troublemaker, look at all the trouble we'd had. [laughter]

Well, anyway, that is the toughest case I ever came up against, in that the case was just quietly tough. You know? There was nothing spectacular about it, but probably right here there are some people who have audited this fellow or seen him gone and they knew how rough this case was.

And so we made a dent on it. All right. We got him flying. All right. Swell.

But what did it take to do this? It took a very, very precise knowledge of the whole track. It took a precise knowledge of the consequences of – that a thetan runs into and how he had gotten himself balled up and how he'd tangled himself up along the line and then if you knew this perfectly, why, of course, you could take it apart. That's fairly easy to do.

Some lectures on this exist under Routine 3 and they have to do with this. But you are following a rule in auditing whole track and that rule is – it occurs actually as a first or second sentence of one of the sectional books of *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*: If you can parallel what the mind is doing and undo that or handle that, why, you will get a gain. And that is the basic rule of processing and we have not violated that rule in all these years. That's remarkable that that thing has remained that constant.

Well, let's take a look at this. If an individual had lived only once and then you processed that one lifetime he had lived, wouldn't it become apparent after a while that the individual would glow Clear and disentangle gorgeously on just having audited that one lifetime? Let's just present that as a piece of evidence. That'd be possible, wouldn't it?

Actually, if an individual had lived only one life – just one – here he was and if he was just a meat body and so forth and you know, he has a psychological-type brain; you know, solid meat and if that was all there was to this fellow, then he would untangle in this lifetime. In other words, the aberrations could be untangled and so forth if they ever could be.

Now, if one lifetime were true, then Freudian analysis would work. If just one lifetime were true, Freudian analysis would work. But Freudian analysis didn't work.

If just one lifetime were true, then running the engrams off one lifetime would clear somebody. Right? And that is not true and can't be done. You run the life – all the engrams out of one lifetime, you can straighten somebody up remarkably, you can do marvelous things. But for some reason or other, there is always a little additional bug

Unless you go at it on the basis of conditioning the individual to be able to confront all of the pictures and things and stuff that he found in the bank – that is to say, he isn't afraid of pictures and he's not fighting them – you can actually do a very delicate key-out on one lifetime and leave him separate from all of these masses and so forth.

Well, you can – you can accomplish that.

Now, there's just – that's just evidence. This has nothing to do with anybody's recall. This has to do only with the technical aspects of existence in Scientology.

Nineteen fifty-one, I rolled up my sleeves and started to investigate the whole track. Because in 1950 – late 1950 – it had started to raise its ugly and unseemly head. And auditors who would run into it and try to audit it and pcs who dare bring it up, of course, ran into a considerable social ostracism of one character or another. That was not done. The first Foundation board tried to pass a regulation, a board ruling to the effect that nobody would ever look at, believe in or investigate past lives, and so forth.

And yet auditors in auditing them kept running into them, you see? So that probably was the basic split-up of the first Foundation. The first Foundation wanted to sit there comfortably and just grind on and on in present-life engrams and consider that we had it all made and they wanted no further research or investigation of any kind whatsoever.

Well, that wouldn't go and that was that, because auditors were not turning out the results they should have turned out if one had only lived one life.

So in 1951 this – I didn't fly in the teeth of this. I would have investigated anything. I mean, there's no real resistance on my part. You show me something, tell me I can't investigate it, I'm liable to investigate it. You show me something and tell me I can investigate it, I'm liable to investigate it. I mean, there is no influence in that line.

I – just down through the trillennia, I have not paid attention to and/or paid no attention to people who have told me not to look. I just have not paid any attention to this one way or the other. This, of course, adds up to a total neglect of the – the "finer sensibilities," I think they're called, of other people. The finer sensibilities, I think, is another way of expressing the idea "he's too yellow to look."

So anyway, 1951, I started in to investigate how far back this went and where it went and actually an entire year was spent. And Mary Sue was of considerable assistance at that time and we went plowing around – I didn't mean to modify that by saying at that time only. I think – I think there was a time there in 54 when you were also of assistance for... [laughter] But to be very blunt about the thing, there wasn't anything, I don't think, that we didn't chew into one way or the other.

If there was any free track associated with it, we looked at it, and the result of that work, the records of that work don't exist because you can't sit around and do research and make records.

You either research and get research done or you make records. And the primary thing they do today in the field of research is to make records. And you'll find the time-wasting and expensive thing to do in research is making records. That costs like mad. And you have 185 clerks filing and compiling records in quintuplicate and crossfiling and crossindicating. And what they neglect on the modern research line is to have somebody who is finding any data to record. They've omitted him from the research line.

Of course, this is probably very wise, because when you think of the people the research is being done for, you could see at once why there would be a slowdown (a strike, you see, on people who could research). Well, look at it. Governments and politicians and that sort of thing. Who'd do any research for them?

I'd research them; I'd use them as case histories – research them: "Look around here and find something you can go out of ARC with." I think they ... [laughter] investigate that.

Anyway, what we found out basically, was a lot of the operational characteristics of the E-Meter were discovered at that time. And tremendous numbers of incidents of all shapes, sizes, squares and types were dredged up in whole sections of track and so forth. And I got a – did a track map at some time or another. And you can do a track map on an individual. It's fascinating, too. But you start to do track maps and you start to do this type of research, you are only researching free track.

Now, in view of the fact that amongst a dozen pcs, almost any part of the track is free track, you see, these twelve different pcs will have different parts of the track grouped and occluded into what we call valences. But they've still got lots of free track amongst them.

And if you take the free track collectively of these individuals, you can get a *whole* track. But the Goals Problem Mass consists of those sections of track you know not what of, which have become balled up into what we have for a long time called circuits; we've called them valences; we've called them ridges – they have had numerous names. Of course, a ridge deserves just a little bit of – it isn't a valence. A ridge is a ridge. But a valence or a circuit are definitely just an identity that is so dominant that it balls up a whole section of the whole track. It takes a large section of the whole track and bundles it all up in a black ball and it's got – all full of pictures and when you think at it, it does thinkingness and this is all very, very tricky.

A thetan never made these things. He lived this life and then he got in trouble and it all went scrunch. And he's since maintained it.

Well, of course, it was trying – he was trying to persist while he was it, so of course the common denominator of all such circuits and valences is persistence. So naturally, there they are and you'll find them right here in present time today. They're persisting.

Well, you take a whole section of lives. Let's say he lived numerous lives as a plumber. And all these lives as a plumber, if he then withheld it and considered them reprehensible and attacked things as a plumber and was attacked as a plumber and a bunch of other

conditions – in other words, your four flows are beautifully violated and mucked up during these four, six, eight, ten, twelve lives as a plumber. You're going to get a gaudy mass of condensed pictures and characteristics and individual thinkings, behavior patterns, everything that you now consider an individual, is all going to be bundled up in a little black ball. And that little black ball we call a valence or a circuit.

And when it be – gets activated or restimulated, of course, since he has been *it*, he can now dramatize *it*. And when it is too close in on top of him – and I do mean that in actual space – when it is too close in terms of space to the pc, he *will* dramatize it.

Now, to run out its individual characteristics is a long, thankless, arduous and stupid task. And there'd be no reason to do this. You can run out the whole package all at once. So there isn't any reason to take it apart characteristic by characteristic.

Now, that thing I'm talking about, that circuit or valence – better known as a valence, but it operates as a circuit; anything I've ever said about circuits are done by valences – all of that in a balled-up mass is a mass; it is an electronic mass; it does have weight; it does have density; it does have influence; you could feel it and so forth. It is actually – to the degree – to the degree that it is in the mind and therefore rather ephemeral, it has the same reality in the mind as a big black billiard ball would have, sitting out here on the table. You see, that's just – is it – isn't any *imaginary mass*, you know, that *all of us* have *heard about*, you know?

When you run into this thing, you go splat, see? If you picked it up and threw it at somebody, it would go splat. You see, it does have that characteristic. You might ask why is your body at this present moment persisting or why is that blackboard persisting? Well, that blackboard is a – is a mass which is persisting in time and that's all you can say about that. Present time is a persistence of mass.

Well, in the mind you get a mental mock-up which nevertheless is persistence, which nevertheless is mass. And the primary *mistake* that you could make about these things is that these things are – you'd say these things are imaginary because, of course, they occur in the *imagination*.

And of course, when the fellow first runs into one of these things... Let's take a bowling ball, you know, of some size, and – a black bowling ball – and he's standing there holding this black bowling ball and somebody has greased it up and he drops it and it hits him on the toe. Well, that would hurt. That would hurt, I guarantee you. And if you tried to tell him at that moment that it was an imaginary bowling ball, you are liable to get into an argument. You would be very likely to get into an argument.

As he stood there rubbing his toe, he would be likely to express not only his opinion of bowling balls but his opinion of you. He wouldn't enter into the logic or a discussion as to whether or not it was imaginary. He would simply refute that. That was intolerably stupid.

Well, similarly, one of these black valence masses, when collided with, or these mental energies when collided with, are imaginary just up to the time of that collision. And after somebody yo-yos in and out of one or tries to go through one and hits an apathy strata in one and dramatizes it, too, and after he's had one pushed up against his chest or tearing the back of his head off, after he's had all the somatics of the thing going through his stomach or some-

thing like that, he would not be in any condition to argue with. He wouldn't be set up nicely to argue with.

You couldn't come up and say – I think there are several in this class right now, that I don't think – I think it would be adventurous to go up to them and say, "Well, you know, these masses you've been running into, you know they're just imaginary. And they have no existence in fact and so on. They are just imaginary."

I think you would get a rather interesting argument at that point. Isn't that right? And in fact, I don't think you'd get much agreement at all. I don't think that would be the way to build ARC.

Well, it's not on the basis they're defending anything. It's just that it violates a reality. Well, what's reality? Well, reality is not what the individual thinks reality is. Reality is what the – the majority agree it is. And you look over this and if people can weigh these things in their hand or feel the pain of these things in the small of their back or, as they hover out in front of their faces, they perceive them one way or the other, why, I don't think you have any argument that they're unreal or imaginary. They are real within that viewpoint.

Well, it's so much for that. It's almost as if here, on a broader agreement in the physical universe, we were to take billiard balls and bowling balls and footballs and several other types and pile them all up on the table here, just keep piling these balls up and get a whole big mass of these things and so on. Well, that would be something that would look very like a Goals Problem Mass. I mean, it wouldn't look much different, except a Goals Problem Mass doesn't have the pretty stitching and it doesn't have orifices to blow them up. Otherwise – it doesn't have holes in them to pick them up with three fingers. But aside from that, that would look quite like a Goals Problem Mass.

Well, of course, a thetan is really in no great position to appreciate the character of their ephemeralness, once he collides with them and their ephemeralness ceases to be a matter of grave interest to him. Their isness is a great matter of interest to him. His effort to not-is them being combatted consistently by the isness of them causes him a considerable amount of worry.

So that we find, then, that the authorities on the field of the human mind dared adventure into those areas which had been totally not-ised.

Authorities on the field of the human mind do not believe in pictures, do not believe in engrams, do not believe in time track, do not believe in the masses, don't believe in any of these things. So we would say offhand, then, that they were only brave enough to adventure into those areas which had been totally not-ised by them. So if they had successfully not-ised something, then they were willing to look, if you call that looking.

There is looking and then there is not-ising and of course, not-ising, it's very – it's very easy to look. There's many a fool has gone out in battle while the cannonballs were flying by, saying, "I don't see any." And this – the sergeant there, lying under the log, says, "Well, you will presently."

Of course, they lug him off to the burial detail shortly if he keeps walking around in all this. So I imagine that's what's happened to field-of-the-human-mind people who have

been carefully schooled into believing it is all imaginary and then they've walked into one of these cannonballs. They probably tried to tell one another about these cannonballs. And the fellow tried to say, "You know, there's cannonballs around here," and they've said, "Well, he's gone stark, staring batty. He – now he thinks he is Napoleon or something of the sort," and they probably disposed of these chaps to the local institution, you see; the burial detail has gotten them. Or they've simply collided with them, have actually seen a tiny corner of one of these things and have cut and run and have said, "Well, we want nothing more to do with the study of the human mind. That is about that. I mean, that settles the point. We have now settled the point. Should anybody ever investigate the human mind? The answer is no. And therefore, we're going to stick very, very closely with Freud. We're going to stick very, very closely now with Wundt. Now, these are the boys to stay with. They don't cause you any trouble. They say there is nothing in the mind but meat or inhibitions or an unconscious and that nobody can see he's unconscious, so that's all very safe."

Well, now, you didn't know you were brave people, did you? But frankly – frankly, there is no substitute for guts when it comes to taking a look at what goes on on the backtrack. You're not necessarily brave people. You're just people who are willing to look and there were lots of people who would have been willing to look if everybody had told them there was nothing to see. And nobody is willing to look when he says there's nothing to see, you know? Somebody goes to the window and looks out and somebody says, "Well, what's happening out in the yard?"

And the fellow says, "Nothing," so nobody else goes to the window. And that's sort of been the field of the human mind.

Here was this terrific battle, these tremendous things out there in the yard, you see? There were all these masses and lines of soldiers and free track and pictures and identities and madnesses and pain and everything else out there in the front yard. The fellow went to the window, took a look out – it was his job to be lookout – and he went out and he looked. And he says – and they say, "What's at the window?"

And he says, "Oh, there's nothing there. Nothing there," you see? Blood running all over the place. "Nothing going on. There's nothing happening."

So nobody else bothered to look. That's about what it amounts to. Anybody who has an operation to control people in the past has apparently tried to work this operation on the basis of keeping them from looking at the mind, because all the mechanisms of control were resident *in* the mind. And if the mind was much *looked* at, it would as-is and therefore with it would as-is these mechanisms of slavery and control.

If you were to take a superstitious people – you know, superstition is a powerful control mechanism. You may run into a valence sometime or another that specialized in it. "Now, if you never touch the cherry trees in spring – never – and if you're careful not to look at the moon during the first part of its phase and if you're awfully, awfully careful never to eat your oatmeal with a left-handed spoon..." You get the enormous number of not-looks that they're sowing into the thing.

Well, if you – just on that basis alone, if you've sowed in enough not-looks, you would render a person so introverted he would be very easy to control. He would be very *simple* to control; he would be nothing but an automaton. You see how it's done, you see?

Militarily, you see this. You must not strike a superior officer, militarily. Well, what is this mechanism then? It means that you must not reach a superior officer, but a superior officer can reach you. It makes a nice stuck flow, doesn't it? So after a while, a superior officer says, "Now, the best possible survival action that this company of troops can take is to dash over that parapet into the teeth of those new machine guns the enemy has just started firing." This is a survival action. Nobody questions it at all and they go over the top of the parapet and that's the end of that. Nobody has to worry about that company anymore, you see?

But the recruiting sergeants are all talking about the line and they get people in. And people – they say the best possible thing to do is this or that or the other thing and everybody does it, you know?

If you can't look and if you don't look and if nobody is trying to get you to look, of course, these mechanisms, then, all add up to slavery mechanisms. They are mechanisms of introversion.

Now, if that is the bulk of thing which has been on the whole track, and it is – what do you expect the whole track's condition to be like? The overts of making people introverted so they could be controlled – you get this as a different mechanism; introverted so they could be controlled, you see – the motivators are getting introverted so that one was controlled and the common denominator of the whole thing was "Don't look." And, therefore, if we kept everybody from looking and if everybody kept us from looking and we get everybody's anchor points well in, we of course would wind up with balls of *goonk*, inevitably, you see?

If the individual led twelve lifetimes as a plumber and during that whole period of twelve lifetimes, he was basically dedicated to keeping customers from looking at their bills or at the plumbing work he had done, you see, and all of his customers were basically dedicated into keeping him from looking into the bathroom or the guest bedroom at the wrong time – in other words, their common ground of communication was not-look.

He didn't want *them* to look, they didn't want *him* to look. Well, if this is very acute, you wind up with a ball, not a track.

Now, your track can be plotted against time. It goes pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa and the seconds go on, the minutes go on, the days go on and so forth and all of this can be plotted out.

Actually, the track isn't vertical or horizontal or diagonal in somebody's mind, but a person can move from one moment of time to another moment of time. The word *move* is used advisedly because he seems to be in different positions in location while he is in different positions in time. So he gets the *position* change associated with the *time* change, so therefore he thinks of himself as moving in time.

He does have a mobility in time in all those areas except where he has a mass. Where a life – series of lifetimes or a lifetime has become a mass, he no longer has the possibility of moving in time or in space. Why?

Because all the overts of it were introvertive and all the motivators of it were introvertive, so if the overts and the motivators both had the same thing in common, the commonest ground was not just don't-look between himself and other valences, but introvert. And this introversion or looking inward, carries with it pulling inward.

So we have these things taking up actually the most economical geometrical shape for the maximum mass for the minimum space. And that is a sphere. These things actually are spheres. [...laughter, laughs]

So the maximum – maximum amount of content – if you want the maximum amount of content or volume of any geometric shape, you get a sphere. And you want the minimal surface for the maximal content, you get a sphere. In other words, that's the most pull-in that's got the most packed into it.

And these valences are very funny. I heard of one, one time very recently, in the last three or four weeks. You peeked into it and you could see all these little pictures like 35-millimeter pictures and when this thing moved in on the pc, it hurt and when it moved off, that was very nice. But when it came around he could look into it and he could see 35-millimeter pictures, all color slides in it and so forth. Well, that of course was the fellow's track as that identity.

And you got this identity, you see, but all of its time track is in a ball. You see, yesterday is tomorrow is next year is last year. All time is this time and of course there – it's gone down to no time. So because it's gone down to no time, it'll float in present time like a shot. See, no time, present time, what's the difference – not according to this valence.

So here it is. In that ball, if you could lay this ball out like you could a – you take a – you know, you take a – ladies, you take these bundled-up tape measures you're always getting your hip measurements with to make sure that age is not creeping up on you, you know? Lots of those things. You take one of those tape measures and here it is and if you wadded it all up in a ball and laid it down in front of you, you see, *knead* it in, so it's nice and spherical and so on, that would be one of these valences all grouped. See, that's all time is no time, everything is here, now. It is a sphere. Now, that thing has got all the identities, characteristics, ideas, type of machinery thinking. Everything it's got is all in it.

Now, if you would take both ends of this tape measure, if you could find them, you see, and you just stretch it out like that, you'd have your – the lifespan stretched out. Well, it was like that once. See, it was nicely stretched out, but maybe about three-quarters of the way through that life, it started to ball up and the moment of death sure put the finishing touches on it, so it went *uomp*, and there it is all in a ball.

Now, that's these things you're handling. That's these things; that's these masses. Now, of course, they have engrams in them. Now, what you're facing there is a package of engrams. Now, we're auditing packages of engrams.

Now, if you think of Book One: supposing where Book One – Book One – everywhere you said "engram," you said "valence," you see that – instead of auditing an engram your target was a valence. You could have transferred over, then, all the characteristics of valences into these engrams, you see?

You got what I'm talking about? I'm just trying to give you some kind of an idea. So, today, we're not auditing engrams, we're auditing packages of engrams. And we're auditing these packages of engrams directly with 3D Criss Cross and that's what audits them.

And these packages of engrams contain in them, if audited one by one, enough engrams to keep an auditor busy for about ten thousand hours of auditing – just one of these packages. Just *one* of these packages would have enough engrams in it to keep an auditor busy for about ten thousand hours. And he'd have to be a good auditor at that.

All right. Now let's look at this more closely: There are tens of thousands of these packages in what we call the Goals Problem Mass. So it'd be tens of thousands times ten thousand hours. You add it up and it makes an impressive-looking piece of arithmetic, but it would be just trying to give you an approximate idea. Say ten thousand hours of auditing and there's tens of thousands of packages, each one of which would take ten thousand hours of auditing. You'd have to multiply ten thousand times ten thousand and you'd get quite a few hours. And I don't think you're going to be around that long – I mean, just auditing one pc. I think you'd get bored.

I do – I don't – I don't think he'd see enough gain, because he'd just be out of one engram into the next engram and on and on and on.

Well now, that all means if it were feasible to audit the engrams in these things, it would take ten thousand hours. But now let me *cap* this: It's not possible to audit the engrams in them.

Yeah, why isn't it possible? Well, that's because you've got the condensed tape-measure action. You could not separate out enough time in one package to audit one consecutive engram.

Now, you have seen a pc that every time you "put them on the time track" (quote) (unquote) they got *brrrrrrp*. Have you ever noticed this? You'd said to them, "All right. Now, go to the moment when you hurt your foot." And the guy gets about fifty feet.

See – you ever have this happen? He gets about fifty feet and there are about fifty different times and he can't tell the difference between them and you start moving him off of this point where he hurt his foot and he gets all sorts of feet and then he gets shoes and then the next thing you know he gets foundations and it all goes *rrrrrrrp*.

And you say, "Now, come on now. We just want that one foot that you're sitting there with right now and we're going – we're going to audit this foot" – *brrrrrrrp!*

You can't audit it, in other words. It – his attention, every time he hits anything, goes *brrrrrrrp*. Well, you've got a fellow whose present lifetime is a Goals Problem Mass valence. See, his lifetime – this lifetime has gone *blunk!* And, of course, all roads lead to now and all nows lead elsewhere, so that you've just got now, see?

And you say, "All right. Now, get in – get in contact with your tonsils." Say, the guy has got a sore throat, you know? Say, "Get in contact with your tonsils."

All right. He gets in contact with his tonsils, see?

"Well," you say. "What's happening?"

"*Yeaow – ayeaa – yeooo.*"

"Well, what happens when you do it?"

"*Yeooo.* It makes me very dizzy." He hasn't got an engram in his throat; he's got a Goals Problem Mass valence in his throat and it's an oppterm. And every time he hits it, he doesn't get the throat somatic, he gets dizziness, because it starts to move, you know? And it just shakes everything. And this is "*Ooo-o-o-oh*, no. We don't want to have anything to do with that." You see what this is?

So we're not auditing individual pictures or individual bodies. We're auditing *packages* of pictures and *packages* of bodies. We're auditing packages of identities, as far as that's concerned. I defy you to go into the middle of Goals Problem Mass. You know, I mean not with any 3DXX, see? Nothing like that. Let's just say, "All right. Now pick up the moment you were a Roman senator. All right. That's good. What's the matter?"

"Well, I don't find any moment when I'm a Roman senator. *Yeaow-uuuu. Thhhhhh.*"

"Well, go on. Find the moment when you're a Roman senator."

"*Uhhh.*"

"What are you looking at?"

"Well, it's just all black."

"Well, can't you find the period there where you were a Roman senator? I get a knock on the E-Meter here – Roman senator."

"*Nnaaa.*"

Well, you of course think you've moved him back in time. Of course, you've run him into the Goals Problem Mass and that's all now. So he hasn't gone back in time, he is right here at now. And as far as the Roman senator is concerned, he's contacted it. And if you watched him leave the session, he would swing his toga. [laughter] But he couldn't see anything.

See, his pictures are in a total condensation. That's what bars out knowledge. Every time you try to think like a Roman senator or think like a plumber, if you've got a valence of a Roman senator or a valence of a plumber, everything starts to move slightly and it goes *zzzzzz*. And you don't want anything to do with that. So you promptly don't think the kind of thoughts that a Roman senator or a plumber would think.

And you get into a technical school sometime or another and you're going along fine, you're learning some carpentry or something like that or how to saw small rabbits out with jigsaws or something. And then you have to put a pipe through them to make them stand up, you know? And, my God, you can't get the pipe through. You just do a beautiful job of sawing out the bunny out of the – out of the piece of board, but getting this little piece of pipe through so the bunny will stand up, you know? That's just something you just can't manage. You finally cut your finger on it and have to give up, you see?

Every other student in the place, they got the little pipe through okay. You didn't, see? That's because if you think or do like a plumber, you've had it.

And it isn't that you have a mechanism residual which says "Never again shall I ever be a plumber because it is a failed life." No, that thinkingness actually didn't have to take place.

If you've got a valence as a plumber that can get disturbed in the Goals Problem Mass, then every time you try to think like a plumber, you think like an idiot. Now, you either can go into it wholly and with no self-determinism whatsoever, simply be it with no resistance – you'll be a lousy one, by the way, but you could be it with no resistance at all. You can go on hooking up the cold-water pipes to the fridge, you see, and draining out – draining out all of the sinks into the fresh-water line and you could just go on and people wouldn't quite find anything right with your plumbing, but they really wouldn't find anything wrong with your plumbing. You'd be sick most of the time. You'd be a very sickly sort of plumber, but you probably could make it – you probably could make it. I think probably most of the politicians that are around right now busy politicking are in the valences of politicians.

It's one of the easiest things in the world to get into one of these valences. First the individual just can't stand the thought of it and then he makes up his mind to be it. And after that, he sort of goes through life this way, you see: fixed-eyed, steering an erratic course, no self-determinism, nothing of the sort, so that stimulus A happens, response B always occurs, you see? Just bang, bang. And they're very easy to handle; they don't make much sense.

But if they're in that state – now get this – they *don't dare think*. You see? They can only dramatize. They can't think; they can only dramatize. Now, how many pcs have you run into that you couldn't run "think" on?

Have you ever run into a pc you couldn't run "think" on? You had to run "Get the idea..." or something. I don't know where he's going to get this idea. It's evidently dragged in on an endless belt. And he takes it off of the assembly line.

But the idea of thinking is totally foreign to his abilities. He cannot think. Have you ever run into any like this?

Let me tell you, they're quite common – quite common. You possibly – because our processes over the last few years haven't ever used this to any great extent, you probably haven't noticed it too much.

But you say, "Put a thought in that object" or "Think a thought," or "Think of yourself as..." any think-think. You know, the individual has got to input a thought – can't do it. That's because he's sitting in the middle of a Goals Problem Mass. A case that cannot do that, does not really surrender on an auditing process auditing thinkingness.

You see, you don't want them to audit thinkingness in order to get them to think. Now, there were some thinkingness processes in the Fourth London we had some that – they worked a bit. "What isn't thinking," I think the process was. "Look around here and find something that isn't thinking." Well, that's very interesting, because it would raise their havingness and it would move this valence off far enough so that the individual could think a thought.

Of course, havingness being havingness and no withholds having been pulled off, he probably walked out the front door immediately afterwards, had it collide with him again and was unable to think once more. But it was an interesting phenomenon.

So there are a lot of people around that can't think and they don't dare think. If they think, it almost kills them. They can dramatize, but they can't think. Spot that particular pc, because he's of interest to you.

Now, trying to find an engram on that pc is one of the more adventurous things that you could do, because the second you try to find the engram, it goes *zzzzzzzzzt, bzooooooooom-swish*, and you say, "Now. All right. Now let's get the first moment you heard the news your father was dead. Now, let's get the first moment..." *Zzzzzzzzzzt-ba-zooooooooommm-boomp-boomp*. What's he got?

"Well; I've got myself as a pirate captain in the year 1051."

"Oh? All right. Now, let's just – let's just get that moment, the first moment when you got the news that..."

Zzzzzzzzzzt-boom-mum-zoooooooooom-boom. "What's happened? What's that – you look kind of startled. What's happened?" "Oh, uh – I don't know. I was thinking about my little brother."

"Well, uh – did he hurt his – hurt his foot?"

"Uh – oh, no. He had mumps."

And you get the idea of a preclear being totally out of the auditor's control and you're liable to start treating the pc as somebody who is out of control, when actually the pc isn't out of control, the pc is simply in a valence. And any time they move as the thetan – it's actual movement as a thetan, you see – any time they move slightly as a thetan or as a thetan put out any fresh energy, something activates. And *it* controls them more heavily than the auditor controls them. You see, the auditor can't hold the bank straight because there's no bank to hold straight.

So the auditor is trying to hold the bank straight and there is no bank and there's nothing there but a valence. Now, this is very amusing that a case of that character cannot have engrams run on him, but he can do 3D Criss Cross like a startled gazelle. Nothing to it. Give me a list of people you don't like. *Brrrrrrrrp bang-bang-bang-bang-bang*. Differentiate the list. *Bong-bong-bong-bong-bong*. Null it out. *Bu-bow-bow-bow*.

And all of a sudden, particularly if you run lots of Havingness with this kind of thing, why, you'll find the individual *zzz-rrrr-m-oom*. It's all right.

Now you could say, "Well, now, think a thought."

"Think a thought. *Mm-mm*." He'd be able to think a little bit, you know? Not for long, because you've still got some more masses for him to confront, but he wouldn't be solidly impacted into a dozen at once.

Now, they could be in *one* valence or they could be in *three* valences or they could be in a valence which is a combination of the oppterm and term – a combination valence. It has

all the characteristics of the terminal and oppterm. You'll find this occasionally. It's the most maddening thing you ever had anything to do with, because it'll do nothing but beef up the Prehav Scale and it'll – just won't run and *euuuuuuuuu*.

What it is, is the waterbuck has faced the tiger until you have a waterbuck, you see, that is thoroughly striped and has long paws and swims and you'd say, "What is this?"

And he'd say, "Well, it is, I'm a waterbuck."

"All right. That's fine, but what do you look like, you know?"

And he'd say, "Well, I have these – I'm a waterbuck, I have these long stripes. I roar, uh – and so forth."

In other words, everything is totally collapsed into it and he would as easily call it a tiger. Only it's the same thing. It's a waterbuck-tiger.

And if you – if he said he was in a tiger valence, well, he was in a tiger valence and goes *ga-zoo-uh*, and he's in a – he's a swimming sort of tiger and he has smooth, soft fur – only it's hair. He has hoofs. All his tigers have hoofs. In other words, it's a combination valence – waterbuck-tiger.

And it – actually, he has lived along some Goals Problem Mass package, on and on and on and on, until finally he has hit this as a valence; he has become this valence *in life*.

He is a police officer with all the characteristics of a criminal, you see? He is a politician – he is a politician – an American politician with all the characteristics of a Russian, don't you see? You get the idea? Or he is a criminal with all the characteristics of a police officer, or a Russian with all the characteristics of a...

This is a special kind of valence, see. It is one being. It is not two beings, but it has the characteristics of both sides and it won't run. *Won't run!* I insist on this, see?

This is the thing. This is a thing. And you'll hit that occasionally and the pc will *sell* this to you – will sell this to you with all of the salesmanship of a Dale Carnegie. Hell give you the whole thing. He'll try to fiddle the can and everything else because this is the thing. Hell tell you, "This is the me. Oh, man, *oh-oh-oh-o-o-o-ah*." It isn't that every one he tries to sell you is a combination valence, but the combination valence is almost always sold. He'll sell it to the auditor, you know? "Well, that's it. I know what that is. Yeah. *Ooooooh, yes*." Terrific game going on here. Yeah, *oh-oh, big, big game. Oh-oh, yes, yes, we gotta run that thing*.

The auditor ran it. The Prehav Scale would beef up and the pc would fall in pieces and fall on his head, see? It's a late valence on any cycle. Usually there is a combination valence toward the end of any long cycle.

In other words, a period of 60 thousand, 600 thousand years and so forth of one game going on and on and on – one game, the spaceship officer and the spaceship crewman. Let's call that just one game – the spaceship officer, spaceship crewman. And he will finally – you will finally get a spaceship crewman who acts like a spaceship officer who is a spaceship officer because he's a member of the crew.

In other words, you get your current breed of officer, as it exists more or less in the armies today, you see? They're not really officers. They're not really enlisted men. They're nice to all the enlisted men, you see and all the enlisted men are nice and then they all... Do you know, it's all kind of messed up? It's a very interesting state.

Now, that's – that's a combination valence and cycles finish in these combination valences – quite ordinarily. The guy goes on playing the game of the criminal, the police official, the waterbuck, the tiger – standard games. This is a very, very standard game type of thing and he finally winds up with the guy in CID. The CID man who was just arrested the other day for burglarizing a warehouse. See? He's a combination valence, you know? He's both at the same time, simultaneously in one body in a lifetime. Quite amazing.

Now, individuals, living as they come down the track, live a certain amount of free track and those are usually fairly happy lives. When you run into engrams on those, they will run them quite willingly, but what's the difference? Not going to make any difference because actually it's one engram out of God knows how many and it doesn't amount to much.

Don't mistake it though. You can change a case all over the place by running one of these whole track valences, you know? You can practically have him growing fleas. Everything is wonderful and so on. They say that's the exact somatics and so on. You can make a change in the individual.

In the same number of hours of 3D Criss Cross, you would make ten times the amount of change. See, so don't say that you – running engrams is no good. That is not true.

But you're running engrams off of free track. And the trouble with the bloke, that is going to be the long, persistent trouble, is this valence and there's no free track in the valence to run any engram out of.

All right. Now let's go a little bit further. How did these valences get there? Why did they get there? And why does a Goals Problem Mass hang up as a mass? Now, you already have an adequate answer when I say the motivators were to extrovert – introvert somebody and the overts were to introvert somebody and so on, you're naturally going to get a ball of introversion. Naturally.

But what makes it so persistent? It's because this ball, which is a valence, in its lifetime, had *hates*. It had things it didn't like and things it had overts on. So we have this fellow and he's lived this lifetime and he is this whole lifetime the temple priest. That's fine. The temple priest, and he's gone along, he's done all right – sacrificial altars have all been well bloodied and he's done every – all the now-I'm-supposed-to's of a priest – collected all the loot, lied to the peasantry, invented gods that everybody would be terrified of; he's done all the proper things that he's now supposed to do as a priest. He's been a very successful priest, lifetime after lifetime, after lifetime, after lifetime, after lifetime, after lifetime, you see?

But somehow or another, down along the line, he just didn't like these temple virgins. He just didn't like these temple virgins. He never could quite see a temple virgin. Actually, he had a few overts on them and this sort of pyramided up into more overts.

It's not actually an overt-motivator situation. A fellow accidentally gets an overt on something. One day he was raising one of the burning pots up before the brass god, you see,

and one of the vestal virgins was helping him and he slipped, because he was terrified of spiders or something, you see? He slipped and he spilled the whole ruddy lot on top of her and that burned her up to a cinder.

Well, having done this overt, you see, he now will do overts. See, he tries to prevent himself from doing this. So every time he gets around to burning incense pot, if there's a vestal virgin anywhere in the temple anyplace, he of course is very careful not to let the incense pot go toward her.

And it takes only a relatively short space of time, like a lifetime, two or three lifetimes, till just the thought of the incense pot and the vestal virgin, he's *h-hrum-hrum-hrum* – he's holding the incense pot – and by the reverse flow which he is setting up, he gets to a point where he sees the vestal virgin; he knows what he's supposed to do. He's supposed to take out the incense pot and dump it on her, you see? This is how you handle that situation. It's easier to do that – to keep on restraining yourself from doing that, you see?

And the fellow who every time he has an accident says, "Well, it ought – it had better be a good accident. We had better make it a *good* accident," you see? He's just tired of restraining himself from having accidents. So now that – the mere thought that he's going to have an accident, he's going to have a *good* accident. This is the laws of flows at work.

So inadvertently at first and then later on, more purposefully and then more and more purposefully and *more and more and more* purposefully, he just gets more and more and more overts on vestal virgins and temple virgins. He just gets more and more overts on them, you see?

And finally he gets up to a point where he's in a terrific games condition with them. They're on that side of the temple and he's on this side of the temple. If he is a priest in a temple, he knows that there's one thing that he has to be very careful about, because the whole cult is liable to be overthrown by those vestal virgins. He *knows* what they're up to; they're plotting to dump burning incense pots on his head. [laughter]

Now, of course, in view of the fact that all during this period of time the vestal virgins have been accumulating – the whole line has been accumulating overts on priests, we eventually get the two sides of the temple, which is the priest and the virgin and so forth. And we get this *awrrrr* and it goes *wraaaw* and wow! So he accumulates enough overts on one and he can't stay out of them. That's advisedly stated.

He kicks off as a priest one day: The mob as usual overflowing of the dikes of the temple has eaten them up and he takes off and he goes up and he sits on Cloud 19 for a little while and then he knows exactly what he should do. He goes right back down and picks up a girl and becomes a vestal virgin. See?

Now, you've got a real interesting game going. Up to this time, every time one of these lifetimes as a priest balled up, it would find itself opposed to only a thought of the existence of a temple virgin. And it's only opposed internally into pictures he has of temple virgins.

But now we're really going to fix him up. We're really going to fix this one up now. He picks up this girl, he knows exactly what he's supposed to do. He goes down – as soon as

she is of any age whatsoever, he won't let his parents rest, you see, until she is enrolled in the temple.

And he goes up through the lines and is very carefully virginal and goes carrying right straight on through and oddly enough, has a slight feeling that this virgin should be kept away from priests. He just has this idea as a virgin, there's just something tells him – you call it intuition if you like – but that he had better not go very close to any priests.

So by the fact of disassociation from the priest and by the fact of no communication with the priest, he of course is getting himself into a beautiful condition of just going into a long series of overts against priests.

So now as a temple virgin – as a temple virgin, every time the cups for the libation are served, why, she, now, goes down the line, you see? And somehow or another, every time she comes to a priest – not a – not one of the local citizenry or something – every time she comes to a priest, she's liable to trip – the wine, you see, is liable to be dripping slightly – there'll be something a bit wrong – and occasionally spill a whole tray, you see, in their direction. And we'll give her another lifetime or two running along this particular line and she doesn't just drop wine cups, you see, she carefully puts the hemlock into one or two at the proper occasions, all for the good of the temple, you understand.

This is well understood. Everybody realizes this. That it's nothing personal about this. It's just – it's better to get rid of the priests and everything'll be fine, see?

So we get up to the hemlock stage and then we get up to the cutthroat stage and then go back down into the hemlock stage and then somehow or another in all temple revolts claim the citizenry was the one who murdered the chief priest and it's always, of course, somebody else who did it – and carefully puts the bloody dagger in her shirtwaist afterwards, you see? And says, "A bunch of peasants came up and stabbed him to death as he knelt at the altar. Yes, my lord, that is the way it happened," you see?

You got big withholds building up on this particular line and enough of these and all of a sudden you have a round ball called vestal virgin. Now, this can drift around loose because internally it's only opposed to priests and it can drift around loose on the track but kind of floating in present time.

And then having *lived* a number of lives in this particular line and gotten this all balled up because it's a high games condition, takes off one fine day after the peasantry has burned down the temple – which is the usual indoor sport of the peasantry after being oppressed and taxed for long enough – takes off, picks up a boy and comes back and joins as a priest. Now he's a priest.

All right. Now let's accumulate some more overts against vestal virgins, you see? Oh, my God! The first time he shoves a dirk into a vestal virgin, all of a sudden it's so funny, but it's all those – kind of *waagh-thud!*

You've got the ball in the bank which was the vestal virgin and the ball in the bank which is already the priest, went together *scrooo* splat! And there they are – almost inseparable.

Now, he can go on and live lifetimes of priest; he can go on and live lifetimes of vestal virgin; he eventually will come up to a combination lifetime. He will come up to a life of an effeminate priest who has interesting habits. [laughter]

And that's the dying line. That's the combination valence he has arrived at there and eventually it's just too painful to be any of these things and he won't want anything much to do with them and he'll drift off. But he's carrying all of that with him.

It's all part of his baggage. He doesn't want anything to do with this baggage and he doesn't quite figure out how he got this baggage, but there it is.

Now, by the time he's gone through this whole cycle of the priest, the temple virgin, the combination valence and so forth, this whole thing balls up into a mass of some kind or another. It's composed individually of a lot of individuals.

Now, if he's – if he's got all this – priests and vestal virgins and the combination valence – all bunched together, you'd think he wouldn't have anything more to do with this, you see?

Now that's *it*. That's a finished action.

Well, he goes along for a little while and he lives a lot of free track. He gets out; he's – actually gets a job as a water boy or something like that to a camel train, goes travelling around the countryside – he gets a lot of free track. Nothing ever happens to that free track, it just stays free. It gets kind of looped up and squeezed in on other things. But one day he's got a body as a merchant. And there he is as a merchant. And he is busy selling Aladdin's lamps, cheap, cut-rate price, straight from Syria. And somebody drifts by in a canopied sedan chair and says, "Deliver it at the temple." He doesn't see anything wrong with this. So he picks up the lamp and he takes it down and delivers it to the temple. And as he goes out, why, one of the vestal virgins chucks him under the chin.

And he goes back and sits down. It's been a bad day. It's really been a bad day. Now he goes on as a merchant, gyps everybody, introverts them, keeps them from doing business, eventually becomes the military – a military governor who is bound and determined that nobody shall ever do any business, graduates up into a standard income-tax racket like they've got going in some countries now – I won't mention the name of – where they take all and give back nothing. And this – he goes on this whole line. It hasn't anything to do with anything like temples or anything like that, but it's a brand-new game, you see?

It's the merchant prince versus the tax collector versus the governor versus the army versus the government. The merchant prince versus the government, so he's a merchant prince and he's the government and he's the government and he's the merchant prince and he's a military governor and he's the collector of taxes and he's a prince of merchants and he is a merchant and he sells things and then he's an industrialist and then he manufactures armor and so forth, for the government. And we've gotten to our combination valence stage on this series of packages. See, he is an industrialist who manufactures only for the government; has only one customer, the government. And, of course, that's a combination valence.

Ordinarily, when that gets down to a total thing, you – generally the political form the country has is a fascism. That's the – generally the end product of fascism – all production is

for the government. And usually by force of arms to keep the rest of the population enslaved. Interesting economics. But regardless of that, it's some kind of a game of this character and it's run on. Of course, as a merchant he has formed these masses; of course, as a military governor he's formed these masses; and of course, by the overts, one another, you've got a whole new package here, see? You've got this whole new package.

So you had the temple priest, you see and the vestal virgin and all of that game and that became a package. And then you had a lot of free track. And then you've got this other thing and they have gradually grouped together as a package. You see, these things plotted out against time very nicely until they *grouped*. And of course, they grouped with the *ne plus ultra* combination valence sort of a thing.

A combination valence just groups everything anyhow. You see, the effeminate priest, he can't do anything that doesn't restimulate being a vestal virgin and he can't do anything without restimulating a priest. So he can't do anything without pulling his bank together. It's impossible.

So you've got this Goals Problem Mass. Now, that *is* a Goals Problem Mass. You see, your – the problem that a vestal virgin would have with the priest and the priest would have with the vestal virgin and all that sort of thing, that's a Goals Problem Mass all by itself.

And up here, we've got the merchant prince and the provost marshal and all that and that's a Goals Problem Mass all by itself. And then one day after that – he can't sell things anymore – what he does these days is he's a night watchman in a rice paddy. And he's sitting there nightwatching like mad and he notices there's a fire going on over in the edge of the woods someplace. And he decides to go over and investigate it and he finds that somebody has set up a brass idol and they are all going *oowah* and *wumm-wumm*. And they're all calling out to *woo-woo*, and so he says, "Hey! What you doing there?"

That's enough. They all come over and he has to knock one of them colder than ice. And he gets in trouble with the local authorities and all that sort of thing and the Goals Problem Mass of the merchant and the military governor and the Goals Problem Mass of the temple come together and they make one awful big mash of *bthaaa*. See?

Well, free track sort of sits out here someplace and these two things come together and become undifferentiated from any time in them. Now you're really getting the mass.

What do you think happens after a thetan has had ten thousand such games? Ten thousand such games on the track? You see, each one of these games is one whole Goals Problem Mass, see?

They've got terminals, they've got oppters, they've got everything all mixed up. And, of course, as these things associate, you see, he had two association points that could have brought it together: once he did visit a temple as a merchant, but that was enough to start and then he actually knocked somebody out who was practicing rites in a wood, you see, while operating as a guard. Umm. And that really keys him in. He, by the way, got malaria after that and got very sick and they eventually buried him in the rice paddy, thinking he was possessed of demons – and he was, too.

So these masses just keep adding together and adding together and adding together and sometimes they're not totally added together at the moment the auditor enters into one. The auditor says to the fellow so-and-so and so-and-so.

And all of a sudden the fellow says, "You know that has some vague connection – a merchant prince and a temple. And there's something between a mer – – . Oh, there's something between a merchant – " *Clank!* And two pieces of Goals Problem Mass – two Goals Problem Masses go together with a *splash*. And the pc will say – this has rarely happened, see? In other words, the auditing furnished the key-in, see? Don't let that worry you because it's inevitable. The thing was about to key in anyhow if it was that close, see?

Now you both key it in and separate it out again. He never would have had a chance of separating it out again, you see? So, don't let that worry you because you all of a sudden have these masses suddenly colliding with masses while you're auditing somebody.

You can sometimes group this lifetime. You're going along, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, auditing and you all of a sudden hit a whale of a grouper in this lifetime – overts and motivators and that sort of thing. And this lifetime goes *clank!* And it becomes a balled-up mass. It's nothing to worry about. It would have gone in another year or two anyhow. You can separate it out and so on.

Now, the odd part of it is, you can take this lifetime apart if you can find the exact prior confusion to the exact moment of group. And you better learn how to do that because you can always take a Goals Problem Mass and put it back into a longitudinal track. You can take one of these valences and stretch it right out along the track again by picking up – if you wanted to audit just that valence.

Let's take him as – let's take him as Ali the errand boy of Baghdad. And we've got a valence there that's Ali the errand boy of Baghdad.

And we managed to have gotten this thing straightened out and separate. We've peeled it off, you see? And we've got it separate and it'll stay separate, if you can imagine such a thing. It won't.

But let's say we could get it to stay separate. We could then audit it this way: We could say, "What is the principal problem that Ali the errand boy of Baghdad had?" and he gives it to us and we said, "Well, when did that happen?" and so on. And we run it down. And "What's the prior confusion to that?" and "What were you withholding at that time?" and so on. And we'll get Ali the errand boy of Baghdad straightened out, so that it'll be – it'll be a section of free track.

We could do that. We don't have to do that.

But you could get all of these valences straightened out again and you could straighten them out along the track or you could group them up in a ball. You could do almost anything you want to with them with auditing. They're fairly easy to handle.

The best way to do something with them, of course, is to differentiate them, one from another: Both by finding them, naming them, getting them inspected very closely by the pc and blowing them off, nulling them and winding up with those that won't *budge*. And those

that won't budge, of course, won't budge because they are impacted on others that are too heavily charged. And you just bleed charge, bleed charge, bleed charge.

Now, these things are dependent on one another for their own charge, and the thing wouldn't hang together as – now, you notice you didn't get a ball-up happening until the fellow had an overt on the oppterm and then you get enough overt on the oppterm, you get a ball-up. See, the priest didn't get the track collapsing on him – if you wanted to call it that, he didn't get the track collapsing until he actually had run up an awful lot of overts on vestal virgins.

Now, that priest thing could collapse all by itself because he had overts inside it on vestal virgins without any valence of the vestal virgin being around, see? But frankly, that will unwind very easily. There's not very much to it. So he had some overts against some vestal virgins. That's about all it amounts to.

It takes the mechanics of a problem to keep this thing in suspension and keep these things from straightening out.

Now if you've got valence A versus valence B, you have the terminal and oppterm of a 3D package – A versus B. And let us suppose that both A and B are heavy inflows. You've got a valence versus a valence which is flowing away from a valence while the two things are held closely together, you create a vacuum. And you have brought later valences up into the vacuum between these two valences.

You've got inflow – or outflow valences actually create the same thing. Two outflow valences flowing against each other will tend to create the vacuum at the *backs* of the valences – two vacuums created.

So you get the thing held together, really, by the mechanics of opposition. These things have to be in pretty close balance to hang there at all. Otherwise, they'd as-is. It takes a lot of doing to get one of these things persisting. I mean, it's very delicately, the way they hang together. It's something.

Now, once you've got these things shredded on, the charge blown and the fellow has looked at them and he's discarded them and he winds up with what it was and you find some more of them and blow that and you straighten them up, another step could – two more steps could be done with this stuff – is when you're doing line A, let us say, in the Goals Problem Mass, you could take every zig and find out what problem it had with every zag.

In other words, you could take the zig and the zag in it is temple priest and the zag is vestal virgin. And you could ask the individual, "Now, what problem would a vestal virgin have with a temple priest and what problem would a temple priest have with a vestal virgin?" And just state the problem.

The individual will usually state it that fast. But you could do a little assessment on that point and tend to blow these things even further than they have blown. Just a method of differentiation, this would be.

And then you could say – your next one is – that happens on that opposition line is for some peculiar reason an idol maker and you've got, well, "What problem would a vestal vir-

gin have with an idol maker?" Now you see, the vestal virgin always – already had a set of problems with the priest. Now, the vestal virgin can also have a set of problems with the next zig which is the idol maker, see?

So you could then get all the problems of the zags with the zigs. See? Consecutive. You got the problems of the zigs with the zags and now you can get the problems of the zags with the zigs. And you keep writing down problem and the fellow looks at these things. And it's like running problems on somebody, only he'll keep recognizing that he's had these problems and so on.

This thing blows, blows, blows, blows further apart.

Well, every time you enter this thing at all, you improve the person's ability to confront it and his ability to confront it as long as he's permitted to confront it. It takes good auditing; bad auditing inhibits his confronting of it. Poor auditing, rough auditing, keeps him from confronting it and it's trying to keep him from confronting it and the two complement each other and he really gets upset.

But it – let's say it's good auditing and he's going along fine, as it would be if any of you did it (or I'd knock your blocks off). The – the point we're making here is that the individual is continuously confronting the phenomena of the Goals Problem Mass, you see? He's continuously confronting it, one after the other and what these things are and he's handling these things by the bushel-basket load. And he's getting somatics here and getting somatics there. And it's kicking his brains in on this side and it's going on and on. And he gets accustomed to this sort of thing; he gets used to it, that's all.

He's blowing them. He's separating them, differentiating them. He's seeing what they are. And they frankly have less and less effect on him.

Now, all the way up the track, he has only been the effect of those things. He himself has been the effect of those things, but now they are being the effect of him. And just by reversing this cycle and doing no other action but just reversing this cycle, you'd stretch out the whole Goals Problem Mass. And you stretch it out back down the track.

And your eventual product of this, particularly if you added dating as a step (which I haven't taken up with you and which I sometimes shudder at having to teach you, because I've had loses on it before) but if you were to date the thing and if you were to get a long roller tape of some kind or another that was about four, five, six inches wide and – so that you could put sections; you know, like motion-picture film on a spool. And you just kept writing down where these things were and you dated these things, you dated these valences, where they were found and so on and you got them all neatly in place on this long, endless belt of tape that – not endless belt of tape – the tape was so fixed that you could cut it out with a pair of scissors. And you could take another section – because it looked like you had everything consecutive, but all of a sudden a million years opens up in here that you never suspected before. So you cut the tape and take some Scotch tape and put another tape in the middle, see?

You add a section of tape, you see, because this thing will keep going that way. It will keep spreading out, naturally, as you get more and more track, don't you see? Eventually you'd have a time track of the fellow and you wouldn't do it on a – on a simple paper graph.

You'd have to have an endless-belt proposition, because I think the paper required to do this sort of thing would be something like about a hundred feet long, I think about a hundred feet of paper at a wild guess (just to give you some idea of the magnitude of it, you see). By cutting and patching – and you write up the track that you've got, this whole thing: he was a this and then in so many years he was a that and he was a that and he was a that and he was something or other and you put that...

Now, you find out, horribly enough, that this belongs in the middle of the temple-and-vestal-virgin game; it was an excursion on the temple-and-vestal-virgin game. You had to cut the temple-and-vestal-virgin game plot in half and sticky-plaster the thing to the both ends and now you've got that smoothed out. Don't you see?

And you could keep on drawing time track on the individual like this as an exercise, which would again just increase his ability to roll on the thing.

Now, at the same time, if every time you made one of these plots, you had him tell you the principal problems that were faced between these terminals and oppters, you see, and the oppters and the terminals and you had to – wrote the problems down on this line, you'd eventually have a *long* run of *problems, problems, problems* of various kinds. You'd be running problems on him at the same time.

What would you wind up with?

Well, you'd wind up with a whole track. Well now, when would these things start to unball? Well, you'll eventually find, early on the track, the mechanisms which made them ball up in the first place. And the individual actually straightens out his postulates on this subject and you would only find his postulates by doing this.

And he straightens out his postulates on this subject and all of a sudden all of them just go *brump-brump-brump*, stretch out, stretch out, stretch out, stretch out. They're eventually all lying out like tape measures, not lying out like balls of mud.

Now he could run on the time track and he could go the whole length and breadth of the time track. He could think of anything he has ever done and remember it.

Now, the reason he can't remember it, of course, is too much of his existence is in areas and in valences at which he must not think. If he thinks at them, he goes stupid, because they can think and he can't think. So therefore, he cannot remember his past. His past is totally occluded as far as he's concerned, because of there – total areas of no thinkingness. Do you see how that would be?

Now, that's about the only way you would ever recover a person's memory on the whole track and that's about what a whole track is all about.

And don't blame me if after you've got this universe straightened out, you haven't straightened out the home universe yet. That's your worry. We're talking about the whole track, we normally refer to this universe's track. Because earlier track is not in agreement with one person and another person, beyond the fact that they usually agree that there was a home universe and that they were building their own universe and other things were happening

which were quite desirable and then those dirty dogs came with all the black muck and spread it all over everything and we stuck and that's why we're in this universe, see?

At first, in discussing things with them, you cannot find the identity of the dirty dogs with the black muck. I have discussed this with several pcs and they keep insisting on using the "*they*." They is the most prevalent pronoun with regard to this. So we haven't found the fellows who did this and got this universe started and this time track going on total agreement. We haven't found them yet. We're still looking. We're still looking to find the people who got this universe started that way and trapped everybody in it. We know it wasn't you.

But on the other hand, you might – you might have met one of them at one time or another. And you might have some responsibility for turning him against beings or something. You might have had some minor overt that took *them*, you see and made them antisocial so that they would do this.

Or on the other hand, on the other hand, on the other hand, thinking it over carefully, you might have been there and watched them – not intending to do it, of course and not having anything to do with it, but, you know, like people watch construction on the street – you might have been there watching them, something. And occasionally you might have offered them a small pebble – just to be helpful, you see; that's just to be helpful, but no responsibility of yours.

Or on the other hand, on the other hand, there is some possibility – there is some possibility that you knew one of them rather well and agreed with what he was doing, you see, just because you knew him well. And there's another possibility, if we reach a little bit further, that you were one of the workmen – of course, being driven with a whip, of course; but you were one of the workmen that was doing this.

And then there's another possibility if you look very carefully on the whole track. You may very possibly find yourself standing there and the picture of a whip just below the level of your eye, and a hand holding this whip; and it might come through to you as a sort of a dim suspicion that if you had this kind of a picture at that point of the track that it might be you who was making *them* build a universe and who trapped everybody. You see, that'd be pretty hard to face.

So I'm not asking you to look at that, now. But I am asking you to look back at that period when you might have been standing there, *caught*, a total victim at the beginning of track.

Anyway, there is the – there's the whole track and the way it rolls, that it exists, that it is there as a plot, that you're still mocking it up and so forth, is quite remarkable. That this universe exists at all is quite remarkable and I am – I congratulate you. You did a pretty persistent job on it.

Okay. Do you see what you're handling when you handle the Goals Problem Mass?

Audience: Yes.

Every one of the main valences has hundreds of subordinate valences and you can pull those off. And they're what you get on a list; they're the things that don't hold on a list.

They're little incipient warts on the main – on a main mass. And then you know, at first, why, you just – the pc can't tell the difference between them. At various – as you go on running, the pc can all of a sudden, even when he lists, recognize what the mass is and the identity of the mass. Even before you null it or differentiate it, he knows what it is.

And then that goes from there to knowing a little bit more about the whole track and knowing a little bit more about the game and then knowing more and more about life and knowing more and more and more and knowing more and then finally knowing all about it. That's the other end that comes out.

There are many assistive things that an auditor could do. Many of these things probably won't have to be done, because remember that you're auditing a pc toward a rather steep increase of ability and recognition.

That's the Goals Problem Mass as it relates to the whole track. You might find the information useful – if, of course, you ever find anybody with a whole track.

If somebody comes around, you know and tells you that past lives don't exist or you have no reality on past lives, I'll give you one little tip in taking this sort of thing apart. People can't think of past lives when they're stuck in one life. But they normally, quite normally, have had the subject of past lives itself invalidated heavily in this lifetime. And if you pull that apart as invalidation and get all the ramifications with relationship to that, why, generally it will all straighten out.

This is too new a subject for anybody to have too much antipathy against. After all, it hasn't been around since Egypt. And in those days, if you said there was no such thing as a past life, why, you were liable to have had it, because it went quite the reverse.

I remember vividly – one of the mechanisms and overts and uses of past lives in Egypt was that the king could come back and claim his possessions. And I thought that was an awfully handy mechanism: did very well for a number of years. Went many lifetimes before anybody got wise to this thing and thought, "Well, we've got a better idea; a better idea. And that is, if we claim that everybody when he dies is dead, dead, dead, then we never have to give him back any of his possessions. And that settles that!"

And the idea of one lifetime stems purely and entirely and completely out of ideas of property and that is all. So you see why the popularity of it. I imagine the Prudential Life Insurance people and the Bureau of Statistics and the Record of Wills and the Recorder of Wills and Testaments and so on would be amongst the first people to shoot you down on sight if you went around saying people have lived before and you are only living again, because, of course, they have a very vested interest in it.

But so does everybody have a vested interest in there only being one life. Unfortunately, unless we admit the evidence before us that there – one has lived more than one life, we don't clear anybody or make him any better.

The only reason we're interested in the subject particularly is because unless you pay attention to one lifetime as a fallacy and audit past lives and whole track and so forth, you make no gains. And we're interested in gains, we're interested in understanding of the subject

and interested in wins, so therefore, we have to admit something that seems much closer to the truth. Okay?

Thank you very much.

IN-SESSIONNESS

A lecture given on 30 January 1962

Thank you.

Okay. Now this is the what?

Audience: Thirtieth.

Thirtieth of January. What year?

Audience Member: 12.

Good. AD 12. Okay.

Haven't a thing to talk to you about. You're all doing so well, you're all doing so beautifully, know your stuff so well, everything's going along so swimmingly, I have nothing to talk to you about at all. There's only one small question, is when are you going to start to audit? [laughter] Now, that sarcasm was uncalled for because with very few exceptions, why, you're doing splendidly.

Now, you are about to get demonstrations here the like of which you never heard of with TV. That's coming along fine. And the sets are all upstairs, and I think the cameras are being adapted, specially built in Germany to be flown over here. Adenauer's bringing them personally. [laughter] Anyway, it's very special, so you can expect that in very short order.

Now, I'm tempted to give you a lecture about pure theory about things, speculative theory, and so on. You're doing 3D Criss Cross pretty well, and I'd like to make a comment on 3D Criss Cross, no more than that. And that is 3D Criss Cross sort of comes to you all of a sudden. It is one of these processes.

Now, in general auditing, in general auditing, you will find that there is a point where an auditor all of a sudden realizes he can audit and that he doesn't mind auditing and auditing is fun and that he can do it.

Now, there is such a point just in normal auditing You would expect that to happen someplace in Class II that all of a sudden, why, the fellow can sit there and ask Sec Check questions and run Havingness and get rudiments in, and so forth. And that's all right. He can do that. If a person hasn't had such a realization point, they can expect that sometime in the future.

But in 3D Criss Cross there is apparently another one. And it is just that one thing. A fellow all of a sudden realizes he can do 3D Criss Cross. It suddenly shows up in all of these reports. And I've never seen anything quite as sharp as that difference.

The reports right up to Tuesday are all "Well, *ha-ha, ha-ha-ha-ha* scratchy needle, couldn't do anything, and we got a list all right, and what do I do with the list, and I guess ..."

And then all of sudden, why, you get the Tuesday report, and that is to say, "Well, we made a list and differentiated it and got the object. Going to check it out tomorrow, and the pc feels much better, and everything is running."

And do you know that's happened with nearly every one of these auditor's reports? You, yourselves, might not have realized it, but anybody doing 3D Criss Cross went across this either gradually or suddenly in almost one session, you know. It was just *bang*. There it was.

One of the reasons for this, of course, at this particular time is you've been taught to assess in order to find something in order to run; to find something in order to run. That was the orientation point.

It took a little while to find that you weren't finding something to *run*, that you were *running* the case. And I suppose that is the main point of "geewhiz," you know, that comes up.

But I think you're prepared to say that 3D Criss Cross – when it's running – is about the hottest thing that you've had on two wheels yet, isn't it?

Audience: Yes.

That's very hot in the way it runs.

Now, I want to talk to you about pure theory. It has something to do with 3D Criss Cross.

First is flows. And this applies to Class II auditing, Class III or any other class of auditing – is rudiments have to be kept in during the session.

Now, reorient yourself with regard to rudiments. Rudiments were something you got in at the beginning of session in order to get the individual, pc, to run during the bulk of the session. Now, that was the basic orientation of rudiments over a period of many, many years. We looked on rudiments as just doing that and doing nothing else. That is to say the pc sat down, you got the rudiments in, and then *bang!* From there on there was no rudiments. You didn't have to worry about rudiments because you had those in. And then you went along and you ran the body of the session, and then you came to the end of the thing, and you said, "All right. Now we make sure the pc is all right. And we'll do something here at the end of the thing even if it's just say, 'End of session' or 'That's all, bud'."

We certainly did something to get the pc out of session at the end of the thing. Well, that's expanded, of course, to your very complex end rudiments today.

Now, end rudiments are there to keep the session from hanging up, and that's the purpose of end rudiments. It's to keep the session from perpetuating itself. And if you do end rudiments with that in view, you will be doing end rudiments properly. And you're not interested in anything except you don't want the session to hang up.

Well, the session can hang up on all the points of end rudiments. If you took them up one after the other, you would find out that any one of these points would hang the session in time. So you just take all these things that would hang the session in time, and you evaporate the session, see that? You not-is the session right there at that point. It's gone.

Now, beginning rudiments is to get the pc out of the Physical universe into an auditing session in his own universe. Let's be factual. That's really what it is. You see, there he was going along with all of his beautiful adjustments to how awful it was that he was not-ising, you see. And there he is going through life somehow or another, trying not to walk through brick walls, and his total concentration really is on how present time shouldn't be or is or wasn't or should be alter-ised or something like that. He's coping, you see. He's coping all the time. Now, this copingness is to a slight degree or to a great degree, but it's always slightly coping. Always. Right up to the point where you got the fellow all the way up the line, he is coping in every waking moment of the day. That's all he's doing. He's coping.

He's navigating a ship through the rapids. He's piloting a body down the highway. He's keeping a body seated at the desk properly. He's very aware of what's going on. The various impulses of existence are hitting him and he's resolving them, and his concentration's extreme on present time.

Now, if you have a pc who is still coping, while he is sitting in a session and is being made to cope while he's sitting in a session, with the physical universe and the life he lives out of session, you of course don't get him into session because it's a different universe.

It is his own universe that he is occupying in session. Now, if he is made to put too much concentration on the auditor, if he has too little confidence in the auditor, if his trust level is very poor, he, of course, carries the copingness of his day-to-day life over into the session, and he's on some sort of a social basis or a copingness basis or a handle basis on this other human being. And the auditor's a human being. He isn't an auditor, you see. He's just somebody else that – just as he'd meet the streetcar conductor or he'd meet a tradesman or he'd talk to the boss or something of this sort. He – that is the role that he puts the auditor into, and therefore he goes on coping with the auditor. And you will find him doing all sorts of social things with the auditor. You see, he'll be very socially minded toward the auditor, and so on.

Well, he wants to make a good impression; he doesn't want the auditor to get into the nasty, dirty little sewers, and so forth, that some of his life has run in, he thinks, you see, and the auditor must have a good opinion of him, and so on.

Well, this is actually the way he treats human beings out on the street. This is the way he treats human beings in his office. This is the way he treats human beings that he is in con-course with all the time.

And if that attitude continues, of course you have the pc really coping with the physical universe, not in-session. And that's a different attitude. There's a great difference in this.

Now, an auditor who does a poor job of getting rudiments in and fumbling around, you know, and he fumbles with the E-Meter and he doesn't know, and he misses a withhold, something like this, why, any one of these things will get the pc coping with the auditor, you

see, and puts him back into the physical universe somehow, but now puts him in the physical universe with a liability. He's supposed to be in-session and he is not, don't you see.

Now at the moment he went into session, he is then expected to cope with the auditor, you see? Now, actually, the state of a pc is no responsibility. No responsibility for the physical universe around him during the period of the session. It's a no responsibility. Let's just face up to it.

Now, that's the reason you can plumb the bank. The less responsible you make a pc for the physical environment and for the auditor and the auditing, the more no-responsible the pc is for those things.

Now, this sounds very peculiar. That sounds very peculiar because that also is a common denominator of an hypnotic trance. The pc in-session is not in an hypnotic trance. He definitely is not. The difference is very, very interesting

In an hypnotic trance, it is demonstrated conclusively that he has no control over anything. That is what is demonstrated to him, you see. He not only has no responsibility but he also has no control over anything and that the only person who can do any control is the hypnotist. May sound rather slight and esoteric, but they are nevertheless quite factual.

All you have to do is show somebody that you can make his right arm rise without touching it and that he is powerless – you always punch this home in hypnotism – that he is powerless to stop the right arm from rising, and he goes into a trance. Bzzzzz. It doesn't matter what trickery you indulge in to get these combinations of conditions to exist. Nevertheless, those are the combinations. So that he loses all control.

But hypnotism is devoted to the physical universe. It is devoted directly and immediately to his body and is not consulting the person concerning his bank, his reactions or anything else. Hypnotism is a total overwhelm. You do a total overwhelm and show the individual that he has no willpower of any kind.

Now, that state, a hypnotized subject, is very, very far from and has very little to do with an auditing session's pc's attitude, but nevertheless it is a state, and it was the only strange state that man had plumbed and could induce. Man could induce the state of cured by physical means. You know, set somebody's broken leg. He could induce the state of injured. He could induce the state of dead, and he could induce the state of hypnotized. And those are the states which man could induce on man. He couldn't induce much other states. He depended totally on other automaticities for other states to exist, such as get hungry. He depended on the automaticity of the individual, you see, and so on.

Well, there are a lot of minor states with regard to these other states but they're little tiny things that don't amount to anything, like get cheerful, get sad, you see. They're various tricks. They don't amount to much because they are not very deep-seated states. And they are all very much what we would consider the ordinary livingness and existence – we'd consider these states.

But these others are not really considered ordinary states. The state of dead, for instance, is not an ordinary state. It is so extraordinary that the very people who should know most about it, the medical doctors and the coroners, know nothing of it at all. They are the

most ignorant people on the subject of death we have on this planet. Almost any child could tell you more about death than a medico. It's quite interesting.

So they've become less and less familiar with this particular state. But man can induce that state on man, and it's an extraordinary state. He can induce the state of injured on man. He can induce the state of cured by a few minor means. Somebody has a headache and you give him an aspirin. And he can induce this other state called an hypnotized state. That's a highly specialized state. And that is the one string of man's guitar where it approaches the mystery of the infinite and the unknown. And that was the only string he could play on. And he strummed on that, and he played "Yankee Doodle" on it, and "Brahma Be with Us," – he's played that on it, and "Christ Save Us," – he's played that on it.

In other words, he plays all of – all these things are played on this one-string guitar: hypnotism. So it's very, very easy for somebody who has this in his background to get a mis-interpretation of an auditing session. And therefore, you get many states called "in-session" because there are many people auditing who have different interpretations of states. Well, you take somebody who was a gee-whizzer back in Egypt on the subject of levitation and rigidity and he knew how to handle the priesthood, you know, and the lesser priesthood, and the neophytes and the public, and that sort of thing. He knew, you know. He did *uuuuu*, you know, and that was all set.

And because you get these past experiences with the induction of these states, such as kill them, injure them, cure them, hypnotize them, you see, that sort of thing, you get different attitudes toward the pc from auditor to auditor.

They will color the quality or state of the pc in-session by these other things. Now, we also have, of course, all these social states which are near present time, which is entertained, happy, sad, hopeful, all of those things, you see. And that's one long, long catalog, but of course those are just social states. Anybody does this to anybody.

And an auditor who plays those exclusively, you see, really isn't auditing. He's trying to make the pc cheerful, he's trying to make the pc sad. He thinks the pc ought to have a grief charge, and so on, if he can force it, which is interesting.

But there's no sin in playing on that particular guitar. It's perfectly all right. I do it myself. Every once in a while I see a pc that is close to a grief charge, and I speak somewhat quietly and sympathetically. [laughter] And it'll spill, you see.

Now these states, then, all get mixed up in an auditor's individual interpretation of what is in-session. What is this thing called "in-sessionness"? What is it?

Well, is it hypnotized? Is it overwhelmed? Is it cheered up? Is it grievous? Is it injured? Is it dead? What are these things, you see?

How's this pc supposed to be? What is this thing called the beingness of the pc? That's the point. Well, you could probably draw up a long catalog, and you could do a lot of things, and so forth, and search forever for the answer if you bypass *the* answer. And *the* answer is, the state is simply this: willing to talk to the auditor and interested in his own case. And that's all there is to the state.

But this is such an idiotically simple statement that tremendous numbers of auditors think there must be more to it. And you get additive states on the top of this one. When you see an auditor doing that, you say, "Well now, there's something wrong with this session, but we can't say quite what it is."

Well, I'm sometimes horrified. I see somebody who has been audited consistently by some auditor – not here, around here. This is not a minor thing. This is a major thing and quite rare – who has done nothing but overwhelm. You know, he's got death or injury or something mixed up with the state the pc is supposed to be in or hypnotism or something – and you see, he's got a *total overwhelm* on this pc. And you'd see this pc, the pc is just way out of present time, you know. Every time the pc said "I thought," you see, we add the hyp – let's add the hypnotic angle now.

Remember the two shuns of the Auditor's Code. And all you have to do is don't shun 'em, and you can turn auditing into an hypnotic trance proposition. I'll show you how it works, see.

Pc says, "Well, I think it's a miller. I – I think it's a miller. I think that's the terminal. I think it's a miller."

And the auditor says, "Well," he says, "You know better than that. We had that on another list, and it couldn't possibly be a miller. Now what else is it?"

Well, the pc goes *ahh rhrrr*, you know. And he says, "Well, it – it might – might be a carpenter. It mi – mi – mi – mi – might be a m – m – mi – mi – might be mi – mi – might be a carpenter. Maybe."

"No, that's much too bold a terminal for that particular list. No, we don't want a carpenter on that list."

You see how gently it could be done. And do you know that at the end of that long thing the pc would be totally *thhhaaa*. But we would have violated in-sessionness. The pc not only unwilling but totally unable to talk to the auditor.

You know, the pc just – he had a dropped jaw in place of an in-session.

Now, as far as being interested in his own case, he's not interested in his own case now. He's totally fixated on what is this auditor going to do next. See? That's the fixation. What's he going to do next?

So of course, this definition, willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case, are violated at once, and you can induce an hypnotic trance that way. Just overwhelm the pc, get the two shuns backwards, and you've got it all set from there on and you'll have trouble. But it's an overwhelm. And of course the overwhelm doesn't have to be that subtle. And when I see it in an extremity, it is not subtle at all. The person has simply been clobbered and wiped out, see.

I mean everything the person said was muffed and thrown back in his face, see. Any effort to communicate to the auditor was instantly blocked till – if we ran 8-C on the person, we would have it running on the auditor's willpower, you see, and we'd get the levitation of

the arm, and touching the wall, and we'd get a robotized attitude. This would be a pretty wild thing.

Now, this can't happen easily. It really takes some doing, and it's nothing that any of you are doing at the present time. I'm not being accusative, for once. But it is – it would happen. And you see, the auditor has made a different evaluation of what is auditing.

What you want is somebody who is no longer fixated on the physical universe or in a social state with the auditor. So that's why you run your beginning rudiments. But now, of course, if you violate the Auditor's Code too thoroughly, you've got somebody – a pc now – who is still hung up to part of the physical universe. He's got a person, not an auditor.

And so he's got this social chitter-chat going between himself and the auditor, and he's still out of session. And he's too interested in what the auditor might think and what the auditor is doing. And he is defensive, and he doesn't understand what's going on, and he's coping. He's almost sitting there with a pair of small theta boxing gloves on, you know, and you can kind of see him putting his dukes up every time you say anything.

Well, early in auditing, that can be expected to some degree from a pc. There is some degree of that always early in getting audited. Some tiny degree of it.

"What's this? It's all new and strange. Case? Case? I don't have any case. I've never had any trouble at all. The psychoanalyst always told me that if I were careful I never would have any trouble. I wonder if he really thinks I am crazy. Do you suppose my wife is right in saying I am just a fool to be sitting here with this stuff? Is this really black magic?"

You know, all kinds of wild little questions, you know.

And he's got to get a sense of trust. Therefore, the first auditing a person should have, should be optimumly the best possible auditing.

After a person's audited for awhile, you could get a little careless, but not early in his auditing. Why? Because you take that distrust and build it up into a constant, running thing. It's always there, don't you see. And the person's sort of been parked out of session permanently. This is how you regard an auditor, and that has been hardened into a habit. That is how you regard an auditor.

Now, getting rudiments in, getting beginning rudiments in, is getting the individual to be able to sit there without taking full responsibility for what's going on in Russia at the moment and what's going on in the United States at the moment, and without taking full responsibility for what's going on at the office, and taking full responsibility for having to go home at dinner and so forth. In other words, you detach him from all of this superconcern with the physical universe, and you set him up so that he can look at his own universe.

And you have to indicate that he has one, you know? And that's what's known as impingement, in various ways. The impingement is also part of the auditor saying things to the pc to make the pc respond. And he's in a state of no responsibility with regard to the physical universe. Its immediate concern is right now. That's quite interesting because, of course, he's been in this state since the beginning of track.

The first time he said, "Why did you build this universe?" you see, began that long career of no responsibility for the physical universe. What he's actually doing in the physical universe is, because he has no responsibility for it, he has to cope with it somehow. And because he can't be fully responsible for it, it's all agin him a little bit.

"Ah, *i-isth-this all?*" We're not quite sure about this, you see.

And it's an insecurity, you might say. Well, of course, this is a common denominator of bank. At those most aberrated spots on the backtrack, you'll find that the individual is 100 percent irresponsible for the lot.

Now, if you put somebody into the middle of the reactive bank, you would have him into the most zero responsibility state that a person could be gotten into, or that that person could be gotten into. Common denominator of the reactive bank is no responsibility.

So he goes into this state rather easily, but remember that we are more interested in the backtrack. In fact, we don't get any auditing done if we're not interested at any degree in the backtrack. We're more interested in the backtrack than we are [in] the present life. So the reason we're trying to detach him from present time physical universe is so we can put him into communication with back time physical universe, and that's about all it amounts to.

Now, if he stays obsessively – this is an old, old phrase that was used to describe certain pcs back as early as 1949 – were stuck in present time. He just couldn't get out of present time.

You'd say, "Now go to the time when you were three years old," and the person would just go, "*Uuuuuuuuuuh-uuuuuuuuuuuh*. Yes, I'm there."

No, he wasn't there. He was right here in present time, you see. Well, this is supercope. And he's just in a state of supercope, that's all. It didn't matter if he were lying on the couch, the house was dead quiet, there was nobody going to come near him, nobody knew where he was, including his wife. He had no worries, there wasn't anybody worrying about him. You could get all these things exactly right in present time, don't you see. I mean, you could make present time right. Perfect. And a person would still be stuck in present time. And you say, "All right, now get the idea of thinking about a clock."

"Yes, yes... yes..." [laughter] At no moment could he ever ... He actually had to mock up a new clock because otherwise he might move out of present time, don't you see, and that would be terrible.

Now, of course, the less willing a person is to move on the time track, the more dangerous he considers the time track to be, and the mind to such a person is already – because he has lived trillennia in this state of *zzzzzzuh* superalertness to present time – it is already an area of danger. It is an area of danger because the time track he has lived, in the consecutive moments we call – the consecutive moments of present time which make up a time track, of course, are fraught the whole distance with insecurity. And even greater insecurity than he feels in present time, don't you see.

So here he is in present time being very insecure about present time, and now you ask him to go to an even more insecure place, which is the insecurities of yesterday, and he just sticks right here. This is safer, thank you.

But oddly enough, the flipperoo on this is, of course, he is stuck on the backtrack. Nobody is ever *stuck* in present time. They have to be stuck on the backtrack which they *believe* is present time. So you're always auditing a certain – a person of that character with the CCHs – you're always doing backtrack auditing, which is very interesting

You're giving him present time exercises, and it's always backtrack auditing, because of course they can't even get close to present time, although they're stuck in present time, although they're coping with present time, although they're not in present time – all of these things, apparently contradictory, simply add up to a tremendous confusion. And the common denominator of the pc, of course, in that state of mind is confusion.

Well, now all of this adds up to a necessity to get your beginning rudiments in much better early in your auditing of a pc than you might later. And on taking over a new pc, I would just beat the beginning rudiments to pieces. And after I'd been auditing somebody for twenty-five or fifty hours or something like this, I would just take a long yawn one day. Everything seems to be going along just fine, you see, except we've lost the high rate of change that we were experiencing. The individual was changing with great rapidity and now isn't changing so fast.

In short, anytime auditing settled down to a long grind – let me characterize that and give you the stable datum for it – you just take those beginning rudiments and you just tear the thing to pieces. In other words, you *make* the rudiments function. Now, that's different than just seeing if they are in. Most sessions, you just want to see that they're in. That's great. That's nothing. *Zoom, zoom, zoom, zoom.* Fine. Fine. Now we get busy doing what we're doing, see.

But now we find out we've got a scratchy needle and not going anyplace, and there's not very much progress, and so forth. Now we make a different use of the beginning rudiments. Entirely different use of them. We use them to audit the case with regard to an auditing session. And we get those rudiments in. And we don't just get them in for the session we are running. We get them in for any session the pc has ever had anyplace, particularly his first auditing session. Let's get them in. Let's get them in, the lot of them.

Well, now, do you see then the difference, the two ways you could use rudiments?

Way number one, you go *zip zip*, disconnect the pc from all of his anxieties of present time so that he'll be interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor.

All right. That's the immediate, most common use of beginning rudiments. *Bang!* There they are, they're in. You're off. The individual's interested in his own case, willing to talk to you; you go on and audit what you're going to audit.

The same exact items have a wider use. And that wider use is to get the rudiments in for *every* session the pc has ever had. Make sure that all sessions are in. In other words, you could expand it from this session to all auditing with considerable profit.

Now, how many rudiments processes would you use? Ordinarily, it's enough, really, to flick the withholds off of every rudiment. Did you know you could do that? You can get any rudiment in by getting the withholds off at that rudiment level?

All right, that will normally get the pc immediately into session. He's willing to talk to you, and he's interested in his own case and ready to sail. But there are just about forty-eleven squared processes that could be run to get rudiments in. They are almost uncountable. If you'll notice, your last Model Session does not have any current rundown of processes connected to it.

Well, I was writing it up, and I finished it off. I worked on it rather late, and it was a tough evening in general, I suppose, or something like that, and it was getting on to about four o'clock in the morning, and I lifted my pencil to write down the processes, and I was simply overwhelmed. How many processes are there? Good heavens, I know of literally dozens and dozens and dozens of processes that could be used to get rudiments in.

They are really some of the cream processes of auditing of yesteryear.

For instance, I was running a session not too long ago, and what do you know – the 1st Saint Hill ACC, I got tired of the pc's boxing around and being social and standing off toward me, so I simply said, "Who would I have to be to audit you?" And we cleared this up in about four questions, and the session ran quite well.

Well, that's an interesting use of the situation. But it's just what process was needed at the moment, don't you see. There are lots of them, you know. "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" Perfectly valid. On withholds, "What doesn't George know about you?" you see. Oh, you know – just know endless processes get withholds off on the withhold question.

There are at least thirty-six Havingness Processes, and just today an old-time field auditor had been dreaming up and had been culling the stuff out of old textbooks and had walked up to sixty-three Havingness Processes. I looked over the list and thought that's very industrious, and all of a sudden saw that there were six or seven more. There must have been that many because I got an additional one in the first two.

Well, at that ratio, it would have been ninety-some, don't you see. That's an awful lot of Havingness Processes. That's a lot of them.

Now, as far as getting somebody to talk to you is concerned, well, any communication process you ever heard of can be used. Yeah, just take a weird one, workable or not workable, just take a weird one.

Just thinking off the cuff, and the fellow is not facing you and that sort of thing, and say, "Well, what spot around me could you communicate to?"

You know, make him point it out, and he'd finally punch you in the nose or something of the sort, and he'd say, "There," you know. And he'd feel much better.

In other words, any of the old communication processes, just any of them, any valid process would get the auditor in to some degree. As far as ARC breaks is concerned, "Recall

an ARC break," would be the most strenuous of these that I know of. Run the whole track, run for hundreds of hours probably without ever fetching up to a dull halt.

So you could get in all kinds of aspects of the rudiments, and therefore it is necessary that you recognize what the rudiments are, you see. Exactly what these rudiments are. A rudiment is not a process. A rudiment is a reason why he's not in-session, see, a reason why he might not be in-session. And that's what they are.

And your job in using the rudiments is to get him in-session, and if you wanted to straighten out a pc, 100 percent straighten out a pc on the whole subject of auditing, then you'd simply straighten out the pc on the subject of every session he'd ever had. Well, that sounds more arduous than it is.

All you have to do is pick up the first session. That'll take you quite a while sometimes.

"Well, was the session then?"

"No, no, there was a session. Oh, no, no, there was a session – *ra-ra*, yeah. Then, then it was Joe, I've – had completely forgotten about Bill, yeah." And then, "Oh, no. No, no, there was – it was much earlier than that. Come to remember, I had a session in 1950. What do you know? I'd completely forgotten that one."

You know, it'll take quite a while to sort this out. What is the fellow's first session that he's absolutely sure of. And then you might run such a process as this – and this, I think, would possibly be the best process – is "What didn't that auditor know?" That seemed to run the motivator of the untrainedness of the auditor, gets off his withholds and that sort of thing, coupled with, "What didn't you know about that environment?"

Now, some such combination as that – "What didn't you know about the environment" and "What didn't that auditor know" – this could be marvelous.

Now, maybe this pc has been an auditor and has tremendous overts on pcs and you haven't run a complete 6 on him. The form about pcs, the Sec Check about pcs is the best one to handle this. But you might turn it around and say, "What didn't your first preclear know about you," you see. Locate the fellow's first preclear and clean up that session from the viewpoint of the auditor.

Therefore, by cleaning up his first pc and cleaning up his first "being a pc," and cleaning up these two, you start to release charge which has accumulated up the line through such things as bad auditing and nonsense that's been pulled, and cul-de-sacs he's run into, and sessions that have been run with the rudiments thoroughly out.

Now, you could go ahead to this extremity and get the rudiment in for every session the pc ever had. You'd get rudiments in. All rudiments. Every one of them.

Now, you could do worse than this. You could get all the *end* rudiments in for every session the pc had ever had. Now, that possibly might be more profitable because they haven't been around very long.

"Now, did you tell that auditor any half-truths, untruths or said something just to make an impression on him or damage anyone in that session? In *that session*, that one that we're talking about right there."

And, boy, you'd find some pcs had been having a wingding They've just been having a ball.

Even if you find it today, you find that damage question – if you're using it; it isn't in a written version; it was handed to you verbally, I think – "Or tried to damage anyone in this session?" You'll find this every once in a while a little bit charged.

And if it's always null, I'd get suspicious, you know. If it had always been null on some pc that wasn't making progress, well, the obvious answer, of course, is by not making any gains he's trying to damage himself, isn't he? That's the obvious answer, isn't it?

By failing to do auditing commands and to monkey up the auditor in some way and to get everybody upset in general, this all by itself is, of course, efforts to damage self. That should show up sooner or later – efforts to damage himself.

But you could get all those rudiments in, every one of them for every session the pc ever had. Now that looks absolutely fantastically laborious. It just looks too much. Well, what do you know? It'll only be the first session or two that have any importance. His first session or two as an auditor, his first session or two as a pc. And then the rest of it is all gross. It's just the gross here and there, one after the ... Well, three times he got mad at pcs and, you know, they're all small number stuff.

And probably the best, probably the very best method of doing that is, of course, your Sec Check, your Form 6 Sec Check is to follow through from that. So I would say offhand that in handling a pc, I would do these two things, if I was trying to straighten this pc out. If this pc behaved peculiarly as a pc, you know, just didn't seem to be able to get into session and didn't seem to be able to talk to me, and I was having an awful time straightening all this out, and this pc had a sort of a history of kind of grinding, never got anyplace and so forth, then I would smell a mouse called a bum session.

And I would straighten out – first session, I'd find and straighten out and get the rudiments in, all rudiments in, for the first session the pc had ever had, and for the first auditing session the person had ever given if the person were a Scientologist. I'd get those two in. Those two sessions. I'd just straighten them up. Beginning rudiments, end rudiments, I'd polish those things up and burnish them until, God, the pc wondered why he ever walked in that room in the first place, you know?

I mean, just get those things really polished, and then spot check the rest of them. Now, I'm not above scanning him from that point on once I've got those things straightened out to make the pc hang on the track. That's an old technique – lock scanning. Not engram scanning, but lock scanning. Old creaky technique. It has its own – only value it has is to find out where the pc's stuck. And there it is very, very useful. Extremely useful.

After you've got these first two sessions – you see, the one he gave and the one he received – after you've got these straightened out, you've got a takeoff point. Now, you'll rip up a certain number of locks, and you do something weird like this. I'm not giving you this as a

standard auditing. I'm just telling you you can do anything to get rudiments in. This is one of the creakiest old processes that ever existed.

And you can say, "All right. Now pick up that first session that we've just covered so well. Good. Got that first session? All right. Now scan rapidly forward to present time through all sessions you have ever had."

And he, "*Yyaayyayyy, mmmm*. Yeah, that was tough."

"All right. Fine. Good. Now get that first one again. All right. Now scan rapidly forward to present time through all the sessions you have ever had." Or "When I snap my fingers start scanning," you know, anything you want.

And you find by observation of the pc, this is what goes on. At first it takes place with fair rapidity. And then it takes him a little while. And then it takes him a little longer. And then it doesn't take him quite so long. And then the next thing you know, it doesn't take him long at all. And then the next thing you know – he ain't moving on the time track.

"Yeah," he says.

"All right. Scan on forward to present time."

"Yeah."

"Did you?"

"Yeah."

"Oh, you've done it already?"

"Yeah."

"All right. What are you looking at?"

And of course, he's stuck in 1955 in the middle of a session. Now, you've got that session, and that'll be a juicy one. That'll be the confusion prior to and all that sort of thing. Now, you can take this thing and straighten out that particular session, get all the rudiments in for it, don't you see. And you could do this over and over and over and over, and you would run out auditing. Actually shouldn't take you too long. You'd probably run out all the auditing the person had ever had in four or five hours.

But it'd just be the basis of getting the rudiments in for the sessions. If you wanted... I can tell you what a full straighten-out would be for an old-time auditor who'd been auditing a long time. It's just what I've been telling you, but I'll give you – it to you in a very one, two, three, four type of session thing or actions.

Straighten out all rudiments beginning and end for the first session he ever received. Straighten out all rudiments beginning and end for the first session he ever gave.

Pick up, no matter how you do it, the rough spots on the auditing track – the spectacularly bad sessions – and every time you'll find one, get all the rudiments in for that session. Give the pc a Form 6 from one end to the other to get off all of the overts as an auditor, pull all the withholds on the subject, run lots of Havingness, go back over and spot check it for anything remaining when the Form 6 was complete. Now, that would be quite an activity.

I don't know how long it would take to cover a full Form 6, but we have had, horribly enough, one question of a Form 6 require a whole week. So there's no estimating how long it would take. Also, we've done a whole Form 6 in a week, don't you see. So there's no estimate of the amount of time.

But that's how I would go about straightening out somebody.

Now, if a case were grinding, and if ordinary auditing and if ordinary activities did not bring the case in toward rapidly running and benefiting from 3D Criss Cross, that's what I would do – what I just enumerated. That is what I would do. I'd expect something was awfully wrong with the auditing either given or received on the past track or there was something *really* screwy on the subject here someplace, and I would devote time to straightening that out before I went on with it, with profit.

Now, if you're using old slowpoke processes, of course, it might take you longer than if you're using very whizzed up processes. Just plucking the withholds off from each rudiment, *bang, bang, bang, bang, bang*, would be the fastest way to go ahead and straighten out the rudiments for any given session.

But if I were confronted with a choice between going on and doing 3D Criss Cross on a very difficult pc that had a very scratchy needle and I just couldn't seem to read anything and the pc didn't seem to be interested in anything I was doing or if the pc were afraid of 3D Criss Cross or afraid of this sort of thing or I just couldn't read anything and it's going on and on and on, well, I wouldn't keep wasting time because you're going to find out eventually that there are ways to waste auditing time. Yes, you'll find it out. There are ways to waste auditing time.

Can you look back on any sessions where you should have done different? Can you look back on any two weeks of auditing that you wish you had done different? Hmm? And the answers all of a sudden loom up at the end of this period of time. Uuuuuh. You'll sometime – I hope you don't have this experience – wake up at the end of two weeks and find out that you haven't got an item in 3D Criss Cross. You haven't even gotten a good list. You just haven't gotten anyplace, and the pc has had no advance or gain. Well, you could do that. It could happen. It would take – it would be a pretty peculiar situation, but it could happen.

Now, the only thing that could be traced back to is total out-of-sessionness. Now, that out-of-sessionness could be arrived at from two different quarters. Either you did not prepare the person for assessment – that is the heaviest sin. You didn't get the person sec checked and straightened up in general and so on. You just didn't do any of that. No preparatory work of any kind whatsoever. You just sailed in and started running 3D Criss Cross and came a cropper.

Someday you'll get away with it. You're liable – much more likely to make this blunder because someday you are inevitably going to sit down to some raw meat pc straight off the street, you're going to ask him for a list of the things he likes, and get the item, and ask him for things he dislikes, and get the item. The person's going to all be straightened up with no more lumbosis, and everything is marvelous, and you'll say, "Well, look at that. Ron said you had to prepare these cases. *Ha-ha-ha*, and I didn't prepare *ha-ha-ha*."

And you get ahold of the next raw meat pc, and you spend three, four weeks – nothing happens. And you just wasted three or four weeks of auditing which, if you'd been sec checking and straightening the person up and so forth, wouldn't have been wasted. And the pc is disgruntled, and you're upset, and you've had a big lose, don't you see.

That will happen sufficiently frequently to make a citizen out of you with regard to preparing a case.

All right. This type of preparation – getting the rudiments in – is very beneficial, and remember, today there is no excuse for a case getting no gain. There's no excuse for a case getting no gain. You're an auditor, you've been trained, there is no excuse for the case getting no gain. There just isn't. It must be a gross auditing error of some kind or another.

I'm not just saddling you with terrific expectancies. Yeah, people fall off and fall on their heads and that sort of thing, and you have to spend three-quarters of three sessions in a row doing nothing but straightening up rudiments and that sort of thing, but if you're doing a good job of this, the pc will have a gain.

What I'm talking about there's no excuse for, is you do everything you think you ought to do, and at the end of having done this for a week or two, the pc makes no improvement or gain. That you shouldn't have. That you shouldn't have. That would be pretty gross. It would be something like trying to do 3D Criss Cross on some fellow who was fixed there in present time right straight on you and can't even think of anything and so he – he – he rapidly tailor-makes lists, see.

He – he doesn't pay any attention to the list because he's got to talk to you and keep you entertained. Well, it'd be a gross auditing error because, for God's sakes, you should pick it up in the end rudiments.

"Have you said anything just to impress me?"

"Well, everything I've said is to impress you." See?

It shouldn't have continued as an error longer than one session. Now listen, you can have one session with no gain, see. You could even have two sessions with no gain. You can even have two sessions with no gain and a session in which the pc slips backwards. I'll let you have that, see.

But beyond this point, no. No, no, no. You're abusing your margin of error, see. Something is going wrong now, and it must have been going wrong for those three sessions without your spotting it, and it must be something like the pc sits there all the time thinking how ugly you are or something like this, and you just haven't picked it up. That's all.

You – it's some gross error. You're just not reading the meter, you see, or it's something wild.

Now, to prevent that sort of thing from happening, you've got rudiments. You've got your beginning rudiments, you've got your end rudiments, and they prevent you from making gross errors, providing they are done. And they will also clean up all past sessions in which gross errors have occurred.

Now, you can make a case feel a lot better if the case has had a lot of bad auditing. Well, the case had some bad, overwhelming auditing. The auditor, he was the high priest of Noz, and he was that for a number of trillennias. As a matter of fact, just finished a life as a Roman Catholic bishop or something. And this bird didn't come in close to an Academy and started auditing and God knows what happened thereafter. Only God would have been able to find out, too, because it'd all be withhold from that auditor, you see. Something real sour had been going on.

He got the pc into a total overwhelm of some kind or another. Got the pc all involuted on the introvert, and the pc is sitting in the square root of nowhere. Knocked out of present time, you see. Nothing ever flattened, anything of this sort.

All right. That session could coast along as a sleeper. You know, just not noticed by anybody until all of a sudden you're running a process on the pc that should give the pc a gain. And you get a lose on this process? Well, don't be so busy at condemning your own auditing. Other people audit, too, and some people in the past have not audited so well either.

No, you didn't get a gain on this person! Your rudiments, as far as you were concerned, as far as you could get them in, were in, and they were apparently in, and you ran a process that should have gotten a gain on the pc, and there sits the pc with his lumbosis in full flare.

Well, one of the things you do is look for a missed withhold. Another thing you do is figure out if the pc's havingness was down. All these various things, they're all "rudimentary" sort of things, and then suspect a session.

You see, you've got techniques of sufficient power and magnitude that this shouldn't happen. I'd suspect a session. What, what session is it that's got this bird hung up, see? Did this fellow ever have a session that was hung up? Is there a session sitting on the backtrack where all rudiments are in, out, sideways and upside down? Yeah. And you'll normally find one.

Now, we've had two or three students here who have had just that experience and who didn't make very good progress until we found our past sessions, which is why I'm talking to you this way today. See? So auditing apparently, just empirically, if very badly done, has the power to nullify auditing on the basis of the first occurrence. The earlier occurrence has more force, more aberrative force, than the later occurrence.

This is one of the odd effects of the mind. It's one of the strange parts of the mind. That is odd about the human mind – that the earlier ones have more force than the later ones.

Now of course, the pc's interest is on the later ones, but the pc's aberration is contained in the earlier ones. Your pc's terribly interested. In this lifetime, the pc was a Christian Scientist, and everything just went bad, and they know the pc, everything, you know. Interest, interest, interest, you know. And – and there they were and – and Christian Science, and – and so forth. And the practitioners told him to not-is all the time. And they not-ised all this sickness, and so forth. And they know that – that's what's wrong. That's what's wrong. That's what's wrong, you know? The interest is right there, see, this lifetime. And you, knucklehead, all too often fall for it, following the pattern of your forebearers.

Other people interested in the field of mind have *always* bought this. This has been the uniform mistake of the whole track. That's why nobody knows anything about past lives. That's why nobody knows anything about technology of the mind – is because everybody buys this fact.

The patient, the pc, the individual being processed, audited, slugged, has his interest on the last occurrence, and all the person's aberration is on the *first* occurrence, so they're the whole track apart, given any existing track on any subject.

You could say somebody had a track as a railroad engineer, and so on. Inevitably, you fall into this on the last incident. And all the aberration is contained in the first incident.

So this pc comes around, and he says, "Christian Science, and it got me all loused up, and here I am, Christian Science, and we not-ised the physical universe, and I'm now so I can't have anything, and this is all very tough, and it's all very rough, and – and – and that sort of thing."

And the person auditing him says, "Well, now who in your family was interested in Christian Science? ... All right. What about Christian Science?"

Christian Science, Christian Science, Christian Science. Well, that hasn't anything to do with that. That's a track called religion. And although the person's interest is seized and gripped with a vice in the present lifetime, it started in a little, old cotton-picking town called Whumpfburg or something back on the Sea of Whumpf, when he didn't have anything to do one day, and he thought it'd be a good idea to build a mud idol. He got to building it. And then he thought it'd be a good idea to tell people a lot of lies about it. And then he thought it'd be an awfully good way to make his living. And from there on, man, we had a track called religion.

Well, of course, the pc isn't interested in that at all. He's had nothing to do with that. He is so irresponsible for it, he doesn't even remember it. But he can only take responsibility for the motivator – this life, now.

Now, that's very responsible. He can be very responsible for that, comparatively speaking. He can remember it. That is your first designation.

You see, bad memory is just a low responsibility on any subject. These two things are absolutely coordinated one against the other, and no memory means no responsibility. You'll be utterly fascinated. Those acts which a person has done in his lifetime for which he has the least responsibility are those he remembers the least. Well, that's the woof and warp of the Sec Checking which you do.

You've got to pull those things because the person has no responsibility for the worst ones he's done, and therefore has no memory of them.

Now, you get an inversion of this thing whereby the person has no responsibility for them but apparently some full memory of them. You get this occasionally, too. Only beware. That is no memory of them. That's a dub-in. That's the dub-in that goes below.

This guy tells you very factually, yes, he's been in prison. He's been in prison this lifetime. As a matter of fact, he's been in jail four or five times in this lifetime, all for chicken stealing.

You look up his record, and you find out he's been to the penitentiary for manslaughter – once, see. So you get the lower level, of course, of responsibility – the lower level of no responsibility is an inversion called dub-in. He's obsessively remembering the wrong thing.

Now, look at this then as a barrier to knowledge of the mind. That's a terrific barrier to knowledge of the mind. The only way you would ever get anybody over his aberration is track it from the beginning to the end, see. You could then do something for the person, but if you just took the end, and particularly the motivators at the end, you would do very little for the person. Run motivator, motivator. You can do something for him just running motivators. Don't think it doesn't work. Dianetics worked. And Dianetics ran mostly motivators, in its first year. And it did things.

But look at that. See your inversion? Now, the one place he can't go, of course, is the beginning of track because he has no responsibility for anything that went on then, so he has no memory of it, so it doesn't exist. Or it is dub-in, and he thinks he's just pretending to know about it. Boy, that is below having forgotten it. Man, you'll hear some of the wildest dub-ins off pcs. Every once in a while some of you get discredited in your own eye, and you invalidate your own past lives because you hear somebody going off at a mad rate on a super-pretended knowingness, you see.

You know, they'll be eight to twelve famous people in the same lifetime? Well, he might have been somebody in that lifetime. Give him that. You see, they remember it by dub-in, but it's below the level of responsibility.

See, it's this fantastic effort to take some responsibility for something they already have totally no responsibility for, and it all winds up backwards. This is a real goofy situation. Well, all you got to do is go down to the spinbin and look up Napoleon. Man, you find him all over the spinbins, so there must be something wrong with this. So – [laughter] yeah, he was not divisible. Thetans is not divisible.

Anyway, you see that this would operate as a considerable barrier to an auditor unless an auditor had a way to detect that there was something under it. And that's your E-Meter.

Your E-Meter will detect no-responsibility areas that the pc can't remember. And a bad meter will only detect those things which a person can remember, and detect them late. That's a bum meter. It only detects those things which a person already knows about.

But a good meter, like this Mark IV, detects below the level of conscious memory and detects into the zones of irresponsibility, and of course then appears to be very magical and appears to know more than the pc knows about it. Well look, if the pc knew about it, he wouldn't be aberrated. You can just always put that down in a little thumbnail margin on almost anything the pc says that is motivatorish.

If the – or the pc is talking to you about his case, and he's going, [makes a coughing noise:] "*khakha-kha kha-kha-kha* and so forth, and I've been out in the cold and - and uh - and - and uh - my mother was very mean, *mean* to me, *kha-kha-kha*," and so forth. And he gives

you this *long* history about all the horrible things that's happened to him in this lifetime, and he's still going *kha-kha-kha*, then you had just make up your mind that he doesn't know what's wrong with him. Because if he knew what was wrong with him, he wouldn't still be going *kha-kha-kha*, see?

This one day you're going to get an individual reality on of great magnitude. An auditor can't audit forever without running into a miracle – real, full-fledged miracle. You audit enough pcs, you'll sooner or later run into an honest-to-God miracle, you know. The only mistake you can make is wearing white robes yourself afterwards. [laughter] Takes a lot of washing and so on. Anyhow ... [laughter]

This bird sits down, and he's got a shrunk arm, you know, and you're puttering around with the E-Meter trying to get him in-session and that sort of thing, and all of a sudden his arm goes out to its full size and quite normal, you know. My God! You know? Or it grows an inch or something like this, suddenly, you know. Or somebody grows a new set of teeth, something like this. These miracles are not frequent because you're not particularly looking at them, but they do happen.

And it will always be because you have tripped an area which was right on the fringe of consciousness, and that the person knew nothing about whatsoever, and all of a sudden leaped full armed into analytical recall. What you've done, then, is take a no responsibility which was almost complete, and turn it into a responsibility which was almost complete, and of course, you're not going to do that very often. It takes a gradient scale.

But they are very, very interesting, these cases that know exactly what is wrong with them that will have sitting right in the middle of all that is wrong with them some totally occluded area, which when you trip it does something odd and peculiar to the case. And there's your zone of miracles. If you're going out to work miracles, why, just go along that line.

"Let's see, what's happened to you in this lifetime that you don't know about? Where are your occluded areas? Well, thank you very much. Good. Now that you've told me, we'll look elsewhere."

And just watch the meter very carefully and say, "All right. Start at birth and scan forward to present time, and the needle will fall on all occluded areas." Oh, no, I don't think that would be a good auditing command. But anyhow, that's almost what you're doing when you're sec checking. Everytime that needle goes *plang*, you're playing with a somewhat occluded area. He may know some of it, he may have a recollection of some of it, but he doesn't have a recollection of all of it. So some or all of it is occluded, and by yanking that into view, of course, you've shown the individual a spotlight on something, and the release of charge on the thing is sometimes quite spectacular.

Of course, Sec Checking is as spectacular as you make it. It's not as spectacular as it is written down on the sheet, you know. I mean there's a lot, a lot of people around who are asking Sec Check questions just, "*Da-de-da*, yeah, that's null, *ha-ha*. *Da-de-da*, well, that one is null. Okay. Thank you. Now *da-de-da*. That one is null. Next one. And that one's null. *Ahhh*," and think they're sec checking, you know. And think they're really getting somewhere. They're running Sec Checks like rudiments. The lick and the promise that you give rudiments to get the pc in-session is not the same way, of course, you handle a Sec Check. You've got to

handle a Sec Check probingly, searchingly. You've got to handle a Sec Check question as though it is a hint of a possibility, and then make the most of it.

And "Have you ever shot any angels with a 12-gauge shotgun?" That's the written Sec Check question. I'd take a Sec Check question sounded as oddball as that and wind up making something out of it, you know? "*Hmmmm*, all right. *Hmmm*, now, let's get down to work here. Got a Sec Check question. Have you ever shot any angel with a 12-gauge shotgun? All right. Here we are now. All right."

"Have you, ah, are you withholding something right this minute? What are you withholding right this minute? Oh, what did you think of? Oh, good, all right. Are you withholding anything else from me? Have I missed a withhold on you? All right. Very good.

"All right. Now, have you shot ... Yeah. All right. What about it?"

The guy says, "What about what?"

"Well, what about shooting people? What about shooting things? How about shots? And so forth. Did you ever play golf or something like that. [laughter] Did you ever cheat anybody in a golf game? Come on. Come on. Come on. Unload here. Shot. Shot. What is this? What is this?"

"I don't know."

"*Mmmmm*." [laughter] "I've got a fall on 'shot,' and he doesn't know. *Ha-ha*. I can..." There's a whole session: Have you ever shot any angel with a 12-gauge shotgun? You say that's absolutely impossible. Nothing would ever come out of the Sec Check question. No gain would ever occur on a case on something like this. A guy who was walking two feet off the ground, he says, "What in the hell happened, huh? It's just a bunch of words, and they restimulated things, and I was watching the meter. Only I was *making* it work, see." *Rhhh-rhhh*.

I never let a pc get in a disarmed frame of mind where the pc is calm about what I'm going to ask him or about his past. Only I don't want him to be interested in *me*. I want him to be interested in what's going to come up. I like him to be very interested in his own case, and after you've pulled a couple of rabbits out of the hat of this character, of course, the pc doesn't know what the hell's going to come up next. And he gets alert. The first lesson he learns in any Sec Checking I would give him is, he doesn't know all about it because the first thing he does when he comes into session and sits down, he's either in one or two frames of mind. "Nobody knows anything about their lives, do they? That makes me average," you see, the guy says. "I'm average. I don't know anything about yesterday or my youth or anything."

Or "Everybody knows everything there is to know about their own lives that's important, don't they? And what could there possibly be in their own life, you see, that has any value or importance of any kind whatsoever because, of course, a person can remember all these things, naturally."

And he comes in with one of those two frames of mind, and I, of course, make it my business to destroy whichever one it is. I shoot it down in flames with rapidity. Why? Not to trap him into his own bank, but to get his attention fluid on the subject of himself.

You know, he's been walking around all these years trying to live with that bank, and he's going to be around a lot longer, not living with the bank necessarily, but he's going to be living with his own thinkingness, and he'd better sure know what his own thinkingness is all about. If I only had five or six hours to process somebody, I think I would teach them to live with their own thinkingness, more, more thoroughly than that, just on Sec Check questions, you know.

I'd give him enough research, when he suddenly realized he had done something, to make him realize that he had some causation over his acts in life. Not to make him more careful about the things he was doing, but after he had done them, for sure remember them.

Anyway, this would be the handling of cases, and the handling of cases to a large degree is a technical matter. But over the top of all of this tremendous technicality, you have one thing that continues to loom far larger than all of the technicalities. All these other technicalities simply serve this thing as a state. That is, the rudiments, the beginning rudiments, the end rudiments, and so on, only serve this one thing, and that's in-session. That's the state of being in-session. That's the only thing they serve.

So what's in-session? And it's just simply in-session. An individual's willing to talk to the auditor and is interested in his own case. And that's all in-session is. And when in-session does not occur, you don't have auditing. And the most gross auditing error there is, is not being able to run a session in which the pc is in-session.

Now, a pc overwhelmed or a pc obedient or a pc propitiative or a pc this or a pc that aren't necessarily a pc in-session. See? Because the pc in-session is very simple and it has very few additives onto it. He's simply interested in his own case, and he's willing to talk to the auditor. Very good. More likely *able* to talk to the auditor, after I've seen a few auditors *prevent* pcs from talking to them.

And I defined it, I think, a little while ago as willing or able to talk to the auditor, but it nevertheless amounts to the same thing.

Now, what – what is this state? And it's one of these things that you recognize when you see it as an auditor. You'll simply recognize it. That is in-session. This pc is in-session. All of a sudden the things go *whiz, bang, boom*.

Now, the only thing which I'm calling to your attention is that you often fail to recognize when it is not occurring. You fail to recognize. You hope it will materialize. I'm trying to make plain to you in this lecture that it never materializes. It is not an accidental. It is just not an accidental. It's not something that you can put on automatic. That is all.

You put a pc in-session with the rudiments or you take advantage of the pc's state of in-sessionness when it occurs. What your end product is – in-session. If a pc is in-session, you certainly don't *put* him in-session. If you've accidentally achieved this state, that's it. I mean, you can accidentally achieve it, just by complete accident.

A person's sitting there, and they're rather bored, and so forth, and you all of a sudden say, "Well, all right. Now, are you willing to have me audit you?"

And the person all of a sudden looks at you and says, "Well, yeah! Yeah, I sure am, you know. What a good idea. I've a lot of things I'd like to tell you about," and he all of a sudden starts talking to you about his own case, and he's in-session.

Now, you're going to go ahead and put him out of session with the remaining rudiments. It takes a very clever auditor to be able to do that, but it can be done. [laughter]

If it weren't for setting a bad example on you, you see in these television demonstrations and so forth that probably some of my rudiments are barely audible. After the pc is practically climbing through the electrodes, you see, I don't see that you need to boost it up, you know.

It's something like, if you've got the highest steam pressure that you can get on a ship's boilers, there's no point in going on and throwing more coal on the boilers' fires. Just no point in it. You're not going to get any higher steam pressure anyhow. I'd take the highest steam pressure I can get per pc. And I'd say, "Well, that's his level of interest," you know. You say to the pc and so on, and the pc is sitting there.

Pc says, "Oh, I had an awful hard life."

I'd say, "Boy, he's in-session," see. [laughter] I mean, he's got it, you know. Dandy, fine, that's it. Oh, we won't go on any further, beating him to death, trying to get him in-session, see. He's in-session, let's do something, see. The usual state of the pc is what usually monitors the degree of in-sessionness the pc has, you know. The pc just is sitting there. [demonstrates it] [laughter] That's the way the pc always sits there, you know. You've actually gotten the person to look up to you and say, [in a feeble voice:] "I had an awful hard life."

Boy, is he in-session. He's interested in his own case, and he's talking to you. What more do you want? Man, give me that, and I can show you miracles.

But creating that particular state is something that the auditor is supposed to do before he does anything else. Now, if an auditor does it so badly that he knocks the pc consistently and continually out of session, there's something wrong with his auditing. That is all. Because it's never going in the direction of getting audited, see. It always is in the direction of *not* getting any auditing, you see. If the auditor in the process of putting in the rudiments knocks the pc out of session and holds the pc out of session, keeps the pc out of session, prevents the pc from having any auditing, you of course then wind up with a pc out of session. Seems elementary, doesn't it?

But the main thing that you don't notice, the main thing that you don't notice, is the fact that a pc goes out of session in the middles of sessions and that you should devote considerable amount of time to putting the rudiments in when they are out during the session.

Now, this becomes very necessary to do with 3D Criss Cross. You can't do 3D Criss Cross without putting them in. You've got to put them in.

One or two of you keeps telling me, "The item keeps going in or out." No, the item doesn't ever go in or out. The *rudiments* go in or out. The pc goes in or out of session, see.

Now, a pc can go out of session just like that doing 3D Criss Cross, see. [snaps fingers] Like that. They're gone. There they went. They're ... Saint Paul's is just passing below them about fifteen hundred feet. They're out. They're gone.

We don't care why. But actually you're reading charged items, and pcs run into these items, and they're having an awful hard time handling these items, and they just haven't got confidence enough to handle the item that just came up, so they have an ARC break with the auditor or something of this sort, or they invalidate the situation, or they withhold something. And man, some pcs just are busy little bees. They've just got this little automatic speaker system going, "Oh, I don't think that's it. That couldn't be it. That couldn't have anything to do with me," and so forth. "But there's no sense to tell the auditor because he'd just do something about it."

And you're busy nulling, and the whole list just goes null, that's it. There's nothing more. Nothing reads. Here it is. Now you have to go back there. And you have to find out, "All right, what did you think or what did you say to yourself a few minutes ago?"

"Oh, nothing. Nothing. No."

Clang!

"Well, what was it?"

"Oh, just – well, I don't see how it could be the item. That's all I said. I just don't see how it could be the item."

"Anything else?"

"Oh, and decided not to mention it to you."

"Oh, well, all right. That's good. All right. Thank you." And you can go on with the list.

The mistake which you most commonly make or is most commonly made by the auditor is to take this up, see. You don't think anything blows. Well, the guy *said it*. That's enough, man. It's blown. Skip it.

I ran into an excellent example of that in rudiments the other day. I was just doing it. And I suddenly saw a tremendous error that could be – had been made with it.

I said, "Who would I have to be to audit you?"

And the pc said, "A woman."

And I said, "Thank you." And went straight into the body of the session.

I'd just been thinking about this, taking up what the pc has already blown as the primary Q and A, and it occurred to me at that moment that that had been a marvelous opportunity. And I don't know how many auditors would have passed that opportunity up.

See, the pc said, "Well, you'd have to be a woman to audit me," and then look at the marvelous opportunity for the auditor to go in and say, "All right. What kind of a woman? When did a woman have a successful auditing session with you?" [laughter] You see, all of that kind of thing could've come up, but the item's gone. It's blown. You can keep the pc

smothered by insisting on taking up everything the pc has said that has already blown. This is an easy one, see. You read so much significance. You think the pc is telling you what's wrong with his case. He isn't. He's telling you what has just blown. And there's where you run into your biggest cropper doing middle rudiments, see.

The pc says, "Well, I didn't think that could be the item."

"All right," you say, "that's fine. Anything else?"

"Well, I was – decided to withhold it from you because there's no sense in telling you because you would have just blown it."

"All right. We've done so. Here we go." And go on with the list.

All right. Look at that as a marvelous opportunity, see. Similar. It's not quite as magnitudinous or gorgeous, you see, an opportunity to stray off the track. But you'll see you've already *put the rudiment in*. Your job has been done, see. Finished. Blown. It's not going to worry you. If you were to ask the question again, you would find there was no disturbance of the meter at all because it's now known to the pc.

Instead of that, you'll find you occasionally take up something that the pc has already blown. I know that you take it up because I often do on an off-guard. I will be startled by something the pc said. It's so far offbeat. You know, it's just so offbeat from anything I could conceive of the pc thinking or saying, you know. It's way over in the other pasture. And I say, well, why did the pc think that, you see, and take it up. The pc has said it, so it is blown, you see. But then I take it up out of my own curiosity or something like that and catch myself taking it up, you see.

My curiosity is suddenly trapped in a, "Why did the pc think that elephants were on the roof?" See, it seemed to be an intriguing thought. And I'm liable to say, "Well, why did you think elephants were on the roof?" See?

Well, the pc blew it. The pc says, "Well, I've had this goofy thought. I thought elephants are on the roof"

Your proper thing to do is just say, "All right. Fine," and go on with your session. Instead of that, "Elephants on the roof? How fascinating," you know. *Zzzzzzzzzp brrpp*. "Now, how come you thought elephants were on the roof? What reminded you of that?"

You'll notice that the pc starts to go out of session when you do this. Starts drifting out of session. That's because you have not comprehended that he has blown something. So there is a disagreement going on here between you and him, and you haven't spotted the growing disagreement on this thing. And so he goes out of session on this point.

But getting your middle rudiments in is just, it's very rapid. There's hardly anything to it.

One of the tricks of getting them in is find out what flow the pc has on automatic. There are four flows. One of them is on automatic and causes the others to appear. It's the hidden flow that causes the other – one or more of the others – to materialize.

The pc is holding off an inflow. There's a big withhold on the subject. The pc always has to have a withhold back of these, but these are highly specialized withholds.

The pc has never been able to understand or stand a male voice. All right, let's just put it down to that. So every time the male voice speaks – you, the auditor, speaks, you see, as a male – *bang!* The pc's got to go this way with the inflow, see, *bzzzzzzzt*.

And it causes a sort of a reversed-looking withhold all the time from the pc, see. So the pc is just always kind of back this way every time you as a male talked to her. All right. Or as a girl you're auditing this pc, and you say something, and the pc has the idea that he could never stand a girl's voice or he's afraid of women. They're liable to do something odd or peculiar, and you can never predict them or something like that, and he has to hold you back as an auditor.

You see, as a girl you'd have to be held back. And this will develop a whole bunch of automatic inflows. Well, it doesn't matter. You don't have to get down to the root of the first question, but you just trigger it, and you watch it go off.

You could simply say, "Are you doing something in a session? Are you withholding something in a session? Are you inflowing something in a session? Or are you preventing an inflow during a session?" See.

Phrase those any way you want to, and you're going to get a higher reaction on the meter. These are meter questions. And explore that one that went *bzzzzzzzt*, and you all of a sudden find your middle rudiments will stay in better because you know what the trigger is.

Every time the gun goes off and the pc goes out of session, you know all you've got to do is pull this trigger, and it'll last for a little while. And then you have to do the whole thing all over again.

The pc is preventing inflow from you. That's all you have to know. You don't have to know anything else. You don't have to know why the pc prevents inflow from you, a girl, or you, a man, see. You don't have to know that. You just have to know that the pc is resisting and preventing an inflow from you.

"All right. What inflow didn't you like then?"

"Oh, well. I – uuuuuou – nothing. Oh well, yes, oh, well, yeah, as a matter of fact, I – huh. I thought you sounded tired."

"Oh, all right. Thank you."

Rudiments are now in. Sail. All of a sudden everything starts to go null. And wait a minute. "All right. What inflow did you – have you prevented in the last few minutes?"

That's all you got to ask. It'll go *bang*. And you'll clear it.

You see how you could keep those in?

Similarly, with a very oddball pc, not necessarily an oddball pc, you could turn the beginning rudiment question into all four flows. Not only are you withholding, but have you *had* to outflow? Or are you outflowing anything? You'll be surprised how many pcs are sitting there radiating so that they will be properly tuned in in-session or something.

"Are you preventing an inflow?"

"Yes, I'm sitting here very carefully because I want to be in-session, and I want to be in-session, and I don't want anything to influence me from the outside world. And – so I'm in-session."

And you can trigger that one off, don't you see.

Or you can say, "Now, are you inflowing anything?"

And the person says, "Yes. Yes. I want some good auditing. I'm inflowing good auditing."

And you say, "Well, what does it look like?"

And he'll say, "Well, you know, it's the golden beams that come from you and me."

You'd be surprised. He's sitting there eating energy, not being audited. Energy eaters.

Anyhow, you've got – you've got a very handy method of handling middle rudiments by just sorting out the pc's flows, and keep your finger on what flow is now in vogue. What is the flow in fad at the moment, and you'll know that that is the one that keeps going out.

[The tape ends abruptly as did the original master recording.]

USAGES OF 3D CRISS CROSS

A lecture given on 31 January 1962

Thank you.

And this is 31 Jan. 62. I'm going to talk to you today about some peculiar usages of 3D Criss Cross. The material I am giving you is at the moment under test, and so on. But you have a right to know about it. And this will ju – also give you a clue while I am – why I'm being so utterly beastly on the subject of differentiation – so beastly about it.

If you can't differentiate, you can't do 3D Criss Cross, and I know you can differentiate and do 3D Criss Cross, and if you don't know it, why, catch up.

The bulk of the older auditors that have been on course longer are doing it beautifully. No complaints whatsoever. Gorgeous. But those that are on the middle grade right now, *aah, ooph, ugh!* Awful. Just horrible.

There's too much "I tried but I goofed," see? All I want is "*do*," you see? And if you equate "tried" plus "goof," you don't equal "*do*," [laughter] you see? There's in fact an old gag, you know, in Scientology, about try. You know, if you just keep trying, of course, you never reach it.

Now, I've been studying this, and 3D Criss Cross has a great future. And it has a great future in your auditing, let me tell you. And there are only some few basic skills.

And the basic skills are: Get the rudiments in. Know how to read a meter so as to get the rudiments in. You needn't write these down because I keep telling you, you know. [laughter] And be able to sec check somebody so that you don't miss any withholds anyplace. And be able to do the type of assessment that goes with a Problems Intensive – you know, that's just, run down a list and see which falls the most. And then there's assessment. And the whole field of assessment, of course, consists of those steps which you are doing for 3D Criss Cross. And this is a separate skill.

A person has to know all these other things before they can even attempt this other. But right away, because of the demands on the auditor, the precision of the process just shines up every missing TR. You might have gotten away, you see – in Sec Checking, you might have gotten away with smoking a cigar and blowing smoke in the pc's face in lieu of TR 2; or something like that. You might have gotten away with these little flubs, but not, not on a Class III skill. You just don't get away with it. It just – the auditing just doesn't work, that is all.

And it puts the burden on the auditor's skill. That is where the burden lies. The burden actually no longer lies on whether the technology works.

Now, more and more we have been moving into this area of less and less question about technology which, of course, makes us look around and find out where is the Q factor.

And the Q factor is in the application of it. And that is why there is a Saint Hill Briefing Course.

And when that fact emerged, that the auditor was not catching up with the technology, of course, it caused a total review of auditing as it was done all around the world, and we found it wasn't good enough. It wasn't good enough to get the total result. Hence, the Saint Hill Briefing Course. You make me make snide remarks like "Auditors aren't good enough." Actually, I have a lot of faith in auditors in general.

Auditors are good enough in their hearts. I want them to demonstrate it in the session.
[laughter, laughs]

Now, this is very germane to the material I'm about to give you. Now, the material will work for you or it won't. I mean, there's no grays in here. I mean, it just goes from dark black to brilliant white with no gray in between. The material will work for you or it doesn't.

And whether the material works for you has nothing to do with intuition or insight. It just has to do with TRs, running an E-Meter and keeping the rudiments in and doing the earlier skills well. And if a person moves up into Class IIb and is still ragged on some of his TRs – *bam!* – it shows up on 3D Criss Cross like somebody lighting tar barrels and throwing off rockets.

Now, he might have been able to sit there, and – he might have been able to sit there, you see, and do Sec Checks and do nicely and do marvelously and look very good, and everybody thought he was doing fine, and everybody thought it was all smooth, and everybody thought it was. And then you move into Class III and head-on into 3D Criss Cross. And what happens? See?

It – now you have a technology which demonstrates conclusively whether or not the auditor can audit, see? And if the auditor can audit – just do these various things, the TRs and keep the rudiments in, and do his proper address to just the technology of auditing. I mean, it isn't anything esoteric, you see? And if he hasn't got all of those very, very good, 3D Criss Cross – *poom* – doesn't work.

He sits down, he audits the pc, pc wonders why you're differentiating the list. This is one of the commonest remarks the pc makes: "Why are we wasting time differentiating?" That is a common remark. You just wait for that one. See, well, why are we differentiating? Well, why are we doing 3D Criss Cross, see? I mean, it obviously isn't working if people are busy asking questions of "Why are we doing it?"

And it goes straight back to nothing in the pc's case that is wrong. 3D Criss Cross will audit them all the way to the bottom. The lowest patient in the sanitarium, man – as long as he will talk to you, even gibberingly amongst his monkey squeaks, you can do 3D Criss Cross on him. And you can even go below that and do it on a psychiatrist. [laughter]

Now, this also goes all the way up to the top, and this thing has burst in upon us, and I haven't given you any top billing for 3D Criss Cross. I've just been waiting – letting you find it out. Well, you found it out. It works. And it works like mad. Well, all right.

Now, for whom does it work? It works for the trained auditor – not for the supersensitive auditor, not for the intuitive auditor, not for the auditor who knows more than the E-Meter, you see, none of those things. That has nothing to do with it. We're out of that because it just takes a good, clean job of auditing, that's all.

A person can do his TRs – pc makes an origin – origination, auditor handles the origination, *bang!* List goes null, auditor knows the rudiments are out, puts the rudiments in again, *bang!* He's back into session. You know, I mean, it's just *bingety-bingety-bing* But everything's got to be working.

This is no process to do – this is no process to do at all – if the auditor is still worried about whether the sensitivity knob should be moved before the tone arm. See, if this is still a big problem to the auditor, you see, he had no business doing 3D Criss Cross, see. He has to be able to integrate these tools into one package of action. That's what he has to be able to do. He actually has to be able to do them all at once, perfectly. Sufficiently so that he never has to spend any time worrying about whether he's doing it right.

All right. Then of course he's auditing the pc. He's not worrying about whether or not he's got his fundamentals straight. So that's the time that 3D Criss Cross works.

Now, there's no grays. It doesn't work slightly. It works very well if audited, or it doesn't work. You could make some junior process out of this whereby it could be done indifferently, and you could find a 3D package, and you could audit it with a repetitive process, and so forth. But it's something on the order of taking a jet plane and using the thing to keep the rain off the motor parts at the edge of the hangar, you know? *Thuh just thuhh.*

Now, some of the uses of this is what I want to talk to you about, not berate you about your auditing, because by and large, I think you're all doing well. Much better than should be expected in some cases, of course.

But just raise your sights. The final test on this sort of thing – it's the easiest thing in the world to classify a Class III Auditor. Just look at his last half dozen session reports on 3D Criss Cross. Was the pc flying? The guy can audit. Pc wasn't flying? *Nah*, he got a lot to learn. I mean that – it's no longer "What is wrong with this pc that this pc is not functioning" you see? That's not the question you ask.

You just say well, Class III, pc was fine. All right. Fine.

Class II is a much rougher examination than Class III, from that basis. I mean, much rougher on the standpoint of the Examiner. How do you establish whether or not a person can do that. Well, yes, he's cleared up several Sec Check questions. Yes, his rudiments are in. Yes, he can do these various things.

Well, we can examine that, and that's not hard to examine, but it is much more difficult to examine a Class II than a Class III, because a Class III, practically all you have to do is open up the case folders of the cases the fellow is working on: The pc is flying, he's okay. Pc isn't flying, he isn't okay. Do I make my point here? It's just an open-and-closed proposition.

Now, everything I'm going to tell you about the experimental use of 3D Criss Cross is modified by these very things I have given you here at the introduction.

Experimental use of 3D Criss Cross includes curing up anything. Just anything. I don't care whether a guy's got lumbosis or what. It could cure it. Experimentally, that is an asserted fact.

Any chronic somatic, any circuit, any hidden standard, any other anything that anybody has run into on cases apparently is curable by 3D Criss Cross worked right and used right. So you're looking at the Kohinoor diamond, in actual fact. And I wouldn't be so mean – because I'm seldom bestial about these things; I'm usually very kind, very kindhearted, mostly – except where I can see where you could go and you ain't going there, see? And then right away, why, I start riding at the flanks and pushing. And you right now, of course, as you well realize, are being pushed.

You're not being pushed. You're being shoved hard. You understand? And of course, you're only being shoved up to a realization of your own skill.

Now, here we go. How would you cure a person who had a circuit that accused him all the time of being a beast? Now, let's just take that as a hypothetical case. This is neurosis ne plus ultra. Neurosis Freudosis.

Well, you ask the guy what he's got, and the guy has got a voice which tells him he's a beast. And this is the only thing he will say he has got and this is worrying him. In fact, he is frantic about it. In fact, even as he tells you about it, the voice tells him he is a beast to tell you about it, don't you see? All right.

Now, what do we do? We take any statement that the pc has even vaguely made, and we find "Who or what would oppose (statement)?" – see, that circuit; whatever he's described it as, you see? And we make a "Who or what would oppose?" list. And then we just go through the various steps of 3D Criss Cross with that list, and we come up at the other end with some item that is sticking.

All right. *Voilà!* We don't do a thing with it. That is what is interesting. In fact, you'd better not do anything with it, because that item is unrunnable. Now, let's get into this more neatly here.

The condition which he has told you about – I don't care what the condition is. Mother-in-law stays with him too long every year. All right. You want to solve his present time problem about this, you see. You just do the same thing. It's a statement of what the pc says is wrong with him. You know, pc is always telling you something is wrong with him, and sometimes you look hard, you'll find the pc knows something is wrong with him but hasn't told you. The various methods of discovering this I will cover in a moment. But at the present moment, let's just say this condition.

All right. Now, mark my words now. This condition is not auditable with safety. You cannot safely audit that condition, because it is too far from the Goals Problem Mass. It is probably some kind of a lock valence, and if you ran it directly, you are liable to beef up the whole Prehav Scale. And the pc starts going around *wog-glog-zeboog* SEN is liable to turn on with considerable PN. [laughs]

So you don't want to audit that condition. Now, underscore that and mark that well, and flap your ears on it because that's really important. Don't audit the condition the pc told you about.

I'll give you a little back history on this. Along about 1954, I started telling you don't audit the pc's chronic somatics, and all that sort of thing. Lay off of this stuff.

Now, the basic background music to why I kept saying this is because it often enough didn't do the pc any good. That was often enough. But in some of the cases it practically spun the pc in. And there was a bug factor here which made it necessary to lay off of these things.

All right. I wasn't aware of the fact that everybody was spinning in all over the place, but I knew people were not being successful with this, and it was no business for us to be in at that time. Now, I'm telling you, it would very easily be in this business because these are the bugs associated with it.

Why? It is a lock valence on the Goals Problem Mass. The condition is just probably some lousy old lock valence that hangs at the – that hangs on a lock valence that hangs on a lock valence, and the pc is aware of it.

Now, that the pc is aware of it tells you, one, that it will not blow and that isn't what's wrong with the pc. He's got this circuit in full bloom, you see, or he's got these ulcers in full bloom, or he's got this mother-in-law in full bloom. It doesn't matter what he's got in full bloom, he knows what is wrong with it, and it is *still wrong*. Now, that is your main test. If the pc "knows what is wrong with him" (quote, unquote) and it is still wrong with him, then obviously what he knows is wrong with him is the wrong answer. Isn't that pretty obvious? Because if it was right, if he knew what was wrong with him, it wouldn't be wrong with him. Why? It would as-is.

And if it doesn't as-is, then he doesn't know what's wrong with him, you see? And that – you – probably, even in your own case in running down the line, sooner or later, you collided with this interesting point, and you say, "Oh, I'd forgotten that," you know? That was out of view.

Up to that time, you knew exactly what was wrong with you. You knew it was your upbringing or your father coming home and bringing you lollipops that gave you bad teeth or something like that, and you ran into something, and it didn't have anything much to do with that. It was just vaguely associated with, and you ran into the real reason, and the condition went boom or something like this, and you felt better about it.

All right. So remember that the condition the pc tells you about or that you ferret out of the pc, if in the process of ferreting out of the pc, doesn't disappear, of course, is a description that is inaccurate. Otherwise, the moment it was described, it'd go *whoow*, see. And that would be the end of it.

But it doesn't, and I wish you to note this very carefully on pcs. There are two conditions. One, the pc tells you about this problem or difficulty, and it goes *whoow*, and you can't find it anymore on the E-Meter. And the other one, he tells you about this problem or difficulty, and you have to audit it. You see these? You see these two different conditions?

Well, now the first one that blew on two-way comm was factual. That was what was wrong with him. And the second, it isn't – we're not saying he isn't suffering from this, but his description of what it is, perforce must be inaccurate, because it doesn't blow. Now, it is just as one, two as that, you see?

"Well," he says, "I got a terrible headache."

And you say, "All right." And you ask him what's wrong with him.

"I got a terrible headache."

You say, "All right. Good. Where does it hurt?"

And he says, "Well, it hurts around here."

Now you have to audit it.

Well, now, how come it hurts after he told you about it? It's probably because he didn't have a headache. You ever stop and think about that? See? There's something wrong here.

He's either got a backache or his head is hot or something, but he has not made an accurate description of his condition. Of course, that he did describe it, he only described it, of course, to the depth that he could observe it. And he couldn't observe it deeply enough to as-is it so therefore that isn't what's wrong with him.

It goes deeper than that. So you can say of any condition that does not blow on two-way comm that it is out of the pc's view. And that would be its first – the first thing that you could say about it.

So you have to resort to processes or activities which put it *in* the pc's view at which moment it would go *bloom*, and that would be the end of it, see? So it either blows or you have to audit it.

Now, if you have to audit it, it must – the auditing must disclose new data. And that is why you instinctively go round the bend halfway when a pc sits there for twelve consecutive sessions and has no single, slightest cognition of any kind. He never finds out anything. He never realizes anything. He never finds anything new. He never gets anyplace in his knowledge of life and the world.

Well, that auditing must be up against a dead end, mustn't it? There's something wrong with it. Because, you see, if he's not going to disclose any new data, then what he has said is wrong with him that didn't blow, of course, couldn't possibly be blowing. It'd have to have new data come up to blow it. Otherwise, it'd just blow on two-way comm, don't you see?

And if it didn't blow on two-way comm, then it must be more deep-seated than that, and it requires new cognitions, new information, new knowledge, new penetration, new insight, and then it would blow. And if he's not getting those things, of course, his case is going nowhere.

So sitting down and auditing somebody endlessly – and they never have a cognition, and they never have a new thought, and they never recognize anything.

John Sanborn, back about 54, something like that, made a very interesting remark about this. He said, "Well," he said – he was auditing some pc – and he said, "Well, I'm suspicious of this fellow. Never once has he looked up and said, 'What do you know,' you know? Never has said that. He just never, never said 'What do you know,' you know, in all the time I've been auditing him." He's right, too. Case never recovered from anything.

It was an awfully good description of what a pc might be expected to do – sooner or later, look up and say, "What do you know," you know? And a pc who never says "What do you know," never gives any indication that anything has occurred of any kind whatsoever that might be brand-brassy-new to him – uh-uh, uh-uh, uh-uh, because, of course, no new data's being recovered.

All right. Let's go to the next thing. What is the most buried thing about you? About you? Come on, what is the most buried thing about you? What is the most buried thing about you? What is the most *hidden thing* about you? You? Aside from you, of course. [laughter] What is it?

Well, if you can answer this question perfectly and rapidly without the slightest comm lag, why, you'll have disproved this whole theory.

What was your full name and street address in your last life? What was your full name and street address in the life just before that? What was your full name and street address in your life just before that? Now, you have possibly seen pictures of your last life. You possibly, if you were lucky enough to have your last li – unlucky enough to have your last life still kicking around into this life on the newsstands or something like this, of course, you're aware of what your name was. But you've seen some pictures of this sort of thing, and you've seen scraps of this and that and their surmises.

But sitting here in this lifetime, I can ask you this question. What's your name, see. And you'll sing out – *bang, bang*. You know, there's nothing much to that. Some of you have a slight comm lag, but ... [laughter, laughs]

Now, there's the proof of the pudding: that you can recover pieces of track and engrams. You can recover sequences and circumstances. Well, you can get an engram – the pc and somebody else is in the *bois* at dawn very early in the *matin*, and they have sharp tooth-picks that they are about to insert into each other's *vitals*, and we get this as an engram, you see? We get the somatics; we get all kinds of things. We get the twittering of the "boids"¹ as they twitter in the *bois*. We even get a death. We may even get a trial afterwards. We get all sorts of things, but we ask the pc, "What was your opponent's name?"

You say, "*Aah, oh*, well, that's a new thought. Um, René. Yeah, René. No, no, no, that was – no, uh – well.... But let me tell you about the birds in the *bois*."

Identity or beingness is the most hidden fact about you. Experience – we can find experience, you see? That's easy. We can find masses and pictures and engrams and somatics and all that sort of thing. That is easy. We can find flows, *bango*. Nothing to that, you see? But what's your name?

¹ Editor's note: boids = joking way to pronounce "birds".

So we get beingness as the most hidden factor. And that is why 3D Criss Cross works like a startled dream. Because you're recovering beingnesses, see. *Bangety-bangety-bangety-bangety-bang*. So you're working at the most hidden piece of knowingness there is on the track which is "Who was you, Mac?" You see?

You notice in crowded areas they solve this. They solve this beingness by always being the same beingness. Did you ever notice this? That makes everything very simple. All taxi drivers know this in New York City. To them everyone is Mac. [laughter] And they have no trouble with this whatsoever.

Now, you're recovering beingness, is what you're doing. And beingness, of course, is part of the package of experience. And I studied experience a year or two – a couple of years ago, and so forth, and never got much of anyplace with it because it was – experience is the doingness of a beingness. You see?

As long as you run doingnesses and beingnesses, you, of course, will recover experience. And apparently experience is the easiest thing to recover on the track.

You could always say to a pc, "You ever been drowned?" And the pc starts going *glug, glug, glug*, you know. Well, interrupt him at that point and say, "Well, what was your name then while you were being drowned?", you know?

He can't tell you, you know. He can tell you that he drowned. He can reexperience the drowning, but who was he? In fact, it's a big mystery all over the place. 3D Criss Cross in recovering this, of course, is throwing into view large sections of track. And in that – the basic game of a pc requires first, a beingness and a doingness and then a havingness – the basic game – or a no-havingness – gets into, then, a beingness versus a beingness. And we get the beingness versus a beingness situation, and these hang up like problems.

Now, a problem is a postulate-counter-postulate, idea-counter-idea, A versus B, and the reason a problem hangs up and tends to go on forever and floats in time is that it is rather well balanced. The idea versus the idea. Since you're not given a problem by a little child very often, who comes up and gives you a gratuitous datum, see? This is not usually a datum of magnitude to what you've got as a datum, see? So it doesn't hang up. You don't worry about it. But you run into a friend of yours, and you say, "Those Russians, those Russians never did get a man into space," and your friend says, "Well, they did, too."

Now, you've got beingnesses of comparable magnitude and it makes a problem, *ha-ha*. So you have a fight with your friend about – he says the Russians got somebody into space, and you say they didn't get anybody into space, and it was all hoax and propaganda. And he says no, it wasn't; he saw pictures of the moon and all kinds of things. It can be a problem, see, but what makes it a problem is the A plus B, the identity versus the identity. So you have to have identities of somewhat comparable magnitude to hang this thing up.

Now, the Goals Problem Mass consists of problems of the magnitude of a game. Big, big problems. And of course, these problems are resident in identities. And you can audit the identity out of the Goals Problems Mass, but peculiarly enough, you cannot audit the problem out of the identity. *Ha-ha, ha-ha*. Isn't that interesting?

You can't audit the problem out of the identity, but you can audit the identity off the problem. That's a funny mechanic, but it apparently works that way.

When you start running a pc on Rising Scale – this is dandy, by all means, run Rising Scale and early processes, and so forth – you're actually merely shifting around slightly the now-I'm-supposed-to's of the beingness that the pc is sitting in. And it doesn't shift much. Let me assure you. Well, it shifts a little. You can get some considerable gains and results. Enough to keep us going for a long time. I mean, it was all right. We were happy with them at the time.

But how about blowing the 'ole ruddy package, what? How about blowing all the 16,972 problems per minute that this character had, see? Because this beingness in the bank is posed against another beingness in the bank which keeps it in balance and floats it in time. So all time is that time, and here it is all locked up in the middle of nowhere. You get this idea?

All right. So now let's get back to the statement of the condition the pc has made. See, whether it's his mother-in-law's staying with him too long, or he has lumbosis, or it's – he's got a circuit or something that calls him a beast all the time. We don't care what this thing was. We say, "Who or what would oppose it?"

Now, we don't run the condition because the condition is probably a fragment of the beingness that he has not identified. Nor do we audit what we find as the opposition terminal to the condition. We don't audit the opposition terminal to the condition, but we oppterm that. And those three steps are necessary:

1: Identify the condition. Get a statement of the condition. Find out what the condition is. And believe me, that covers an awful bag of tricks, let me comment in passing. There's an awful bag of tricks attached to finding out from the pc what the condition is.

Number 2, find the opposition beingness. That is to say, you could call it the opposition terminal, but you find an opposition beingness to the condition.

And then number 3, find the opposition to number 2, and you'll wind up with the identity of what the condition has – the identity that – the beingness that had the condition.

You go around Robin Hood's barn to find this thing, you see? He's sitting there with nattering teeth. Let us say, this is his condition. Nattering teeth. And you can't ask him, now, "Who or what would have nattering teeth?" and really expect, in a large... On some cases, you'll get the answer promptly. Very few. But in – largely no. He's so fixated on these teeth that are hanging out in space in the bank, you see, that he can't quite....

Now, you say, "Who or what would oppose it?" Well, you've already knocked the chink out of the hidden suspension of that beingness. You see, for teeth to be suspended in the bank, there must be a beingness in the bank who has the teeth.

Well, you see, that is suspended in place by something he's never put his attention on which is an opposition terminal. So you just take that one, and you loosen that one all up. You take a lot of locks off of it and you loosen it all up, you see.

And then you go on around back and find out what would oppose that, and you get a beingness.

Now, if you do this very slippily and very well, something weird happens to his nattering teeth problem. Because now you've identified who and what has the nattering teeth. And you've also identified who and what would oppose the nattering teeth.

Now, you've shaken it up. Now, if you've done differentiation very well, you've blown it to glory. And if you're lucky, you just blew it up on step 2. And if you're – you don't need quite so much luck to blow it up on step 3. But you've certainly got something now that is safe to audit.

You see, supposing these nattering teeth, he thinks at first glance, would belong to some unproved part of a Goals Problem Mass. And let's say that if we ran mother-in-law – this would be so far from any part of the Goals Problem Mass and yet so closely pinned to it that we'd beef up the whole Prehav Scale. See, that would be a risky thing to do. No, let's prove it out. Let's go around Robin Hood's barn and prove the thing out.

Let's take the condition, find the opposition to the condition, and then find the opposition to the opposition, and we are going to wind up with a large chunk of bank with a hole in it. Now, that action alone may be adequate or sufficient, but you also have something that you could audit.

Now, you had to pay attention to what has SEN and what has PN because the – when you found the opposition to the nattering teeth, and it gave him sensation and made him dizzy while you were doing the list – several items on it give him sensation – watch it because in the 3D package term, that is an oppterm.

And then you come around and find step 3, get the opposition to what you found in step 2, and it turned on pain – we had pains, *ugggg-ugggg, clank*, while he was doing the list, you know, and while you were assessing it, and so forth; he had pains involved with the thing – that's a terminal.

Now, you run the terminal directly in such a case, or you can run a terminal, of course, against the opposition terminal which was the number 2 that you found. You see how you'd do that?

Now, therefore, just by this alone – depending the degree that the person is in-session and that sort of thing, and the skill of the auditor, and all that sort of thing monitoring it – you have in your hands about maybe a five-hour cure for arthritis. I mean a good case of arthritis, you know? It goes *hweeeeee*, you know? Wheelchair scrunch. See, you got that, actually, in your hands, because somebody had the arthritis, and it isn't the pc.

You see, if the pc goes around and tells everybody he has arthritis and it doesn't disappear, there must be a lie. There must be something wrong here somewhere.

And of course, the basic thing that is wrong is he doesn't have arthritis. It's like these people with chronic coughs. [gives a little cough] [laughter]

I blew old Belknap out of his head one time a way back when. I just got so tired of his cough, you know, because people would audit him to get rid of his cough – this was the trap he was manufacturing for everybody: "Get rid of my cough." So anyhow.... It was a game he

was playing. So I blew him out of his head out in Phoenix. You know, I just told him to get back there about ten feet, and I said, "*You cough.*"

He surprised himself to death. He started coughing – a thetan – started coughing. He, boy, *cough, cough, cough, cough, cough*. Body. At first, the body was kind of going *ough, ough, ough*. You know. After that he got so he could cough without the body coughing. And he found out that it was him coughing all the time.

Now, what was wrong with Belknap's cough is, is he said it was his body coughing. And his body was never coughing. So, of course, the condition never cleaned up.

When I blew him out of his head and told *him* to take over the automaticity of coughing, he, a thetan, sat out there in space, you see, several feet back of his head and was going *cough, cough, cough, cough, cough, cough*, coughing, you see. He took over the automaticity of it, and I don't remember if that was the entire cure, but I think I – I haven't heard him cough since, I mean, put it that way.

You see what this was?

Now, you could have gone a little bit further. How come a thetan was coughing. That's an interesting question. Well, he was stuck already in a beingness. Now, I must have blown him out of his 'ead in a beingness, see?

And actually it was the beingness that was coughing, so if I had any trouble getting him to take over the automaticity and it didn't blow at once, it was because we hadn't identified the beingness, see? It was still "who was coughing?" Well, he was, and he was being that being, but we hadn't identified who he was – you see the slippiness. So therefore it wasn't an instant and immediate blow.

Now, if we'd oppterm'd this in some fashion, we'd have worked it around with these three steps which I've just given you, we would have amounted to more or less the same thing. He would have found out somebody else was coughing. That's for sure. Well, he had been blaming the body, blaming his present body all the time, and his present body wasn't doing the coughing, which I think is of interest.

Actually, he, a thetan, wasn't doing the coughing, it was a bank identity. It was a valence or a circuit that was coughing. But of course, he so closely identified himself with this thing, and that was him, you see, that he – it did tend to blow even then. But it would have been a good, clean, quick blow if I had had this other datum, you see?

Now, beingnesses – any error, any condition which is wrong with the individual is, of course, a condition of a beingness. It is not the beingness. It is the condition of a beingness. I don't care if he's got a bullet in his chest and he just received it. His name is John Jones at the moment he got the bullet in his chest, and it's John Jones that's got a bullet in his chest. See, that's the beingness that got a bullet in his chest. And the reason it doesn't blow is because last life's Bill Doakes, and eighteen dozen lives ago soldier Pete and pirate Tom and various other chaps that he has been went around obsessively putting bullets in people's chests, you see?

So you got all of the oppterm's mocked up in the bank that he has shot the chests of, and there is all of the terminals that did the shooting of the chest of, and now you come along

and with a Touch Assist you think you're going to cure up his chest, are you? No, you're not. Because it's John Jones, or something like this, and that isn't really John Jones's bullet hole, and the body just got in the road of it. He's been deserving that bullet hole for a long time. Man, he earned it.

Most thetans work hard for their motivators, you know. [laughter, laughs] Very hard, hard work.

Anyhow, now, you look over this, then, as an action in auditing, and the thing ought to just go together, just click, click, click, you see, because it's the condition of a beingness. Of course, you can't audit the conditions of a beingness and expect to get anywhere. But you can audit identity or beingness, you see, and you get someplace with that. But naturally, why, as you oppterm the oppterm and go around, you're here or there going to run into a case that isn't blowing very cleanly, and you'll have to make a fourth step, oppterm that and run that down, and make a fifth step and oppterm that, and run that down. But that's all right. They're just more steps. And you'll find out there's – quite mysterious. You'll see this is mysterious. It'll even be mysterious to the pc. The pc knows nothing about past lives. Knows nothing about overts. Knows nothing about motivators. Knows nothing, you know. Standard citizen.

And here we are, and the pc's cheery, cheery, cheery. You know, "Only lived once. Only have the guilt of this lifetime on my conscience, and I get rid of that everyday to the priest. And I'm all set. I got it taped," and so forth.

And all of a sudden he gets lumbosis. And he goes around to the medico, and the medico administers some soup or syrup or pill or something, and it doesn't disappear. And he goes around, and he gets platinum shots, you see. They're made out of solid platinum, and they shoot him with platinum for a long time, and nothing happens, and so forth.

Well, he still only lives once, he still never is guilty of any overts, he doesn't know what could have happened here, it is a condition which has to do with the body, this lumbosis.

All right. You come along, and he says, "Well," he says, "I've got lumbosis."

And you say, "All right. Good. Who or what would oppose lumbosis?" In a good Model Session, you swing it right around, and you nail down a terminal that stays in. Now, "Who or what would oppose that terminal?" *Woo-Woo*.

I think your pc is going to be somewhat fascinated. He's going to be very curious. He's going to wonder, "Who is this standing looking at the last address to Wellington leaving his troops?"

Curious. In fact, he's liable to speak of it. And on the other hand, you're liable to have to pull it as a withhold because he thinks he's gone around the bend. [laughter, laughs] But it'd work. I mean, he wouldn't have to know anything about this. See, it'd work.

Just listing oppterm – you know, listing opposition terminals and listing oppositions to that, and so on. All of a sudden this would start all unreeling. And the reason he doesn't have to know anything about it, of course, is – that's what's wrong with him: He doesn't know anything about it. But the reason he doesn't have to know anything about it, of any kind what-

soever, is simply because it is. See, it just is. And this is your fastest route in on is-ness that you ever heard of. Identity. A packaged identity.

Now, every identity that you run into is a total package. Every identity. John Jones is a total package. But as old Gallusha said before he left here, he said, "I don't think that in this lifetime a man acquires even ten ideas." He says, "They're all on the backtrack. They're all on the backtrack, and in this whole lifetime I don't believe I've acquired ten ideas in this whole lifetime." It's true, too.

But yet an identity is a series of now-I'm-supposed-to's, packaged ideas – *da-da-da-da-da*, you're supposed to, and *da-da-da-da-da-de-da* and you're supposed to, you see? You're supposed to *da-da-da-da-da-de-da*. And when anything goes *do-do-do*, you go *da-da-da-da-da-de-da*, see, and it all works out very nicely. Everything works well.

When people run up the street in a large car, you know it is a General Sherman tank, and you reach for your tommy gun and fire at its treads. Or you run out and put a tar grenade in the tread at great danger to yourself. That's proper, you see. When you see large vehicles, that's what you're supposed to do. Only if you look closely, they don't have treads. And if you reach for something, your tommy gun isn't there, or your bazooka, or whatever it was supposed to be. And you reach carefully into your glove compartment or in your pants pocket, you find no tar bomb. And so you just remain sort of upset by large vehicles.

So you have this individual, and he comes up, and he says, "Well, I'm upset by large vehicles. I just don't like large vehicles, see. I just go all to pieces whenever I see a large vehicle. Gray ones – they drive me mad."

Now, this would be a pretty good pc that had identified it to this degree. Usually the auditor has to dig.

All right. Now, let's look at the mistake we could make. We could say, "Well, now, have you ever been in an accident with a large vehicle?"

I've given you the content of the thing. The fellow was a soldier, and he's supposed to attack tanks. Now, we ask him, "Have you ever been injured by a large vehicle? Has anybody you know ever owned a large vehicle? Have you any overts on a large vehicle?"

We ask him this, you see, without much attention to meter or beingness. And he says, "Well..." He swears at them, so we clean this up, and the condition alleviates slightly.

What are we working on? He goes out and he sees large vehicles, and he still feels a little bit nervous, but he says, "I can take it or leave it alone."

So what you've done is ended his current cycle of overts against large vehicles, and you can do that by Sec Checking, so therefore Sec Checking is valuable.

Let's look at another side to this thing

You say, "Who or what would oppose large vehicles?"

And he says, "Oh, well, that's easy. Who or what would oppose them? Traffic officers, policemen, drivers of small vehicles, a soldier, an antitank battery, an antitank infantryman, a soldier, an antitank infantryman with a bazooka, a bazooka operator, a bazooka pointer, a ba-

zooka handler, a tommy gun handler, a tar bomb manufacturer, a tar bomb thrower, a um.... Yes, well, I think that's about the list."

"Good." You differentiate it out, and you'll find out it's "a soldier," and then you move around on the other side of it, and you say, "Who or what would oppose a soldier?" you see? And we get some kind of a thing like "an army." That's what he's being. He's being an army. And this changes his point of view.

You see, he's always had the point of view of soldier. And he's looking straight out from being a soldier, whether it was a terminal or oppterminal, see, soldier, you know. Because that's a soldier's reaction. But there's something else that is holding a soldier in place, don't you see. And this tank is like a goal operates in Routine 3.

See, I mean this large vehicle, that's just a goal. It's an indicator. There it sits. It's the tab that's hanging out. And what we've done is find a whole bunch of new tabs.

So you just say, well, instead of fighting for seventeen days, day and night with the pc, no holds barred, judo, hari-kari, and other exercises, trying to find the pc's goal, well, just pick his condition out of the line and straighten it up, and you get through with the hidden standard right there at the beginning.

This experimental uses of 3D Criss Cross; and you'll find that you have a lot of use for them. You'll find you have to pilot your way through. Now, let's get down to what's the toughest operation about this. That's getting the pc to elucidate, elicit, spill, spew, impart or communicate the condition to the auditor. That's what's rough.

Pc says, "Well, there's nothing wrong with me." Come in on crutches, he's falling into the wheelchair, can't see, hand won't write.

"No, there's nothing wrong with me. I've led a happy and full life. Yes. I have a little trouble sometime with the pension bureau."

Man, he's not to grips with his problems at all. All the basic reason he isn't at grips with his problem is because he isn't at grips with any identity that he is. He doesn't know who he is.

While being John Jones, he's being Tom – Pirate Tom, or something of the sort. And he isn't suffering from the consequences of the war at all. He's suffering from that last time they went out and captured Julius Caesar. That was an unfortunate activity for many of the pirates involved. This made him a foe of governments ever since. So, you see, he's having a little trouble with the pension bureau. Get the idea?

His tags are hanging out all over the place, you know. The pc is practically walking down the street with long strings with labels on them, you know. But it's very hard to get him to impart a central problem or circuit. A pc very often will sit there with a chronic present time problem and never tell you anything about it. He worries and worries and worries about it. He worries consciously about it all the time, and he never imparts it to you.

Now, we have had a great deal of experience during the past few years trying to – the past couple of years with – trying to isolate difficulties with pcs. And a great deal of that technology has come forward, and you have hidden standards, you have present time prob-

lems of long duration as opposed to present time problems of short duration, and you have the mechanisms of circuits, and you have the entirety of the Goals Problem Mass and lock valences and that sort of thing – the way it operates on the pc. But principally, as far as you're concerned, with this particular activity, I recommend to you the Problems Intensive. I recommend to you a Problems Intensive.

You do a Problems Intensive from scratch. There it is. You know, there's a new form out on it, by the way. It's the same form that's in the bulletin. It's just been written up.

Self-determined changes. Never an other-determined change, if you please. Only self-determined changes. You make a list of the self-determined changes in the pc's lifetime, and you assess that list out, and you get the one which falls the most, and you find out what problem existed immediately ahead of that, just before that, what problem existed. Just as you usually were doing it. And – only we take a wild departure. We don't particularly knock out the prior confusion. See, that's a Class II skill.

Now, if we're going to use 3D Criss Cross on this thing, we're just going to rip up the bank with it. We're just going to tear up the bank in long strips, and we're really going to get there with rapidity. What are we going to do?

We're going to say to him, "Well, now, you have a problem. You don't want to go to school. Good enough. Now, what would you say the thing was, now?"

"Well, it's just I just don't want to go to school. I never have wanted to go to school. It's an awful problem."

He's stated a fact as a problem if you will notice.

And so you would have a list composed of "Who or what would oppose your not wanting to go to school?" See, it must be the exact condition stated by the pc. And although that's an involved sort of a statement, he'll master it. And so you make your list, and that's your – then you get all five steps of 3D Criss Cross, and you get your final line. You strike this final line, you know – your final item – and you've got it, *bang*.

Now, you get the oppterm to that, and you walked it around in a circle again. He will have had all kinds of cognitions and various things, and things blowing up in smoke, and he'll know he'd had a change. That I guarantee. Something will have happened if it was well done. It's an oddity, isn't it? You've unsettled this problem.

All right. Now, let's take an additional approach to this, then. We've settled that one. We got a couple of terms and oppterm. Well, let's call it a kind of a line. That's the school-problem line, see. Now, let's do this assessment again, and let's find out what are these self-determined changes, what they amounted to, you see?

And get him to state the problem to the one that now falls. We've struck the one off we've handled, you see, you strike that off. Now, you assess the remainder. Add anything the pc wanted you to add about, well, he suddenly remembered about self-determined changes. Get the problem that occurred just before the self-determined change. Get that problem, *bang*. And of course, you've got a problem like, well, "How to feel safe in a small car."

Well, naturally, there's been all kinds of car accidents in his lifetime, and so forth, and you, with your Class II skill, you'd follow them down, see check them on prior confusions, and so on. You'd really get someplace, too.

But with 3D Criss Cross approach, a Class III approach, what you would do would find "Who or what would oppose not liking small cars?" And you'd get a list, and you'd – that's number 2, and then you would do number 3, and you'd find out that'd wind out someplace, and you'd have another line, wouldn't you. Fascinating.

Now, let's strike that particular problem off the line, and let's assess this list again, adding anything the pc wants, and you're going to find – you're going to wind up with eight or nine lines. In other words, the whole case. Every corner of the Goals Problem Mass can be counted on to stick some thumb up in this lifetime. It's a fruitful source of lines.

But what would appear very mysterious to the pc about it, is his phobias would tend to desensitize and disappear, and change his mind about this sort of thing.

Let me give you a very practical example of this. We ask the pc what difficulty he is having in life. And we simply take that. We don't actually probe the case in any depth. And if the pc just gave us this difficulty, "Well, I can never leave home, see. I can never leave home. That's the difficulty I'm having in life."

Well, you just find who or what would oppose his never leaving home. You understand it's his "never leaving home," not "his leaving home." See, it's always the *exact condition*, you see, that the pc states because you don't know what trickery and treachery is mixed up in this, and if you already start to oppterm it by dropping the "not" out of it or something like that, why, you've thrown yourself a red herring, and you'll find out it won't work.

So you get your list, and you get your second list, and all of a sudden he'll be able to leave home. It'll all appear quite mysterious to him. You won't really have solved anything at all. He won't find that you have solved anything.

What you have done is find the identity of who wouldn't leave home, see, by finding the opposition to that identity and then going back and finding the identity. See?

Now, having found the identity to it, you've blown the identity into view as simply a descriptive identity. That's good enough – to cause the thing to soften up all over the place. So of course it's come into beingness. I mean, his beingness is known. Now, he knows who wouldn't leave home. You don't even have to point this out to him. He all of a sudden cognites. Calls you up at two o'clock in the morning and says he just realized something. "Just realized something, but a sick child would not be permitted to leave home." Big cognition. See? That's probably the end of his difficulty with leaving home.

In other words, here's a whole parade of problems. Now, people have come into HGCs for years, they always present some of these psychosomatic difficulties or a hidden standard or something like that, or their present time problem of long duration appears in their goals. Let me call that to your attention very closely, that if you want to find the pc's present time problem of long duration and you're sort of running out of problems to solve for the pc, or if it

ever occurred to you to read your own auditor's report that it is written up in the upper right hand corner of the report.²

The present time problem of long duration in one version or guise or another is always written in that corner providing you list the pc's goals for the session or life or livingness. That's very interesting.

I mean, it's very hard to find because your writing sometimes is difficult to read. I can read it. I can read it, but you I know have trouble reading your own writing sometimes.

But if you look up in the upper right-hand corner, you will find the present time problem of long duration stated as a goal, and this is the commonest occurrence of a pc. He hands you his case there, right there, *bang*.

You look over a dozen consecutive sessions of a pc – if he's in communication with the auditor at all and is talking at all, and look over all his life and livingness things, and you can see it integrating against a 3D Criss Cross list most interestingly.

In other words, let's take a pc's goals for last July. Any goals last July. No 3D Criss Cross, you see. The goals that he wrote down for the session and for life or livingness, see?

And now let's take his January auditor's report, you see? Same report on the same pc, but 3D Criss Cross. And now integrate last July's goals in life and livingness as present time problems of long duration and see how that stacks up against the terminal packages which he's running, the cognitions he's getting. You'll find out they're blowing He's blowing last July's goals. It's interesting.

Now, it isn't always easy to put your fingers on a pc's case. So in spite of the fact that they walk in and give it to you, apparently, in spite of the fact that they are advertising, in spite of the fact that this is what they're always worried about, by and large, there's usually something else that they're far more worried about. These things are quite red herring. I mean, there's multitudes of red herring go skittering across that trail.

The pc just is a little bit ashamed to talk about this other one – this other one, about the – the ghost.

"What about the ghost?"

"Well, he comes at 1:15 ... and demands lunch." [laughter]

"Oh, where does this ghost come?"

"Well, he comes around."

And the perceptive auditor says, "Well, is he here now?" you see, if he's quick. You know, the auditor's very quick. Notices the pc is looking at the corner of the room while he is talking about the ghost. You see, he's on the ball, in other words. And he asks him, "Where is this ghost?" or "Is this ghost here now?"

² Editor's note: this refers to an old version of auditor report form where the goals the pc set for the session and for life and livingness as part of the rudiments were filled in in the upper right-hand corner of the form.

And of course, the pc says, "Well, yes, of course. It's only 2:10, and he never leaves till 2:23."

Men go walking around down the streets with green alligators snapping at their heels. People walk up and down half a night worrying because they are going mad. They know that. There are all kinds of oddball things occur of one character or another. People worry about these things and they never bother to tell you. They don't let you in on this.

But if you're very perceptive and listen to what the pc says – you know, record it in English – you generally will find it. I'm not now being sarcastic and giving you the impression that it's dead easy. Actually, an auditor very often has to be terribly clever. And when an auditor's very, very clever and listens very keenly and questions just exactly right, sometimes he finds out the damndest things from the pc, and the pc sometimes didn't even know that was what was wrong with him, you know?

But he says, "Well, that's very true. Yes, very true. I have this horrible feeling that I am dying every time I hear the wind blow. I never realized it before, but I all the time feel like I'm – Yes."

But it didn't blow, so you know, then, that the identity cycle and so forth, there's something wrong with it. And you can go ahead and run a 3D Criss Cross on this, and it would clean up.

But don't go auditing those things which blow on discussion. See, don't audit something that blew on two-way comm. Don't take up yesterday's cognitions, in other words. Don't beat to death the item the pc has just blown utterly about you the auditor. Don't always take up what the pc just got rid of or he gets the idea that his aberrations are being continued by the auditor. Do you know that's the illusion he gets? And commonest hidden fault in auditing is probably just that one.

The pc says, "Well, you'd have to be a giraffe before I'd respect you as an auditor."

And the auditor – this is so new and strange, it is so intriguing and interesting, you see, that quite understandably he very often chases this one. And he chases this giraffe around for a while. Well, hell, the giraffe was out of the room and clear over in the next county until he started chasing it again. He chased it right back into the room again.

And he said, "When did you first start thinking of me as a giraffe," you see?

He didn't ever, you see. It's a completely balled up question because if he'd thought of the auditor as a giraffe, then the auditor could have audited, you see? But it's because the auditor wasn't a giraffe, don't you see, and the pc has to explain all this, and it gets all tangled up again, and you get misduplication and so on.

Well, I let pcs cognite and get rid of it. It's always the safer line. I repeat the question in its native form – the first form that it was in – not the question as it was altered to by the pc.

In other words, he said, "Well, in order to audit me, you'd have to be a giraffe."

And I say, "Good. Is it all right if I audit you?"

No reaction, fine, see? But not, "When did you first get the idea that I was a giraffe? Has a giraffe ever audited you?" [laughter] "Hm, this is very peculiar." [laughs]

Of course, you will do it. To the end of your career, you occasionally will do it. You just couldn't possibly keep away from doing it because it's often so intriguing, and actually it's some of your pay as the auditor to find out what the hell's going on here, you know? Perfectly allowable to ask. What I'm talking about is a habit. When you make a habit out of this, oh, my God! That's a dog's breakfast. That isn't a session.

Pc is never permitted to blow anything without it being questioned by the auditor. That's a Q and A straight across the boards. Another additional definition of Q and A is: "A prevention of a pc from blowing an aberration by insisting there is more to it."

Well anyway, look at this as a use and you'll find that if you can locate some of the central pins about which the pc is worried that you can run this by oppterm of 3D Criss Cross, and you can produce some interesting case changes. Now, how far this goes, I am not willing to hazard at this particular moment, because the data I'm giving you is basically experimental data. But it is in use. The data is in use at the present moment.

There's nothing dangerous about this data. In fact, it is much the safest auditing you ever did on anybody.

How far it goes, what ramifications this includes and so forth, I wouldn't at the present moment adventure to say.

I will say this. It's proven out far enough at the present time, that an auditor could just practically go and make a career out of it. Yeah, I mean, make a career out of it, you know, just out of some chronic somatic or something like that. He'd pick out one chronic somatic, you know? Just one like psychiatrosis or something like that, and just go ahead and start and mop it up. You could do all kinds of interesting things from an auditor's point of view this way.

But now let me give you a word of warning before I close this lecture: Don't audit pcs with the rudiments out. And don't audit pcs with present time problems of long duration which you're doing nothing about, because, of course, the rudiments are out.

You've heard this since last September, didn't you. Yeah. Then we sort of dropped it because there was no immediate remedy for it without taking up a whole week or something like this. Now, if you can do 3D Criss Cross rapidly and you can do it very slippily, you can probably knock in the head a present time problem of long duration just in the progress of doing 3D Criss Cross simply by moving over onto it and creating a line for it. Just leave it hanging there. Go ahead, oppterm it. You'll be walking into the bank on that line, too. You see what I mean?

Doing 3D Criss Cross, everything was going along splendidly and beautifully, and the pc all of a sudden put the brakes on like mad and had a present time problem with the pc's landlady, with all landladies, with the "Landladies' Association of Great Britain," you see. And the whole thing is liable to move up at any moment to a question in the House. And the – a discussion on this finds out that the pc has had this problem for months. Has always had this

problem. And there's something about landladies that just seem to have problems connected to them, and so forth. Well, you've isolated a piece of the Goals Problem Mass.

But the only piece you've isolated is the characteristic of one valence. You haven't located a valence "landladies," you see? You've located a characteristic, which is not liking landladies or having trouble with landladies, and that's just one characteristic of a valence, you see?

Well, it's like a little goal, a little tag here. And you move this little tag over and just add it as line H, you see, or line M or O, or we don't care where you've gotten to.

In other words, don't beat yourself to pieces trying to do a long and involved present time problem of long duration, you see, and work yourself to death on that unprofitably when you've got a very heavy process that'll handle it, and just add it into the work you're doing. That'd be a very slippery thing to do, wouldn't it? And just add it in and get yourself a new line. Well, good, you can always use a new line. You're going to start losing lines sooner or later as you go down the line and wish to heavens you could find some new lines.

My heaviest worry right now is how to keep lines going and how to get lines, and I'm working on a flows system of finding lines which would interest you very much. And I have a brand-new pattern of flows and a new description of flows and a new formula of flows, all of which are very intriguing

These give us bountiful methods, bountiful lists. I mean, they're hotter lists than like and dislike lists than you ever heard of. I mean, "Who or what would prevent an inflow?" you know, that kind of... The pc's bank goes off *brrrrrpt!*

Anyway, just all – make all grist to the mill. So the pc has a problem – present time problem of long duration, and you suddenly isolated this as a present time problem of long duration. You skipped back, yes, the pc has had this problem quite often. All right, we'll just give it the 3D Criss Cross treatment and add it as a new line. Only, the only thing that happens is, is you get the condition, you get the opposition to the condition, and then you get the opposition to number 2.

In other words, you'll wind up two items deep on that line before it's of any great value to the pc, and of course, the present time problem'll vanish in smoke, and you've got 3D Criss Cross going at a fast rate.

Now, it's valuable to know this, because it's very probable that doing 3D Criss Cross will throw up the characteristics of not-quite-revealed valences at this stage. And the not-quite-revealed valence may get himself a nice present time problem, you know? The person had never before had problems with fire hydrants. And all of a sudden he's having great many problems with fire hydrants. And it's getting to be very intriguing And he says, "Of course, it must be this new valence that you just found on me – fireman. And that explains it all, fireman."

Fire hydrant, fireman. And it's all explained, and he goes on having trouble with fire hydrants. Well, it couldn't possibly be explained, don't you see, or he wouldn't be going on having trouble with fire hydrants, if firemen... And you finally press it down a little bit further, and you find out it's the firehouse dog. So ... [laughter, laughs]

So anyway, there's many uses to which this can be put amongst keeping – amongst them, of course, keeping rudiments in on present time problems of long duration.

Now, you know what a present time problem of long duration is, don't you?

Audience: Hm-mm.

And a present time problem of short duration is just a breath of air, but it's very recent and very new. A present time problem of long duration? Well, that's been around for quite a while, and there are very precise definitions for this thing. The – there are quite a lot of lectures on this particular subject, and so on. It's really been pawed around and mauled around, and where you get them and how you get them and all that sort of thing.

Now, I'm giving you a way to handle them that's quick as a bunny, and therefore, all of that data becomes more valuable than it was. Okay?

Audience: Hm-mm.

All right. Well, I'm not intending to drive people out of the business of healing. I'm not intending to drive them out of the business of healing.

They can go on and heal all they want to, but that now includes us. I'm not going to drive us out of the business of healing either. Because there's no danger whatsoever, now, in addressing somebody's arthrosis lumbosis of the psychiatrosis, and you could probably cure it up like a scat without knowing any more about it than his medical doctor and psychiatrist did.

In fact, knowing far less because they pretended to know a great deal that they didn't know.

Okay?

Audience: Hm-mm.

All right. Well, I hope it's some use to you.

Thank you.

FLOWS

A lecture given on 1 February 1962

Thank you. And here we are at the what?

Audience: February 1st.

Oh, we've got the Feb. We finally moved into the Feb. The "Febs" are after us now. All right, 1 Feb. 6-2, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

And today – today we have a great deal to take up, but I forgot my notes. I wrote a bulletin in a rush today, and it's all in the bulletin, so the bulletin of 1 Feb. has something to do with what I'm going to talk to you about which is flows.

What is a withhold? A withhold is not a flow.

What's this?

A withhold is the unwillingness of the pc to talk to the auditor or tell him something, because a person can withhold about a flow.

So you actually have a withhold, which is what you're working on, as a "don't know." And you're working with the subject of knowingness when you are working of, "What have you done that the world does not know about, that you don't know about, that other people don't know about, and especially me, your auditor, what don't I know about?"

With withholds you're talking about knowingness. But this knowingness is tremendously influenced by the subject of flows. So when you say "withhold" in Scientologese, you actually mean something that the person does not wish the world, others, all dynamics and his auditor to *know* about. Or it has not occurred to him to tell the auditor or he is *incapable* or finds it *impossible* or is utterly *prohibited* from advising anybody else about it. Now, that is a withhold.

And oddly enough, a pc can withhold about flows. So get these two different things sort of disentangled, because all flows can be a withhold. And if you get flows gorgeously mixed up with withholds, you're sunk.

A withhold is knowingness. Now, I'm straining a point here. I'm straining a point to elicit your understanding of what you are doing as an auditor.

A person who is restraining something from being known is withholding, but basically it is *knowledge* that he is *withholding*. He's withholding knowledge, information and data. And you can put a withhold, as we're using it in Scientologese, under the heading, you see, of data and knowingness. That is a withhold. So restrained data and knowingness is a withhold, right?

Now, oddly enough, any one of the flows can assist, aid or abet a withhold because knowledge can be buried under the flow. You see what we're up against here? We've got a datum and let us say it is a white pebble. And we can cause various flows over the top of and away from and over and back to and so forth, this white pebble, to a point where it becomes totally obscured. See, we can just fix it up so that every time anybody starts to look at the white pebble, a flow starts. And then the individual has the sensation that he mustn't tell about it or something of the sort.

We therefore have a datum or knowingness which we call withholds and the next step and stage of this is the attitude toward flows. And then we have flows.

Now, all of this can be somewhat carelessly condensed under the heading and subject of flows. But I don't want you to remain totally in ignorance of the fact that the thing is compartmented.

We've got attitudes toward flows. Now, actually there are only two flows. Given any one point or any two points, that is, location and space, you only have two flows possible for any one of those points. And one is outflow and the other is inflow. Elementary, my dear Watson. That's all that's going to happen. You can only have outflows and inflows where flows are concerned.

Now, the thing that causes flows is the motionlessness or the fixedness of the point. So flows are regulated as flowing out and flowing into, from fixed points. Now, the point may or may not have a mass. All power, speaking now of electrical power, is derived from holding two positions in space. That is electrical power. It is the base of the motor. I call to mind 8-80. And it is the base of the motor. It isn't the armature nor the electrician nor his plans. Nor is it yet the diesel oil that is poured into the engine that does something or other. If you didn't have this first fundamental, you could have nothing else. And the first fundamental of power, electrical energy and power, is of course two fixed points in space. And whatever gives power has to have a base that keeps these two points separate. And to the degree that these two points can be kept separate, you can generate power, electrical power.

Now, if you had two little copper wires that were just stood up in space, one in one location and one in another location. And they're just stood up, you know. They're not braced at all. And they're stood up there with sticky plaster or something of the sort. And you took an armature and you developed a thousand horsepower of rotation between these two things, you see, you wouldn't be able to do it. They simply – the two wires would simply collapse into the armature and that would be it. Does that follow? You see?

You turn an armature there and you'll get these two wires falling in on each other. No, it requires a couple of pretty doggone big poles between the thing that is cutting the space between them, you see. And they've got to be very strongly fixed and the strength with which they're fixed has everything to do with the amount of horsepower or electrical current or kilowatts or anything else that can be generated between these two points. Do you see that?

Now, this gives you an idea of how *fixed* some of the points must be in a pc's bank to actually generate flows between them.

Now, as a person gets (quote) weaker (unquote) he is no longer able to hold two points in space. And he gets masses. Masses are collapsed locations. Therefore, asking somebody to locate things in space will generate flows.

Now, if you run Havingness long enough on just this simple command, "Point out something," you're – you'll start running into flows.

Now, you didn't realize that when you are running a pc, you actually should probably have an electrician's or an electrical engineer's license. You probably didn't realize that. But we're going to require this from all medical doctors who wish to practice on the mind. They have to have an electrical engineer's license because they frankly are handling a power plant.

Now, when the pc was no longer able to keep Keokuk separate from Sioux Falls in his mind, he has an identification between Sioux Falls and Keokuk. All right. Now, we're talking totally about the mechanics of space, don't you see.

When he couldn't keep his mother away from his father, he got an identification between his mother and his father. Do you see this? So identification is actually identifications of location in space. Foremost, of course, way above all this level of mechanics, you have knowingness and postulates and all the rest of that, but I – we won't stress that point particularly. You recognize that a thetan's mechanics derive from his postulates. And even this universe and its space derive from his postulates and considerations. But we're not going to bother with that right now. We're talking about this electric eel that you're handling.

And Keokuk and Sioux Falls are the same town. And then they become no town at all. They disappear as a location in space because he can do nothing to them or about them. His causation over Keokuk is zero. If he ever went inside the city limits of Keokuk, the police, he knows, would immediately scoop him up and throw him in the hoosegow and chew him up and hand him over probably to the hamburger mill to be fed to the wolves or something. He's sure of this and he can't do anything. He knows he cannot do anything to Sioux Falls. Sioux Falls can do all kinds of things to him, but he can't do anything to Sioux Falls, don't you see?

So he's total effect of Keokuk. He's total effect of Sioux Falls. He couldn't place anything in Keokuk and he can't place anything in Sioux Falls and you'll find these two towns are identified in him. And you say, "Where did you live early in your life?"

And he says, "Well," he said, "I've lived in um – uh – Keokuk – uh, Sioux F – Sioux – uh – Keok – Keok – um – Sioux Keokuk. No, Sioux Falls. No, Keokuk, yeah. No, I was in Keokuk when I was eight or nine and then uh – I was in Sioux Falls when I was five or six. No, no, no, no. I was in Sioux Falls when I was eight or nine and in Keokuk... No, I was in Boston that whole time." [laughter]

Have you ever watched a pc trying to place something? Well, just exactly that. Consider it just exactly that. He's trying to place something on the time track. Well, he's also trying to place its location in space. And when he can't do this, he gets a confusion between the two and therefore you get this principle of identification. The basic principle of identification, that's what you're dealing with here.

You realize that all aberrations and identifications A=A=A=A. All right. Book One. You realize also that the pc's ability to differentiate amongst two objects regulates to a large

degree his state of sanity. You realize also that when he can no longer differentiate, but tries to, he does it compulsively and you get a thing called disassociate. So that he can locate nothing, he simply disperses off of everything he tries to locate. See? So two things or three things or six million things all become one thing. And then they become one thing to such a degree that they cease to exist. In other words, he can't even spot the one thing and you have forgettingness or lack of memory. These are the mechanics of the memory.

All right. He said, "Well, I was in Keokuk between – I was five and six except at Sioux Falls uh – except that was eight or nine. No, that was another lifetime."

When you get this kind of thing going around and around, it sinks just one step lower. For lack of identification, he can't place it at all and you have – he can't identify. He can't even identify himself with Sioux Falls, Keokuk or the mass now that Sioux Falls and Keokuk have become in the bank. And that submerges out of view and you no longer have any ability of any kind to remember Sioux Falls, Keokuk or anything else. And that is the condition most past lives are in. The fellow has lost all of his power over that life and the cities and locations of that life and so he forgets that life. And that is all there is to it.

Now, of course, you understand that everything I'm telling you has nothing to do with postulates, considerations, attitudes. It's just simply the mechanics of how a thetan goes nuts. These are the – these are the electrical phenomena connected with going nuts.

Factually, you see, he forgets everything to get even. I don't know if you realize that. He ceases to be able to place things in order to make another effect. The fact of the matter is that a thetan never gets into a situation where he is not making an effect. He's always trying. Axiom 10 is always in with full throttle. You should know that about a thetan because it'll save you a lot of worry from time to time. You just remember that remark. It's a more important remark than you believe – that a thetan *never* gives up, *never*.

Forgetting is just a way of getting even. That's all. If you don't believe that sometime, ask somebody, "Who would be influenced by your forgetting about ... ?" whatever his chronic somatic is and you're liable to get an evaporation of the chronic somatic. You know, just trying to hold the idea of getting even by forgetting is liable to cause a vanishment of a chronic somatic or a change of his case.

This thing is susceptible to lots of proof. There are lots of demonstrations on this. But of course, we're talking now up in the zone and level of postulates, considerations, intentions and all that sort of thing and I'm lecturing to you on electrical phenomena. Don't lose sight of the other, but know that electrical phenomena can be treated as a separate field all by itself.

And you can do rather marvelous things with just electrical phenomena. "Point out something." He locates the cupboard and the fireplace and the floor and the ceiling. *He* is locating them, see? The fact that he is locating them tends to generate power and all of sudden his bank sort of goes *whuzwhuz*, and he gets a funny feeling back of his eyes, and his chest sort of feels odd, and then he feels kind of tingly all over. And, you know, as he's running "Point out something" – if that's his Havingness Process and that thing is working – why, he'll get all these electrical phenomena and those are *flows*.

Now, at the border between *flows* and intention, we have intention about flows. Now, that sounds awfully *odd*, but intention about flows. You see, you really only have outflow and inflow until you mix it up with trying to do something with the flows.

Now, completely aside from the electrical phenomena and the blown fuses and so forth and the collapsed motor bases and so on in the pc's bank – completely aside from this – we move a little bit higher – you see, we only have outflow and inflow as possible flows – we have his attitude toward those flows. And it's right there at that very tiny little borderline that you can produce some interesting fireworks on a case, because you're at the band between electrical phenomena and knowingness. And that band is his attitude toward flows.

Of course, some people's attitude toward flows is there ain't any. We'll neglect that attitude at the moment. [laughs] And we'll see here that there's only outflow and inflow and the speed of the flow and the magnitude of the flow. I mean, that's the only flow that a points could have. There aren't any other flows. But now, a thetan, he gets to thinking about it and he decides that he will *regulate* these flows and all these flows have regulations. So his knowingness is applied to the flow.

In other words, his intention is applied to the flows. And his intention about flows gives us at once, factually, several intentions of which only a few are important to us in solving cases. But the first band of intention about flows ... Now, you see, we've got just the motor and the thingamabobs and the whatnots, but now we have a living being who has intentions about these things. They outflow and they inflow. He's got intentions about them. All right. And we apply the CDEI Scale somewhat expanded and a little bit explained. Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit – the old CDEI Scale moves in here.

Now, to get a thetan's intentions delineated with regard to outflow and inflow, we apply the lower version of the CDEI Scale. We don't say, "desire." We say, "permissible." Because that's an okay flow. A "so what" flow. That's an "all right" flow, you see. For lack of a better word, we'll call it "permissible." It also can be called "allowable." So that's the okay flow. And that's just at the lower edge of "desire," you see? That isn't really desired; it's really not desired. You say, "I'm hungry, so I will eat." You really don't want to eat, you really don't not want to eat, you see. You're just going to eat. In other words, that's an okay flow.

Well, that covers a wide band because it also covers a desirable flow and it also covers to some degree being curious about flows and that sort of thing, but it's an okay flow.

And just below this, we have enforced flows. And now we have two aspects of inhibit. We must point it out to the thetan that the flow can be prohibited and inhibited. From the point it is inhibited and from outside the point it is prohibited. You follow this? Outside this point it is inhibited, you see. You might say, "an other-determined inhibit," we will call that a "prohibit."

So we have these four things. We have "permissible," and we have "enforced," and we have "prohibited," and we have "inhibited." Now, oddly enough, these things harmonic, just to confuse you further. So we get permissible, enforced, inhibited, inhibited, enforced, permissible, as we go down scale. Now, it's quite important to know that there's an inversion there because as your pc runs it, this kind of phenomena takes place:

You say, "All right. Tell me a permissible flow."

And he says, "Eating."

That's interesting, isn't it? Eating has appeared there as an answer. Now, you've gone on asking for some more permissible flows, but after a while, you're asking him for enforced flows.

And he says, "Having to eat."

And then after a while, you're asking him for inhibited flows.

And he says, "Dieting."

See, he's got eating in here again. What's essentially happening? His considerations of eating are moving up scale. And so they're appearing on these harmonics, you see. And then you say, "All right. Now, tell me an inhibited flow."

And he will say, "Eating. Others won't let you eat," or something like this, you see? That's actually the lower one. Dieting is the other one.

And then he says – you're asking him later for an enforced flow and he says, "Eating" You ask him to clarify this. "Making them eat." See? "Making *them* eat. People have *got* to eat. It's good for you!"

And then you ask him – you are asking him a little while further in a flow process and you ask him for a permissible flow again and he will say, "Eating."

Well, you're actually not back where you started from. It is now, for the first time in his life, all right to eat. When you first asked him, it was down at the permissible, "Well, it's all right. Everybody does it. The poor little animals." You know, "The poor vegetables." And it moved, you see, from the lower scale permissible up through the – that is, the inverted permissible, to the inverted enforce, through the inverted inhibit – uh – prohibit, through the inverted inhibit, through the proper inhibit, through the prohibit, through the enforce, to the permissible. And therefore, the subject of eating, on the subject of flows, would graduate up all those bands and that's eight.

So there're actually eight attitudes toward flows, if you take the whole band – eight attitudes. And those, of course, I have just enumerated. Those are permissible, enforced, prohibited, inhibited, inhibited and prohibited, enforced and permissible. In other words, we take the thing turned over on one harmonic, in other words, and we've got eight attitudes.

But in auditing commands, you would only need four, you see, because it doesn't matter. The pc isn't interpreting whether you're asking him for the harmonic of it or the actual one, so you get away with four. So those four consist of permissible, enforced, prohibited, inhibited. And of course, they take care of both harmonics. Just don't lose sight of the fact that there's an inversion there, just because you're shorthanding it.

All right. Now, there's only two flows. There's outflow and there's inflow, until you add attitude to them.

All right. Now, we can discard the harmonic because it merely repeats itself. We have to know that it's there, but it merely repeats itself, so as far as fact in processing is concerned

– the factual use, the reality of the use – you're simply using these words in connection with each flow. And you get permissible outflow, enforced outflow, prohibited outflow, inhibited outflow, see. And that's – you've got four of them there, which will cover all of eight of the inversion. And then you have, of course, permissible inflow, enforced inflow, prohibited inflow and inhibited inflow. And that gives you the eight basic flows for purposes of processing. Understand that they are *sixteen*. There are actually sixteen flows there. But for purposes of assessment, Sec Checking, for purposes of keeping the rudiments in, for purposes of running a Flows Process, you only need eight because the harmonic is a duplicate of the two.

You see where this is landing now? Well, you've got eight things. You actually have four, phraseologically, attitudes toward an inflow and four attitudes toward an outflow, see? Four attitudes toward an inflow, four attitudes toward an outflow and it gives you an eight command process if you're running a flows process with all necessary flows.

Now, this is sixteen, actually, you're running sixteen flows with eight commands. Recognize that. But if you were to put "others versus others," and not only the thetan here but the other point over there and then you were to put over an extensional point as in a bracket, for an "other to another," you of course have got the "another to the other," also. And you got sixteen more flows sitting out there, which we could express, however, in eight commands. Do you see that?

This gives us thirty-two. Now, we've got "another versus others," and "others versus another." We've now got sixty-four. We haven't got sixty-four, but we could add the other versus self, which makes a round of roodles on the thing and we would get up to the sixty-four.

All right. Let's take a look at this and recognize that we don't have to run it by brackets. Thank heavens. I'm clever enough to figure out a way where we didn't have to do this, because I can just see you now trying to keep in touch with sixty-four auditing commands. And we get sixty-four auditing commands merely by this tricky system of shorthanding, you see. So that we do not – if we do not specify "self" or "another," we can run all available flows with eight commands. Providing we do not specify self or others or which point we are talking about, the automaticities of the pc will shift over to that point or that dynamic or anything else that the flows apply to, you see. Just leave that on automatic and you only have eight commands for a flow process.

All right. Well, what would this flow process be? Well, I – it's almost gilding the lily here to describe what the flow process would be. And there's no real sense in giving you the *exact* flow process because you should be able to work it out from just that basis. And if you can't work out a flow process from your data, why, you're going to get yourself in a spot someday as an auditor that you're sitting there with your mouth open when you should be talking, because it is a little bit different all of a sudden. And you're not auditing from data, you're auditing from a ritual.

And I rather frown on auditing from a ritual without knowing why you have tied the cat to the bed, do you see? "We always, to start a session, tie the cat to the bed." I can see auditors two hundred years from now, you know, and they always audit the pc's chair for a half an hour before the pc is permitted to sit down in it.

And this all came from a developed fact. It is true that you should set up your E-Meter and adjust the pc's chair before starting a session. [laughter] It's perfectly valid and you should do that because it places him in space and makes you cause over him.

But you could see that somebody on a ritualistic basis would figure this out that the pc's chair was pretty important in the session. Well, they wouldn't even be auditing the reactive mind, don't you see? They could move all sorts of directions, you see, by just losing bits and pieces. So I'd like to see the theory stay in. I like to see an auditor audit from fundamentals rather than ritual.

Of course, you – nobody really had to tell you to adjust the pc's chair. If you knew your fundamentals about flows and positions in space, you know darned well if your auditing commands are going to stick with the pc, you would adjust his chair. Pc shifts his chair over two feet or something like that at the beginning of session and you leave it there. Oh, *ha-ha-ha-ha-haha*. Whose flows are going to dominate this session? The pc placed himself in the session, didn't he?

Well, that's the same as asking the pc to say ... All right, you say to the pc, "All right now say, 'Start of session,' so that you get the session started for yourself."

A session has a lot to do with flows and has a lot to do with knowledge, so you should know about your eight flows – four to inflow and four to outflow – and it's simply the simple formula. It is nothing but permissible, enforce, prohibit and inhibit.

Now, so that you get to know these things very well, I'm going to ask you sometime after the lecture to draw these flows. Take one point and draw all eight flows from that one point, so that you really got this in your mind's eye so that you just aren't understanding some kind of a ritual, so that you know what's going on here.

Will you do that?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Now, what's the use of all this? Why did it become necessary that all of a sudden after *all* these years I all of a sudden start researching the pc as an electric motor? Why? Because you're having a hell of a time keeping rudiments in during listing and differentiation and assessment.

Rudiments go out. Well, why do they go out? Well, rudiments get kicked out by triggering automaticities of flows. And that's how rudiments go in and out. The pc is so much the subject or the effect of electrical energy and bank that he feels the flow and obeys it. In other words, boy, is he inverted, see? He feels the flow and he minds it. "Oh, oh, that's – I shouldn't do that," you see? But of course, underneath this flow is a consideration about this sort of thing. And that consideration is resident in the 'ead of – visible or not visible – some identity in the bank that will be someday discovered by 3D Criss Cross.

All considerations about flows that are present at Class II auditing are, in effect, the considerations of identities which are contained in the bank and noplacelse. Recognize please, in Class II that you can do wonderful things with a case. You can get the case started. You can get the case bouncing along. Everything is fine. You can accomplish considerable

gains. But recognize at the same time that you are processing the considerations of beingnesses, which are whole beingnesses resident in the bank or in the pc's 'ead. Have you recognized that about Class II?

It's very hard to shift, by the way, the considerations of a beingness. Very, very difficult. But if you can produce results with Class II auditing, you can be trusted with Class III. That's for sure. And furthermore, pcs wandering in from here or there who are all of a sudden confronted with having to dabble with their mind – which they have not been in very good communication with for the last few trillennia, you know – being asked to communicate it, will find that they are far easier to communicate it probably along the lines of Class II, like a Problems Intensive. Just a standard Problems Intensive or something like this – they'd think that was very nice. And they'd get some gains out of it.

But recognize what you're processing You're actually not processing the pc. You're processing a package of beingnesses which have long since overwhumped the pc and you're changing the considerations of these beingnesses, which is difficult. That's what Class II auditing does. I'd be dishonest if I didn't explain to you exactly where Class II auditing begins and ends.

Now, these beingnesses which are resident in the bank have considerations with regard to flows. And when flows flow, the beingnesses in the bank all of a sudden get ideas because they become activated electronically. So a little trickle of electrical energy goes *whiz-biz*, and the pc says, "*Ooooooooooh*. Now I'm supposed to inhibit outflow," and sits there in a comm lag, which is what a comm lag is.

And something else goes trigger-whiz-click in some other department as you're processing him and he says, "*Ooooooooooo*. Now I know what I'm supposed to do. Now I know what I am supposed to do. I'm supposed to keep the auditor from talking to me. In other words, I'm supposed to inhibit inflow."

Now, he could prohibit inflow by talking back at the auditor or inhibit inflow by getting the auditor to not talk. And it'll be one or the other of these and he's liable to resort to this type of trickery of some kind or another. In other words, the now-I'm-supposed-to occurs because of the running of the flow. And these beingnesses which are packed into the bank one way or the other activate and obey these flow patterns. Quite interesting. Very interesting piece of electrical buffoonery. Very intricate.

It's all done on flows. So you can sit there under Class II and deal with pure knowingness which is pulling withholds. You're getting withholds into view, withholds into view. And of course, as you do this, you are running hard aground every now and then on a flow and the flow tells him to withhold. Oh, he's busy withholding. He's got a flow. It's going this way, see. Now, he knows what to do. He actually doesn't have a withhold at all, see? You see them in session?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

Then you plug and plug. You say, "We know this guy's withholding something," and it turns out to be the fact that he twisted a cat's tail sometime or other. He actually has to dig one up to account for the fact that he's withholding. He's doing a flow withhold as different from a

data withhold. But you can straighten this out by pulling a withhold. There's always a bit of a withhold kicking around someplace to ease this thing up.

But differentiate between these two actions: the datum which is wrapped up in the reactive bank, one little tiny tag of which may or may not be known to the pc and which you're trying to get at as a withhold. That when released, releases knowledge into view and makes the pc freer. And that is pinned down by flows. You're looking for the white pebble and you're getting all this, that and the other thing.

Now, actually, a datum can substitute for a thetan. It's done all the time. They do it *all through* modern education. The system is called the old school tie system. A datum is being substituted for a thetan.

I'll bet you the number of chaps – now I may malign them – that are hanging around Cape Canaveral with the proper old school tie, that are actually contributing to the space program at the present time, can be counted upon the fingers of no hands. The only birds I ever ran into that were doing anything in that field very progressively had old school ties, but they didn't fit the job they were doing. They were professors with – of English and other things.

In fact, some of the more modern electronic machinery has been designed by professors of literature and so forth. And the boys with the old school tie – you see, if they're a perfect datum, not a thetan but a perfect datum, see; see, they're a Doctor of Mud or something – then they don't have to know anything, do they? Because this thing, this datum knows everything and then there doesn't have to be any thetan there.

And one of the most serious mistakes that a society can make is confusing ability with a datum because you can't confuse a thetan, you see, with a datum. A thetan is alive and a datum isn't.

Now, if you look along the lines of the datum, you'll find out that the thetan in his bank has parked data which has become *bzzzzzz* fixed, rooted, *nrrrrrrr*. These are the now-I'm-supposed-to's, you see.

Now, the most basic datum that he can park, oddly enough and what he was withholding the hardest and which forms most of the flows on the case – the bulk of the flows on the case are wrapped up and are released by 3D Criss Cross, because the data is John Jones. There's John Jones. He's John Jones and he knows where John Jones is. John Jones was buried in a graveyard someplace and now he's forgotten. And he's now forgotten John Jones. But John Jones was a datum and John Jones was what was holding locations in space, see? No thetan, him, was holding this location in space, but a thetan which was a datum. We had a datum called John Jones. That's his identity and it held a position in space, he thinks. I mean, people get horrified at me because I actually have been known to almost forget my own name, because I couldn't care less about this particular phenomenon.

You possibly heard a lecture or two by me in which I have not approved of the old-school-tie system, to say it very mildly. And that's because I don't believe that you are you because your name is Pete. You see, I don't believe that. Nobody could convince me of that at all. I believe you are you because you're you, see. And I think you've been you for a *long* time

and you're going to be you for a lot longer. And you're sure going to be you a lot longer and have been you a lot longer than you have been Pete.

So, you see, I find it better communication to talk with you as you than you as Pete. Of course, my own identity's lines are fouled up by habit pattern, undoubtedly, as a writer. And most writers are trying to make a name famous or something like that and I didn't ever care what name I ever wrote under. It just didn't matter beans to me. As a matter of fact this has lost practically everything I've ever written. There are very few things extant, because I even forget what names they're written under.

But there are certain satisfactions in this. I wrote one of the stories in the *Arabian Nights*, for instance, many thousands of years ago and it's still in the collection very nice. It's the story of a lost prince. It's definitely me. It isn't by Achmed Mud or something. It's – I write it.

But you know, Bob saying last night, he says, "Well, in – now, in space opera, that's good, see. Because you – of course, all doll bodies are all alike, but you know the guy. You know the guy, you see?" And that's true. See, they know him. And there's a lot of argument about whether or not this can or cannot be done. And it's not real to people in some ways, but truthfully speaking, you get spoiled here on this planet because they build all the bodies differently and you get dependency on appearance. And you don't have to know the thetan. All you have to do, you see, is know the appearance of somebody and you get spoiled that way and you can get hooked on this way.

Now, it is true, I'm sure, that thetans on the track had made mistakes about the identity of people. I know people have walked up to me occasionally in various climes, spaces and planets and have accused me of being somebody else, but never to the degree that they have here on Earth. [laughter] Yeah, it's marvelous.

Anyway, you, a thetan, you see, are still carrying on very nicely and you are not a datum. You are a living thing and you are a creator and – of life and a being which is alive. And when you were John Jones, John Jones was a datum, you see. And there's that datum and it stays as a park place in the bank. And it forms the terminal from which the flow can charge and discharge, you see.

Well now, as John Jones, a datum, we also had enemies. Bill Smith, you see. And John Jones had the enemy, Bill Smith and Bill Smith, of course, has been approximated in the bank someplace by John Jones as an earlier time, you see. And now Bill Smith becomes a lock on the earlier identification John Jones has made with an identity and you get an electrical discharge between Bill Smith and John Jones because they're holding positions in space in the bank.

So you ask a pc, "What do you think of cake?" And all of a sudden he goes *zzzzzzzz*. "What was that? What was the matter?" you could ask with pretended innocence.

And he'd say, "Well, I felt dizzy," or "There was a little whir feeling in my head," or "I had a somatic in my back," or lots of other things. But it's the interaction of flows between these past *beingnesses*. And that is what causes all this nonsense and bric-a-brac that goes on in the mind.

Now, if you get – a past beingness – it itself is a mass because it has blocked flows so often. It has gained mass and its mass is dependent upon its different positions in space as it is moved around and the number of positions it has held in space. And it generates mass. So you actually run into one of these things and they look like a – oh, I don't know – a Guy Fawkes dummy or something of the sort, done totally in black or a pyramid or something like that. And you run into these beingnesses and you say, "What's this?" you see? It looks like a burned-out tar barrel that's painted black. But it sometimes has a shape. Sometimes it has a head and shoulders and feet. Sometimes has only feet and a head. It can startle lots of pcs because there it is and it doesn't have anything in it.

He tries to find something in one of these things, you see and of course there's nothing in it. He was in it. He's gone now. And its circuits and connections, however, are still susceptible to flows, so its thinkingness can still go forward. And it can still think and it can disintegrate and it can – has a time track. When one or two of them started to come apart here rather remarkably and it's very startling because it looks like you've got a machine going off which is making pictures or you've got a machine going off which is doing something. And that isn't all. Well, you're just looking at the disintegration of one of these old beingnesses that's suddenly no longer so fixed.

Well, that's why your pc thinks he's on Arcturus when he's here on Earth; that's why your school child is out of present time, and so on, are all contained in these various things. And all the handles of these are, of course, proceeding from points in space.

But I'll let you in on something about points in space: You can't process them. You can spot them and so forth. But they are stills. We had to make up our minds about this a few months ago – if we were ever going to process stills. And I've never seen anything but catastrophe attend the processing of stills as long as you didn't discharge them.

Now, you see, a body – processing the identity of a body is not really processing a still. This person was after all moving all over the place. But if you were to process dead bodies only, you see, you would find the pc after a while going *zzzz-whizzz-zooooo*.

Now, you could process living beingnesses very easily because, of course, they do have motion. They're only occasionally stopped. You can process those. But to process stills – "Look around here and find something that is motionless. Thank you. Now make it more motionless. Thank you. Now be as still as it is. Thank you."

I think if you ran that for an hour or two or four or five sessions ... I don't think the pc would be there four or five sessions to run it on. But anyhow, if you tried to run it for a while, you would produce, at first, an interesting gain for the pc and then the gain would all of a sudden deteriorate and go, see? It is – the person, at first would say – you know, you'd restimulate being powerful or something of the sort; holding a position in space, something like this, you see, by saying "stills."

Now, keeping something from going away is not quite holding something still. It is not quite the same thing. That actually brings about the generation of power and it'll discharge quite a number of flows.

But, in general, you want to avoid inerts in the bank and process actions. That's in general, in generalized processes. That does not apply to winnowing out beingnesses and that sort of thing, because they're not proper stills. They're fake livingnesses. They're data.

Now, having a datum there in the bank – a withhold – which is fixed in place... Perfectly all right to process it, you see, because it's just a datum. It tends to act as a pole on a motor. A very false one, but it tends to act that way.

So this individual has a withhold – been to prison; has never told anybody. This ceases to become just knowingness, withheld knowingness and eventually will take up a flow action. And having been to prison caused him to feel sort of fixed and will cause an interesting lot of electrical play around in his body somewhere, like his stomach or his throat or his head or something like that. He'll be trying to do something about this.

Now, he isn't going to give up this datum. So that anything you do to him has still not gotten rid of the pole of the motor which has got him messed up. See, he's not made this datum general, it's not been released, he is holding a piece of knowledge here which he must not tell anybody. And because he must not tell it – anybody, it of course becomes a duplicated pole for the anybody he mustn't tell.

You see, there you are, the auditor and you didn't know that in his bank he's got "having been to prison," mocked up exactly like you. Because he's withholding it from you, it duplicates you. So to some degree, we get this odd phenomena of a discharge going.

Guy has got a withhold. He cannot talk to you. Well, he doesn't dare talk to you. But, of course, while he isn't talking to you, he's producing flow phenomena all over the place. [snaps fingers] You release this withhold ... You are not processing a still because it's a datum and a datum is never a location in space, but a thetan believes it can be, you see. It goes [snaps fingers] out and he's got some kind of a circuit disappears at the same time, you see. It's gone. He feels good. It's quite mysterious to him. What happened?

Well, actually, what happened is, is he had this datum – which frankly didn't have a sixteenth of a grasshopper power in itself – restrained from all sorts of people and being restrained from all sorts of people, then, of course, must have been of as great a magnitude as the people it was being restrained from. You understand that?

So he sets up a motor. Just as nice as you please, he sets himself up a very interesting motor. And he's at the receiving end of it. So he's got all kinds of games going with everybody who doesn't know this. See?

In other words, it's the withheld datum which then operates as a pole which then generates an electrical flow which will then make a ridge and do all kinds of other things, you see? And you've got the mechanism there more or less – you've got the mechanism by which his valences have become solid in the bank. And when you recover these valences, they're all ridged and everything else. Of course, they've got withholds like crazy. Every time the thing had a withhold, of course, it had something then mocked up as big as it had a withhold from. And you've got motors set up. And when you start getting into the bank in general, wow, you know, you can really set up some currents and torrents as you already know.

3D Criss Cross makes going over Niagara Falls in a barrel, you see, look like a canoe ride of a Sunday afternoon on a placid lake. You really set up some currents. Well, recognize what the currents are being set up from. They're set up by old withholds and old intentions which are acting as false poles amongst themselves and against themselves.

Now, you see what a problem is, basically, electronically. I'm not really giving you anything that cancels anything I've said about problems. This is just the electronic look at a problem. Why do people fight when they have a disagreement? Well, they have intentions to fight and all that. We neglect that. Let's get in – for the moment. We'll get into the electronic or electrical phenomena. Don't call it electronic. Call it electrical because it's practically the same juice that goes through that light up there. Electronics – that's mostly how you get transistors to capacitate without rectifying them on the infiltrusions. [laughter] And that's pretty hard to understand and – [laughter] but if you stick your finger in a light socket, that's not hard to understand at all. You ever stuck your finger in a light socket?

Audience: Yes.

Have you understood that? [laughter] Well, that's all you have to know to understand Scientology electric – electricities.

Now, here we have John and Mary. And John says that we're going to have fish for supper and Mary says we are not going to have fish for supper. Well, you'd think ordinarily in any universe that a person could have the intention not to have fish for supper and another person could have the intention to have fish for supper totally independent of any kind of an upset. I know you could have an idea that you were going to have fish for supper and I was going to have an idea I'd be damned if anybody is going to serve me fish for supper, without us getting into a fight. But if we've got withholds from each other madly, it only takes this new little datum of fish for supper and no fish for supper to set up two opposite poles, which then discharge on the old withholds. See, they actually – that's why the prior confusion holds the problem, don't you see?

And then all you've got to have is some prior withholds and you get this little tiny thing – one is going to have fish for supper and the other doesn't want fish for supper and so forth – and the next thing you know, man, you look over the police records. How did the argument start? There lies – [laughter] there lies this fellow stone dead. Well, how did the argument start? And it'll start in some stupid way like that. Be all there is to it.

And, well, how does it discharge against each other? Why did they fight for three days and then she sued him for divorce? How come? Well, it took these other hidden poles. And the fight is actually, simply, the electrical sparks flying off of these two hidden poles – speaking electrically.

So he's got a bunch of hidden withholds, which is knowingnesses and she's got a bunch of hidden knowingnesses and these are hidden from one another. So they're already pulled back from one another. So they're all set up, you see, to be fixed positions in space. And then we get this one visible datum, this little tiny visible datum which doesn't amount to anything about have fish for supper or not have fish for supper. "Well, all men are alike. My father was just like that." I mean, we can get all sorts of irrelevant statements being made on the subjects, you see? "You men think you are the lords of creation." "Housewives never do

anything." You know, I mean, you can go on and on this way. [laughter] The power – the electrical discharge and the power and the violence on the whole thing, however, is based on former withholds.

So if you want to solve a problem between John and Mary, you find out what the problem is and it's "He likes fish and I don't like fish." Only the problem by this time won't have been anything that mild. It'll have blown up to something that they have justified having a fight about. In other words, they dream up eventually something that's big enough to have a fight about. And this action's tracked back and you look for the prior confusion and of course you find a little cotton-picking withhold here and one there and it all just blows out and they – there's no problem.

You could do it to both of them and they wouldn't have any problems with each other, and they – because the problem, of course, was never a problem in the first place. It's too picayune to have been a problem. So of course, the problem is only the visible evidence of hidden poles which can discharge against each other unknown to one and all.

It's very funny, you know. There's John and Mary and the fireworks is all going off and exploding all over the park and the grandstand. And somebody just threw a match in the residual magazine of supplies for the rest of the fireworks display. And we look at all this, you know and it really looks fantastic. And then we find out, well, she actually loaned his shoes to her brother once and didn't tell him, you see. And he stopped by a widow woman's house for a glass of wine a few weeks ago and hadn't bothered to tell her. And it's just made up a whole bunch of little poles, see. They're all hidden knowingsnesses. Data substituted for thetans, see. And all these things are all covered up and forgotten. And it takes the air on this datum, you see, "I like fish; she doesn't like fish," see. "I like fish; she doesn't like fish. Therefore, that's a problem." And he'll go around and he'll worry himself sick about this problem. Terrific consequences occur because of these withholds because they make up ...

Now, if you miss a withhold, you of course have activated one. That is the difficulty. If you – if an auditor cannot handle withholds at all ... Let's say you're training somebody and they have just – you've got to have a pc audited and the only auditor you can get to audit them has finished the first day of his Comm Course but nothing else of the HPA or HCA and so on, I advise you *not* to let him audit withholds on the pc. See, I – that's just friendly advice. I mean... You can go ahead and do it sometime. Just see what happens. But stand by with the sticky plaster because the results are actually very, very gory, see. It's horrible because all this auditor will do will be to activate withholds, see. He's asking for withholds and not pulling them and asking for withholds and not pulling them, you see? And asking for withholds and not pulling them.

Now, all he's doing is just charging up these hidden, with – strained, withdrawn poles, you see, of one kind or another. And all of a sudden, there's some dumb, tiny, screwy, little thing that has nothing to do with it, you know. The auditor actually makes a click with the E-Meter and that's enough, man, and the pc just about tears his head off. This is one of the reasons husband-wife auditing teams have so much trouble. Before they've pulled their withholds, of course, they can't really have much randomness between themselves without discharging at each other, see?

So the best way for a husband and wife to audit each other is, of course, have all of their withholds pulled by somebody else and then audit each other. But that isn't successful either.

Actually, the best way to do it is just lay in a good supply of bandage [laughter] and keep at it. That's the main thing It's the failure that busts it all up. It's not doing it all that breaks it up.

Now, here's the system, then, that goes to work. You trigger [snaps fingers] this withhold, you have triggered [snaps fingers] a live pole. You see, you've got this little position in space here, this datum and it's now gone *bzzzzzz*, and the pc doesn't even know what it is, you see?

And then you get – it triggers off another one, *bzzzzzz*, and another one, *bzzzzzz*. And by the time you've got some of these things going, you know, the pc is sitting there and he can just feel it start to throb, you know. And all of a sudden he tells you off.

Well, he just goes into an automaticity. And you're seeing there simply the *flows* start after the polarity has been set up. After the poles have been set up, why, you get the *flow* going. And that's why it is so dangerous to miss a withhold. You see, you'd have probably never been in trouble if you had never activated it in the first place.

But if you're going to pull withholds, you're going to do marvelous things for cases. But if you're going to pull them badly, get lots of sticky plaster because it's – the pc's just going to be blowing up in your face all the time.

Now, this is the electrical aspects of all of this phenomena that you watch, one way or the other.

Now, pcs have habitual flows. There's always a current running from *bzzzzzzt* to *bzzzzzzt*. And one of the eight attitudes is in full force on most cases. At least one of the eight will be stronger than the other ones.

In other words, he has to prohibit – pardon me, his outflows have to be prohibited. There actually is a whole nation like that. The Bantu. If you want to get in trouble with the Bantu... I don't get in trouble with the Bantu. They get along fine with me. But I've noticed this peculiar characteristic, that this particular flow is very strongly in force, that their outflow has to be prohibited and they're very unhappy unless you prohibit their outflow. You could work this out for almost any being.

He gets unhappy if something isn't happening with a certain thing – one of these flows. One of these flows must be treated reverently, in a certain way. He's got one of these points and it will be goofed up somehow or another, but it has to be handled that way and that's how life should be. And his now-I'm-supposed-to with regard to flows is that one fixed attitude. And one of those eight attitudes toward flows is going to be more dominant than the other.

Now, you know what I mean by a prohibited outflow. You have to make it clear to a Bantu that if he does something wrong, that he will be upbraided for it. You don't have to upbraid him, you know. You just have to make it clear that you will. This is what is so interest-

ing. I don't know if people down there in handling them have ever learned this. But you just say, "Well now, don't you worry about it because I will make very sure that you don't go away and stay away two or three days." And they're very happy. And they go ahead and then not stay away two or three days. They're very happy then because you're withholding for them. You see how it is?

You're prohibiting that outflow. And they don't believe they have the power to prohibit the outflow, so they feel nervous. I didn't mean to run the color bar in this, but I did want to say they're – that I've noticed this one characteristic on a racial line. I haven't studied any other lines to amount to anything, but I did study that one.

Now, you'll find a pc gets in a state of an inhibited inflow. He is going to hold off the inflow; he's going to inhibit the inflow. I guess from that standpoint it'd be prohibit the inflow. He's going to say, "Any inflow? No."

Of course, this goes to only certain classes of inflows, but actually can broaden out to a generality where any time he gets an inflow he has to classify it to make sure what it is, you see? And he gets very nery.

You have people who can be stuck on any one of these points and there are eight of them that he can be stuck on. This pc or any other pc can be stuck on any one of these points more than another one.

So therefore you could list these eight flows and assess a pc and wind up with the perfect Sec Check. Assess it in some particular way, you know. Just write down the flows and just call them off to the pc, see which one reads the most and then take a Sec Check. We were saying last night we might even have a series of eight generalized Sec Checks which each one of which matched this particular type of flow. So you could write them up yourself. You look it over and you will find, then, that during a session, when you are listing, if you've already spotted the pc's automatic flow, you can turn the rudiments on at once after, when they go out. You can get the rudiments back in promptly if you know that the pc is prohibiting inflows.

You ask him some question which adds up to "All right. What inflow did you prohibit just then?" You know, the rudiments go out.

And he says, "Oh-ho, well, I ... There's a bird singing outside," and you know, he'd stopped that. And of course, he'd parked the session right at that point. You got the idea? He does this obsessively and automatically. If you know which one of these eight is wrongest with your pc or most dominant, rather, with your pc, you can trigger it and get the rudiments back in with speed. So it has use. It has very practical use, all this stuff.

He starts withholding the knowledge that this flow has occurred. He withholds it from himself and from you. And then the rudiments fly out. He withholds all this knowledge. But I call to your attention, now, a withhold is a withhold of data or information; it's an unwillingness to talk to the auditor. It's not necessarily a flow.

Now, when a pc deteriorates, we get him into flows. He goes into flows very obsessively. Then he can't help but scold you. He can't help but be apathetic. He can't help but – you see. This flow just starts flowing, and he follows suit and he can't do anything about it, you know.

Now, you've got a pc who is prohibiting outflow. He's not inhibiting outflow. He believes outflow should be prohibited – make it that way.

In other words, if he outflows he believes some exterior force should prevent him from outflowing. And the pc will sit there *yow-yow-yow-yow-yow yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yup-yup-yup-yup-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap*. Waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting for the auditor, for God's sakes, to please say, "Shut up."

He goes *yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap*. He's stuck on prohibited outflow, don't you see. He'll talk until stopped. In the middle of all of this, the auditor says, "Good. Thank you."

"Well," he says, "the auditor was on the job that time. That's better."

You mustn't get the idea that one of these is more social than another one, from person to person. Everybody has his idea what sociality is. And although the majority of a certain race might have a definite opinion of that inhibited outflow is the very best social presence, remember, that's not necessarily true of all races or even all people in that race. See, that might be just a social generality.

Well, you take a German knight. He knew what he was supposed to do: enforced outflow. That was it. He's got it taped. His social conduct. The Romans – Roman officers and men used to practically roll in the ramparts listening to these birds, you know.

They come out there shaking their spear, riding a horse and telling about all their great deeds, you see. And they ride up and down with all of their great deeds at full automaticity, you see. They had to enforce this outflow and knock anybody over the head that wouldn't listen to them, and of course the whole tirade concerned itself with knocking people over the head anyhow. [laughs] That was the way it fired.

So you get these different attitudes. They make different social conducts of one kind or another.

Of course, if you want to get a pattern of all social behavior, just apply the Tone Scale to the eight flows. They do fit one to another, you see. You get all sorts of ramifications. There's lots of use can be made out of this particular thing.

But you'll have a pc that knows what the auditor's supposed to do. See? The pc is supposed to enforce an outflow on the auditor. Now, you understand that location A can run all flows on location B or at location A. You understand that, see. So he can apply all of these things to the auditor and he knows what a good auditor is: A good auditor is somebody on whom he has to enforce an outflow. You may have even seen a pc like this. See, had to – enforced an outflow. And he'll do everything under God's green earth to make the auditor talk to him and sap at him and yap at him and bark at him and use heavy control on him and so forth. He knows a proper auditing attitude. He knows what it is. It's enforced outflow. So he enforces the auditor's outflow, don't you see.

Another pc has got the idea the proper auditing attitude, of course, is that the auditor should inhibit his outflow. And he finds the auditor is not properly inhibiting his outflow,

why, he thinks he's a bad auditor. Of course, this is just an automaticity firing off, that's all. Hadn't anything to do with reasonable considerations or how to audit, but he gets that notion.

Or some other pc has got the idea that – the – you must have and the auditor must enforce an inflow on the pc. He's got hypnotism or something mixed up with auditing. He says, "Well, the proper auditing attitude, if you just enforce an inflow on me, you see, you just shout at me and insist that I accept everything you say and so forth, well, then the session will run off beautifully."

Or you have another auditing – another pc and he says, "Well, the proper thing is for the auditor at all times to just have an okay inflow. And that's a proper auditor. It's a permissible inflow." In other words, "Everything I say and do is a permissible inflow. And the auditor must never acknowledge, never give an auditing command, never exercise any control, never stop anything, never do anything and so forth and I just sit here in the auditing session and talk. And that's a proper auditing attitude," you see?

Now, coupled with a proper auditing attitude, of course, have their own attitude as to what is a proper pc's attitude. And these are not necessarily the same one at all.

So you see, you take these flows and stack them up and get a fixed consideration on one point and the same point's consideration of what should be on another point and you get all these various complexities known as social intercourse. And when they get into auditing, you get into trouble because auditing, of course, is the delivery of an auditing command and making sure that it is executed and acknowledging the thing in proper flow; understanding the pc, keeping the pc talking to you and so forth.

Well, now let's suppose you have a pc who is just *horrified*, just cannot *stand* the idea of an outflow and so he is inhibiting all of his own outflows. He thinks it's very bad to have an outflow. And he sits there and you ask him a question and ten minutes later, he answers the question and you ask – you get so you just don't want to ask him a question because you know – you know that it's going to take minutes before this thing is finally replied to, you see.

And he's got an inhibited outflow. He knows the proper way to go about it – the proper way.... Maybe it's some beingness like a scholar. And you see and he knows that as a scholar he should look learned. And the way to look learned is to look wise and not speak much. In some old-school philosophy, you know. So you ask him anything and he says, "Mmm, well..." [long pause, laughter] because he's terribly learned. And do you know he isn't doing a blessed thing that whole while? He's actually not going – even going through a comm lag, you see. He's not going through a comm lag, he's not figuring anything out, he's not doing anything during that period of time. And you, of course, as an auditor sometimes sense this and you get very impatient about what this pc's doing because you see that it's corny. Something is wrong here.

Now, knowing about flows, you should of course be able to understand what the pc's doing. That's why I'm going to ask you to graph these flows after this lecture and draw a picture. That is to say draw a picture of each flow. You want to draw the picture for all the flows from one point where the pc is and then the pc's considerations of another point, don't you see?

You know, what should be the flows for another point and what is the point for his point. You got the idea?

So you actually draw them from one point and then draw them from that point's viewpoint for another point. You follow that? That point's viewpoint for another point.

Well, I'll give you an idea of it if you didn't grasp that in a hurry – most of you did – but and that is simply get the idea of, you are a driver and what should be a policeman's flows. See, what the policeman's flows should be, not what your flows are.

So you draw a picture for your flows. And then you would have a picture for the policeman's flows viewed by you, see? Get the idea? So there are actually, he's got a – you've got a whole bunch of considerations as to what his flows should be.

Well, draw all the flows for a second point as viewed from the first and it'll give you good understanding of what is expected and what is being done.

Now, as far as auditing commands are concerned, you can actually put together eight auditing commands in sequence that give you all the aspects of these flows. Just roll them off one after the other and the person will run these things.

Oddly enough, since flows are caused by withholds, running flows unburies withholds. Do you see? If the pole which the withhold is disappeared because of flows, then by running flows, of course, you uncover it. And it's very marvelous how many withholds the person all of a sudden finds as he is running a flows process.

So you can locate a process by assessment, trigger the automaticity of the flow, get rid of the flow, straighten it out. You can run a flows process, you can – and, as I've just mentioned, get rudiments in. You can see check by finding out which flow the pc has been most routinely stuck on, you see? All of his crimes are on inhibited inflow. Everything is on inhibited inflow.

And you just assess the eight flows and then you find out which one is the most active on the meter and then you just do a Sec Check for that one. You'll figure out what that one is.

You'll find out this is quite interesting from a standpoint of getting data and getting things released and getting the person's bank quieted down and everything down from the high roar that it ordinarily is.

But a pc's bank could not possibly be discharged rapidly by any machine or chemical. It couldn't be. Because the flows are intricate and the ridges are actually composited flows. And you've got to do something to let the flows straighten out, whether it's getting rid of the beingness that wanted that flow or by auditing flows or by pulling withholds – you've got to do something like this in order to straighten the bank out. Anything that just got rid of the bank as one whole block would, of course, never expose the understanding which is underneath because that is the second inversion.

Understanding, of course, is first above flows and electrical nonsense and masses and the sixth dynamic and then inverts and goes under it all. And electricity and so forth is capable of burying all the knowledge in the world in the pc's bank.

The pc would – by a sudden button or an electrical machine, would suddenly be staggered totally and completely into having to confront all of the knowledge of his whole track in a split second. I don't think he could do that. I don't think that would either be profitable nor pleasant. And I don't think it would result in anything. I think he has to take a look at some of the data.

I know that those people who inhibit inflows would rather have a pill and think that the best possible treatment that you could have would just be to slide somebody a pill and he'd be Clear. I think he has to find out something about himself before he gets Clear. But maybe that's just a peculiarity. Certainly enough, empirically, that is the only way a case makes any progress.

Okay? Well, you think you can make any use of this data on flows?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Good enough.

Thank you very much.

WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on 6 February 1962

Thank you. Well, what did you think of the TV, huh?

Audience: Great. Good.

Think that will work out?

Audience: Yes.

Did any of you shudder at the thought of your overts suddenly showing – [laughter] turning up on that circuit, huh? You did slightly, huh? Yeah. I think it will work out just fine providing we can find a totally indestructible pc. Yeah. ... [laughter]

Okay. And this is the what of what?

Audience: 6th of Feb.

Well, make up your minds. It's the 6th, the 13th.

Audience: 6th.

It is the 6th?

Audience: Yes.

You guarantee this?

Audience: Yes!

All right, 6 February AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Now, I have some very interesting material here today, completely aside from everything else that's happened to you – some very interesting material. I finally equated why the missed withhold and the withhold is so interesting. So this is a lecture about withholds. What's a withhold? How come? And it equates right back to 1938.

Now, you should realize that any truth that has any distance or is going to get anything done with cases and so forth, actually equates against the dynamic principle of existence, Book One. The dynamic principle of existence is Survive.

If you look over Scientology and Dianetics, you'll find that that was the one breakthrough and although it was a rather elementary and simple breakthrough, it nevertheless is the basic pin of structure.

And I have found out over the years, it didn't matter when, that when a principle finally went back to Survive and all of a sudden it was an amplification of Survive, why, it suddenly worked like mad on pcs and was the cause of a great deal of this and that with pcs.

And all of this became very interesting to me when I put up my long ears and heard the back echo of this. Withholds equate to survive.

Now, this, at the same time, this is one of those points where a great deal of theory falls together and at the same moment, we have this – we have this: We have the reason why 3D Criss Cross works because we have the reason why an identity is aberrative. It could be said that an identity is that accumulation of withholds which make an individuation. Amazing, isn't it?

An identity is that accumulation of withholds which cause an individuation. And therefore, when you're auditing 3D Criss Cross, you're doing a Class II skill in gross lots. You see, you pick up an identity, you isolate an identity on which other identities are appended and pinned and you have at once gotten rid of 8,672,945 to the 21st power withholds all in one fell list.

Now you, right where you sit right here at this moment have an identity. So of course, you've got one part of 3D Criss Cross already done.

When we look at the pc and we say, "What's your name?" and the pc says, "My name, him Joe," you've got one 3D Criss Cross item, "Joe." Shocking, isn't it? There's a 3D Criss Cross item, "Joe." A hundred thousand years from now somebody will be auditing him. [laughs] Isn't that an entertaining thought, you know. They'd have to run you out of you. "Well, how come you're Joe?"

Rather high-toned space opera societies and so forth, do you know they don't even read the numbers on their chests? You see, these doll bodies are turned out in gross lots, you know? Like a high-toned department store turns out a bunch of identical dolls for the kids, you know? But these things are turned out just pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. They all look alike. All of them are alike. There isn't one shade of difference from one body to the next, not a hair.

And yet people in space opera recognize each other rather easily. Isn't that interesting? How do they manage that? Well, it must be they recognize a person from his beingness, not his identity.

So where you have to recognize a person from his identity, there can't be much beingness present. See?

So that's what makes a 3D item. A 3D item is maximal identity, minimal beingness. And every once in a while, you get identity crossed with beingness and you have an historic character. But remember, it isn't his identity that makes him an historic character. It's his beingness.

So an identity is always bringing up the rear. It's always a minor affair. An identity does not amount to a hill of beans.

I myself have erred in this direction time and time and time and time again. I used to have a standard operating procedure over in Europe. What you do is accumulate yourself a God-awful identity, see. You'd accumulate yourself an identity of this particular type of being able to go down to the lists and knock everybody's head off, you see. Or you know – and you

get yourself the current championship ladies' stocking for Europe, you know? They wore ladies' stockings then. They wear diamond belts today. I mean, about the same difference.

And just go down and every time there was any kind of a – of a tilt or anything like that, you see, accumulate yourself a little more identity.

You'd finally get it up to a point where all you had to do was ride up outside of a castle, something like this, you see, if you were for the Crown or something and you'd say, "Well, I'm so and so. Open up the gates."

And whoever the robber baron was that was resisting all law and order, you see, he would say "*Roow*." And all of his young squires would say, "Gee, John L. Sullivan's down there, you know." [laughter] Same atmosphere, you know?

They wouldn't do a thing for him. They'd go down and open up the gates. That's an identity. "Wild Bill" Hickok, Wyatt Earp. The television play this up to the nines. You get the idea? Identity. I've used it on other parts of track. Walk into the Senate, they say, "Now, shut up. That's so-and-so talking, see." And immediately you had silence, see?

Other people talked and everybody else was talking at the same time. No, *bang!* You see, identity did it. That's the mistake. That's a mistake. That's a mistake you've made and that's a mistake I've made on and on and on.

They didn't shut up because of the identity, ever. They shut up because of the beingness. You could reach further and influence more than other people around, so you did. And that's as simple as that.

But the identity side of it was to be more of a lump of than anybody else which totally defeats the reach. So if you conceive of beingness as the ability to permeate, pervade, communicate to, fill up an area and identity as a method of not having to – see, it puts it on automatic, doesn't it?

They say, "Well, he fills up an area because his name is Bill or Sir Tristram or something," so then as Bill or Sir Tristram, you don't have to go to any trouble. You're just lazy on the whole subject, you see. Because the eagle that you're known by painted on your chest or the typical cut of your toga or something like that is not going to fill up any area. That's not going to fill up any area. Only you can fill up the area.

So what you've done is get a substitute for communication, a substitute for reach so that you could qualify an identity as a substitute for reachingness and a beingness as a reachingness. So these two things are contra, one against the other, you see?

An identity is reach on automatic and a beingness is reaching, you know. And by this – by beingness I mean our Scientological aspect of beingness. That is to say you *know*, the fellow really does it. He is doing it. You get the idea? It's not because he *is* somebody that you do something. It's because he *is* doing it. That's entirely different.

Now, that's a current activity. Beingness would be a current activity and identity would be a past activity. This fellow climbed the Matterhorn, therefore, he is famous. His whole value is climbing the Matterhorn when he is climbing the Matterhorn. That is his beingness, you got it? But identity is "the fellow who climbed the Matterhorn."

Now, in view of the fact that the only thing that this universe punishes is being there and communicating – the only things this universe punishes is being there and communicating. Universe is incapable of punishment in the absence of those two factors. If a person isn't there, he can't be punished and if a person doesn't communicate, he can't be punished, you see?

So the universe is an anti-beingness universe and a pro-identity universe. This universe favors identity so it can punish.

All right. Now, let's equate a withhold. What is a withhold? A withhold is a not-reachingness. It's many other things. Don't make that into a technical thing because there's more here. That's not all of it.

What's a withhold? Elementary, my dear Watson.

A withhold, reversely, would be holding onto a piece of information which would damage survival. A preservation of identity. The self-preservation of an identity. Now, you have to remember that a thetan can't be hurt. A thetan can only get connected with something that connects with something that connects with something and then he gets himself onto the circuit.

So here is the thought involved in this: That a person withholds to preserve himself. You do not tell the police that you really did park three hours in the no parking zone, you see? You say, "I just arrived."

Now, why do you withhold that information? That is the police could lessen your *survival* if they found it out. Correct?

All right. The police could lessen your survival if they found it out. Now, therefore, the withholds which you have are things which you feel, rightly or wrongly, that if you let them be known, they would reduce your survival.

That is, they would decrease your reputation or identity; people would think less of you – this is all part of the same thing, you see – people would think less of you if they knew and so on. So that withholds go into that category.

We've made the step now above the idea of a withhold being totally a matter of mores. Now, we've gone a little bit further and we have a little bit better rationale. And that rationale is that a withhold is something a person believes had better be withheld because, if he didn't withhold it, it would reduce his survival as, of course, an identity.

If you were building an identity on repute – nothing wrong with this. It's a standard trick of the universe. Your credit is good. People think well of you, you see. All of those various things which go into repute. It's a standard trick of the universe. I mean, you can't even live in this universe without this trick – in a body. And if you're – if you are working to enhance your repute to be a good citizen, a member of the community, a person on whom people can depend, a person who has good job references, you got the – all of the rest of this sort of thing. You got your nose clean with the government so it'll pay your old-age pension, you know, that kind of thing. All of these things. You've never been known to vote for law and order. You always wanted what the government wanted. And – but what are you doing there?

You're building up a survival identity. All these things build up a survival identity. Nothing wrong with this, of course.

All right. So you withhold those things which would depress this survival identity. So you withhold such things as: You always upheld the government except that time you refused to go to the polls and vote, refused to pay your taxes, refused to uphold the government's desire to savage somebody. You see, all these things that you didn't do, you don't let the government in on, see.

You tend to tuck those in against your bosom because this would hurt your reputation with the government. You see?

In other words, it would injure your self-preservation, so therefore you withhold them. If these things were known, you wouldn't be worth two whoops in hell, you think.

Well now, a thetan goes on the cautious side of this, so he always withholds more than he has to. And naturally, all withholds, then, are built uniformly on the basis of self-preservation. The source and cause of any withhold is self-preservation. That's it. I mean, that's your technical fact. Withholds, self-preservation. Self-preservation, withhold.

Well, let's put it as graphically as this. You've got a body and you're facing a buzz saw. And you withhold your body from the buzz saw and you don't lose a body, see. But if you didn't withhold your body from the buzz saw, it goes *bzzz* and you haven't got a body. You got that? It's that elementary.

Well, it's built on the mechanical force factors of this universe. Trying to preserve form, trying to preserve the form of a body, trying to preserve these things about a body, you see; and therefore, you withhold and protect, take care of, be responsible for, all the other things stem out from that, that we're so accustomed to using in processing.

All these other things parade out from this fact: self-preservation. Now, self-preservation, of course, is a misnomer. A thetan doesn't have to preserve himself. It would be silly for a thetan to even try to preserve himself. A thetan is only involved in preserving an identity. So self-preservation is a misnomer in that it shouldn't be self-preservation. It should be the – identity preservation. Preservation of an identity.

So now let's cross straight into 3D Criss Cross and say with one fell swoop, then any identity which remains in suspension in the bank is the direct product of identity preservation. See, that's saying – well, it proves itself. It's there, isn't it? You can find this identity in the individual. You find this 3D Criss Cross item in the individual, so therefore the basic denominator in that item must have been it was preserving itself. If it was preserving itself, it's there. If it wasn't preserving itself, it isn't there.

In other words, the basic effort then of any identity is to preserve itself. Hence, we find these suspended 3D Criss Cross items starting with the person's own identity right now. Joe, Bill, Pete, Mary, Agnes. It doesn't matter what it is. This person is busy preserving Joe, Bill, Pete, Mary, Agnes, you see, right now.

To give you a reality on this, have you done anything in the last week – answer this question – have you done anything in the last week whatsoever to prolong your life?

Audience: Yes.

You have. All right. Now, what do you suppose is going to happen to the mental energy mass, which is this life, when you contact it? It will be prolonged, of course. Now, think of this last week as a section of time which somebody contacts a thousand years from now. Well, look it over now. A thousand years from now, they contact this little minute section of track. Of course, it doesn't amount to a hill of beans, you see. It isn't aberrative in any way, but actually those things that would be stuck – now, let's be very technical – would only be those points where you failed to preserve your life. That would really be stuck because it's the failed postulate. See?

But the postulate impulse, of course, was to preserve your life whether it won or lost. You see how that would be? Therefore, a death hangs up more than a life.

You see, here's a person's full integrity, his full power as a being, his full power as a thetan. Regardless of what this power could go into – . It's almost unthinkable right now to you that power could go into anything but self-preservation, if you're looking at it and I got this all restimulated with you, you see? Well, what would a thetan concentrate on if the thetan wasn't concentrating on the preservation of self or one of the dynamics? What would he be concentrating on, you see? Of course, he'd be concentrating on one of these things, you can say to yourself. But at the same time, only those points would hang up where the individual has postulated it and has failed. And those are always the hang-up. The failed postulate mechanism is, of course, senior to all of these mechanisms that I'm talking to you about at the moment.

It is much worse – you'd probably get no repercussion whatsoever for knocking a Gorgon's head off because, you see, that whole cycle of action came out. You intended to preserve yourself and not to preserve the Gorgon. And your intention, of course, was carried out in that you did preserve yourself and didn't preserve the Gorgon. See, so therefore, we try to find something wrong on the track when we collide with the knockout of a Gorgon. Find an incident knocking the Gorgon's head off and so on; it doesn't hang up at all. See, the expectancy is carried along the time track. One expects to knock the Gorgon's head off, he does knock the Gorgon's head off and that's all there is to it.

All right. Now, let's just get a little bit more complicated about this and one attempts to knock the Gorgon's head off and misses. And the Gorgon goes chomp and that is that. Now, that was not in the cards. That was an alter-is of the person's own postulate. And being an alter-is of the postulate, it tends to then make its own time track and so hang up in time.

Failing to knock the Gorgon's head off is the only sin, unless – now, let's go over and look at this other little mechanism – unless it was a sin to knock off Gorgons' heads. Supposing it was the king's private Gorgon and huntsmen are riding north and south and east and west, gamekeepers and so forth, wanting to know, who knocked the block off of the king's Gorgon because they're gonna 'ang 'im. They have a special piece of 'emp preserved for 'is 'ead.

And the person who knocked the Gorgon's head off makes the immediate survival computation. The immediate survival computation is, of course, to withhold. *"I will not tell him I knocked off the Gorgon's head because they will hang me."*

No, "They will hang this identity," was a much more accurate statement, "So I better not tell them because they will hang this identity," see? So that's that.

It doesn't hang up right now. Doesn't hang up one identity, but it sure hangs it up on the time track.

Now, you're galumphing down the time track as an auditor looking around for pieces to snufflicate and all of a sudden you get this odd picture of the head of a Gorgon, see. Individual goes up and down the time track and every time he comes around this section of anything, here's this Gorgon's head.

All right. There was nothing aberrative about knocking off the Gorgon's head. See, the Gorgon was going to eat you up or you were going to eat the Gorgon up and you wound up your strong right arm and you whopped the Gorgon and it knocked his head off and that's what you intended to do, and that's what happened and so forth. You see, there's no – there's no hang-up there. I mean, that will just slide right on through on the time track because it's the postulate and so forth.

One has to have considerations about the evil of knocking off Gorgons' 'eads.

Now, instead of running the incident, if you just did this, the whole thing springs free. "What was wrong with knocking Gorgons' 'eads off?"

Or we just find this head floating in space, we ask some nebulous question such as "Well, what would you withhold about that picture?"

That's all we'd have to say and all of a sudden the whole incident would just unreel. *Rrrrrrrr*. You'd have the king's huntsmen riding up and down the land saying, "Here's this specially treated piece of 'emp in which we're going to insert somebody's 'ead."

And you have the individual and this and that. And you'd get this whole identity hung up, because he's had to hide the fact, the new identity, the man who knocked off the Gorgon's 'ead.

Only this is now a submerged identity and he can't advertise the thing, you see. He'd love to go out and tell all of his pals, "Well, you fellows think you can strike a nifty blow. Some moments, I have no doubt, in the middle of battle and so forth, you have been able to assume certain strengths. I'm sure you've knocked off some soldier or man-at-arms' helmet, I'm sure, but myself, I was out in the woods the other day. I met a Gorgon." [laughter] "And *ppfft-ssa*, just like that. You try it."

See, he'd like to brag about it because it could be a survival point. All of his friends, he feels thereafter, would say, "'E's the man who 'it off the Gorgon's 'ead." See?

See, all kinds of value. Every time you go into the pub, somebody buys you a drink because you're the man that 'it off the Gorgon's 'ead, see. Sooner or later they call the pub "The Gorgon's 'Ead", you know. [laughter]

In other words, you've got all sorts of survival computations kicking around here on the whole subject of having done this fantastic deed, you see. You can't tell about them. You must tell about them, you see? You really shouldn't withhold it because it's a survival characteristic. You should compulsively outflow it to one and all. You should go down and beat

your chest at the crossroads and tell the passers-by, you see. At the same time, you mustn't tell anybody because if you did, the king's 'untsmen would 'ave something to put in that noose they have been preparing, you know?

So what do you do? Well, the thing to do is not solve it at all. Just hang it up on the time track and let some auditor find it if anybody ever finds out about auditing. That's about the way it adds up, don't you see?

It's an inadmissible fact.

Now, you get the withholds off of this and then you get the compulsive outflows off of this, you could – you could almost – this isn't absolutely factual, but you can almost free up the track by asking a person "What should you have told people about?" see?

At first they equate it on the basis of what they shouldn't have withheld and then they get into these brags. They get into a big brag sector, you know.

"Well, I was on this – in this war a couple of hundred thousand years ago and there were fifteen enemy fighters and they were coming down out of the clouds. And I was all by myself and I was flying this little triplane, you see. And it was up on this other planet. And as a matter of fact, they were flying more or less the same kind of plane I was. And I had a machine gun there and through superb acrobatics and through the ability to shoot, the like of which nobody has heard of before or since, I shot down all fifteen. And after that they called me 'The Plane Killer.' And I was an ace. And as a matter of fact, I was the only ace that emerged from that particular war. All the rest were killed." You see, brag, you know. Big deal.

But he just withheld it so hard afterwards because, you see, he wasn't supposed to be carrying a Mark 15 type machine gun. That was something he got out of the commanding officer's hut just before he left the field. And it was firing atomic type ammunition which wasn't supposed to be used in that war. They had a united spittoon organization on that planet, which said that "Everybody but us must not use anything that is effective," you see. "And we who are upholding civilization are going to destroy it as fast as we can."

And they had forbidden this particular type of ammunition. So he was using this type of ammunition and he stole the gun and also he never neglected to tell anybody about this, but the airplane he was using also was the commanding officer's. And the commanding officer was on leave at the time, you see and he didn't have any plane at the moment. His had been crashed, so if he admitted to having taken the plane up and the mechanics of the field admitted to him taking the plane up, he would have been courtmartialed, you see?

So this big mystery stands in the middle of this two hundred thousand year war, is how come all of a sudden fifteen enemy planes disappeared. They disappeared with no slightest explanation. There wasn't even anybody flying in that sector at that time. All official records show this. So there's big withholds on this subject while there should be big brags on this subject and you get a wonderful hang-up. And, you see, there's your – your facts of survival are equally matched. It's almost worth the same amount to brag about it as it is to withhold it. You survive, you see.

If you brag about it, your survival is enhanced. They make you a colonel and put you in charge of all of the flying girls, you see. And if you withhold it, why, you can go on holding your present rank of sub-captain to the subgroups, you see and drawing your pay and your old age pension, you see. So that's good survival. But, of course, if you did tell them about it, they would court-martial you, you see and you wouldn't any longer be a sub-captain even, far from being able to brag about it, you see? And you get the most preposterous hang-ups.

So that you could say that any difficult situation is an unequated or unresolved problem in survival. So any hang-up on the track is an unresolved problem in survival. Person couldn't figure it out. There were balanced factors involved. If he admitted it, he didn't survive. But it would be a good thing to admit it because then you really would survive. But if he didn't admit it, then he would survive. But it was a bad thing not to admit it because then, of course, this made a liar out of him, you see.

So it stands right in the middle of that little crossroads and you'll find each hung-up part of an identity are these things. And when you get one of these black bundles called a 3D Criss Cross item – which is some old former identity – it is all hung together and totally interwoven with just these computations. It should talk, it better not. And if it talks, it's nonsurvival. If it doesn't talk, it's nonsurvival. If it does talk, it's nonsurvival, you see. And if it does withhold, it's nonsurvival. And in fact, all things are nonsurvival at this particular point. There is no answer to how to survive. There is no answer to the – this problem. And these are the things which you find hung up. Naturally, by pulling withholds off of the case, you release all of these things.

Now, an individual withholds an identity and withholds and withholds and withholds an identity until it parks on the track. And when you find a 3D Criss Cross identity, you, of course, have got this tremendous *key* to a tremendous section of track. When you find one of these real items that proves out, you see. You've got an identity there that should have been known, that mustn't have been known and the fact that you found it, of course, takes a great deal of charge off the case because the identity itself is dedicated to 'iding. The identity has now gone into hiding and that you find it, of course, brings it out of that category.

So actually, disclosure of an identity destroys a withhold. And you will see a pc – you will see a pc every once in a while... You will be tracking down the line and all of a sudden the pc says, "*Oh-oh. Oh, oh, oh, oh. Hm-hmm.*"

You say, "What's the matter?"

"Well, *mmmm-mm*, nothing."

"Are you withholding anything?"

"Well, I was going to mention something."

"Well, what were you going to mention?"

"Well, I didn't want to really tell you."

You can go round and round on one of these things. And the pc will get some kind of a computation that will say, "Well, they're probably looking for me yet."

That is almost the cliché that goes along with each one of these situations. "They are probably looking for me yet. If they were to find me, then, oh, man. What would happen now?"

This pc has got this identity that he was trying to make famous, you see and trying to make it survive and trying to make it all polished up and a good citizen and then it didn't, see. So your intention was to become a good survival name that would go on and on and a total failure of that, of course, puts a person on a total withhold of something that's supposed to be totally surviving. So he should have been exhibiting it, he didn't dare exhibit it and so it gets hung up. And you come on the edges of this thing and this pc starts to get very alert.

The pc says, "*Ooooooooooh*. They are probably still looking for me someplace."

He gets the idea of his name being on sheriffs' boards and headquarters' bulletin boards, you know – "Wanted for moperly and dopery on the high seas," you see. "Shoot on sight. If ever found, don't bother to return except mangled," you know. This type of thing. "George Aloisious Preclear. Wanted for the moperly of the dopery at the left-hand sector of the right front cross of the second-hand universe." And he will. He'll all of a sudden "*Ooooooooooh, ooooooooooh*, I don't know, if I ... I don't know, if I ought to tell you or not," you know.

Oh, my God, this thing he's telling you, see, is three trillion years ago and it was on some little old second-rate planet that didn't have anything to do with anything and he was selling grain to troopers' horses or something, you know. It just works out it's just nothing. It's a horrible sensation, you know, of "I better not talk because they're still after me."

And of course, this "still after me" is this thing of guilt that everybody was trying to get into in the field of therapy. Of course, you couldn't get into it from the viewpoint of guilt. It does give the aspect of guilt. The person looks guilty. And they are. I mean, why, why not accept it.

But entering it on the basis of "What have you – what are you guilty of? Thank you. What are you guilty of? Thank you. What are you guilty of? Thank you. Now, just lie back on the couch. Take some more sodium pentothal. Very, very nice. Now, breathe deeply. Now, you're all amongst friends. Here, put these electric shock electrodes on you. Now, what are you guilty of? Now, are – aren't you guilty of something and so forth? All right. You feel like you're guilty of something. You think you've killed your father. Well, we're here to tell you conclusively you didn't kill your father, so therefore you are not guilty. Thank you very much." *Bzzzzzt*.

This is psychotherapy, you see and it isn't psychotherapy at all because this feeling of guilt is as much a brag as otherwise, so that's always throwing the psychiatrists for a loop. He wants to know why this patient is going around bragging, you see, about being Napoleon or something. While withholding the subject that he is Napoleon, he's bragging about being Napoleon.

No, it's the person's idea that he's still being looked for, he is still wanted someplace or another with exclamation points, that he is very guilty of something. And this guilt feeling is

simply that he should have talked, he didn't talk and either way he wouldn't have survived. There was no resolution to the problem of survival on any dynamic.

And when you've got one of those on a case, it'll come right straight forward to present time and it'll really knock somebody's head off. He really gets in a mess on this one.

"Ah, God. Well, I was supposed to have the regiment charge, you see. There we were at Balaklava and somebody issued the orders. And if you disobeyed the orders, you see, you would have gotten court-martialed, but if you charged, you would lose everything, so what were you supposed to do?"

Well, whatever he did was wrong, you see. He couldn't survive, no matter what he did, so any way he solved the problem equaled nonsurvival. And you'll get one of these computations coming up and the pc has an awful time. Now, when these things come off, the whole identities come off and withholds come off of identities. And when you're pulling the identity, you see, you will get a withhold at the same time. The withhold there, the person "*Ooooooh*" – I mean, when you have that type of thing coming up. Now, pulling any identity, you should realize – off of a case, you should realize there's probably a withhold connected with it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be hung. Well, let me show you.

It is surviving, isn't it? There is an identity in the bank and it is floating forward to present time. Right? All right. Now, if that identity is floating forward to present time, it must have a withhold connected with it, see. It inevitably has to have a withhold connected with it if it is in the bank and here now. And therefore, this is *true* of *all* phenomena to be found in the reactive bank. Each phenomena has a withhold connected with it. That's uniform.

These phenomena were prompted by efforts to survive. And of course, efforts to survive are very, very silly and a lie themselves because a thetan can't do anything else. How people work to survive, you see. They work like mad to survive. Well, actually, they're not working to survive at *all*. They're working to get an *identity* to survive. Of course, they try to get this identity to survive. They're sweating away at it trying to get this identity to survive and they can't do anything else but survive.

Now, of course, if there's any effort involved in this thing, it must be built around a lie which the person doesn't recognize or realize. And that's the first thing he doesn't recognize or realize: that his beingness is one thing and his identity is quite something else, that he is one thing and that this identity or body or designation – no matter if it's number 6077859 – that's still an identity. But this is something else, it is not himself, you see. So he has himself associated with the identity, you see. And then he's got the – also, he does another cross. He gets the beingness crossed with the identity.

He says, "My beingness is totally over the basis of being Joe Doakes. That's my beingness." That isn't his beingness. His communicatingness is not dependent upon being Joe Doakes. As a matter of fact, it is quite deteriorated because he is being Joe Doakes. Now, therefore, all things have a withhold connected with them.

Now, whenever you miss a withhold, a person is volunteering to tell you something or a person is ready to tell you something or a person could tell you something and doesn't, a person gets a restimulation of a withhold. The withhold restimulates and the individual then

gets the idea that he is in danger. There isn't any more rationale to it than that. Now, if you look any further than that rationale, you'll have difficulty understanding it. It is a Q-and-A, stimulus-response mechanism. If the person has a withhold that he must then withhold he, of course, is in danger. Do you follow that through?

You see, you can always enter one of these dangerous situations from two sides. A person must be in danger because there is a piece of hemp hanging over a tree. Now, that is restimulation. Has nothing whatsoever to do with anybody hanging him, but he knows a piece of hemp hanging over a tree is for hanging. So therefore, he can do this – he can actually think he has done something to be hanged for.

You see, any time – because the reactive mind is A=A=A, the conclusion can then put into action the causation. I'd ask you to grab this all in one minute. This is quite interesting.

We put George in a wrecked car. You see, the car has been wrecked.

There's blood all over the place – somebody else's from some other place. This car is pitched off of a curve and is lying in a ditch and we take George and we put him in the wrecked car.

Now, let's go a little bit further. Supposing George were dead drunk and just getting sober and were sound asleep and couldn't be disturbed and we simply picked George up and we took him down this bank and we put him behind the wheel of this wrecked car and scattered some dust over him and let him wake up.

His immediate conclusion is that he's been in a wreck. Isn't that right? Well it isn't – you could defy this all sorts of ways, you see. It wasn't his car. He wasn't out driving. All of these things don't have to be present at all. He's simply sitting in the car and he can actually sit there and be totally convinced that he has been in a wreck. He can even exhibit psychosomatic injuries to prove that he's been in this wreck. He'd argue with you about being in the wreck if he woke up in this car. And he'd explain to you how he had driven from home in this car. He'd even explain to you how he had borrowed the car. He would defend anything to try to make it agree with reality. This is an interesting fact.

The least he would get out of it would simply be a little shock about should he tell anybody. "What is this? Are there any consequences to having wrecked this car?" You see this? He needn't have been in the car wreck at all for him to think some of these thoughts to a greater degree or a lesser degree. You get an impression of having been in a car wreck.

In extremis he would argue with you, he'd tell you where he borrowed the car, he would give you the places where he was injured, he would show psychosomatic bruises. You see, that's *in extremis*. And the lightest thing is he'd feel just a little bit guilty about having gotten himself into that position although he had no responsibility for it of any kind whatsoever.

He had been drunk. He had been sobering up. You picked him up out of his bunk or off of a sofa someplace and took him down and put him in the car. And he'd blame himself for having gotten there. And he'd go back under a long chain of circumstances trying to figure out how he was to blame for being in that car. You find it?

So that you give a person any result of a chain of responsibilities, you give him the end product of any responsibilities and he will attempt to assume some of the earlier responsibility. I could give you... It's a very nebulous thing. I'll – let me see if I can't think up one for your particular case right at the moment.

Oh, I know. I know. You've got a picture of an army, so you assume you must have been in that army. See, you've got a picture of an army, so you assume you must have been in the army. Got that? You hardly even question it sometimes. And then you're very startled several sessions later to find out that you were a provision merchant and never had anything to do with the army, see. But you did have a picture of the army. You get the idea? That's jumping to a conclusion.

All right. Let me give you another example. Your rib aches, so you must have a psychosomatic picture of some kind. You got an aching rib, so you assume you must have a psychosomatic picture and then some of you girls sometime get home and find out that if you just loosen up the bra or something of the sort, that it was totally twisted and had been so all day. Did you ever have this happen to you?

You find out there was some actual fact of why you had a pain there and you had been going around trying – as a Scientologist, trying to explain this pain away. [laughter] Got the idea? You couldn't have had any pain because it was only a button and a totally twisted hook or something of the sort digging into your live flesh, you see. So you figure there must have been a psychosomatic incident connected with it, you see.

You know, that this is natural and that it should be this way and you normally – to get such a pain without cause – you see, naturally it would take something like a psychosomatic incident. So you get the rare one where you had the actual pain which is right here and right now and you say it must have been psychosomatic. You get the idea? In other words, because you've got B, you conclude A with no evidence. You see?

So you'll get spook factors on a bank – in a bank of this particular character. And because certain conditions are true, then the pc assumes that other conditions must have been true adding up to these conditions, you see? And, boy, can some pcs write script on this subject. And you'll find them tearing off in some direction, writing script all over the place and during the session their bra was turned, you see, in such a way that a hook was inserted deeply in the flesh, you know. And they've been trying to figure out the whole session on who they must have stabbed in the back.

Now, the reason a person does this is consequences. Just – that's all. And you can have the consequence occur and then have the person figure out what the act must have been as well as do the act and then figure out what the consequence must have been. You see, it works both ways. Now, individuals do this first one. We understand this and everybody knows about this first one, is you go to the store and you get a dozen eggs and on the road home, why, you break every single egg. Well, you know darn well when you get home, it's – *augh*, somebody is going to be upset with you, see. That's easy, you see.

So somebody is upset with you and you get to wondering about the eggs being broken, see and you weren't to the store. And this is very puzzling. You see, it can work both ways? So pcs get put into mysteries because of consequences, the accomplished consequence. And

some of the hang-ups on cases is the reverse of the withhold. And that is to say the pc doesn't know what led to the consequence, so he figures he must have a withhold from himself.

Now, everybody has betrayed everybody, see. He's betrayed himself, he's withholding from himself and all of that, so he doesn't know, now, where he is supposed to wind up and he gets into a tremendous puzzle. And you get withholds on the first dynamic as well as the remaining seven.

One of the most interesting things you can do is sometimes go over with a pc and find – if you could do this very directly, it'd be very nice – but you can actually find the material that he "must be" withholding from himself but isn't. You see that?

His anxiety about identity would cover the whole picture. If you ask something, "When have you contributed to ..." Well, let's say we find – we find this terminal "an angry man." Let's say we've sorted this out with 3D Criss Cross and we get "an angry man." Now, this will be a whole bunch of angry men – Joe, Pete, Bill and Colonel Stewpot and everybody else that he's run into, and so on. It's covered a whole series of identities that more or less came along in one chain.

And you could say, "What responsibility have you taken for the continued survival of an angry man?"

And you would see the package "angry man" just start falling apart into identities and into all sorts of bits and pieces and separate identities and so on. All right. We – let's say this individual is in a great deal of trouble with the gendarmes and so on.

Now, let's go further than that. If the individual can have any trouble with the gendarmerie, he must at one time or another have been identified with the gendarmerie. Some gendarmerie someplace, he must have been identified with it. You cannot have a motivator without having caused something. Now, that's the other point.

But the cause which you normally have – if you have been responsible for something and then ceased to be responsible for something, you can get your block knocked off. That's about the only way you can get your block knocked off. You take great responsibility for the welfare of the British Isles and then kick the bucket as prime minister or something of the sort and come back your next life, not caring, as a street cleaner. And you wonder why you're always being arrested.

It is perpetually you cannot park your dustbin on any corner of any street without getting a ticket, without being told to move on, without being threatened with this and that. If any bank robbers ever wished to get rid of the evidence of having robbed a bank, they'd drop it in your dustbin, you see and then you get arrested. And this is just fate at work, that's all. And guys like this, in this shape, can sit around forever and say, "Well, just fate is against me, that's all. I mean it's just fate is against me," you see.

You've taken a wide zone of responsibility and then ceased to be responsible for it by postulates, you see. So you've taken a wide identity and then have killed the identity by postulate. You got tired of being a prime minister or something, you see. You get tired of it, so you say, "All right. Next life I'm not going to be the prime minister. I don't want anything to do with it."

Well, this is the decline, of course – the declining days of being the prime minister is when this occurred, not between lives. All during the last five years of being the prime minister, a guy would rather have been shot than be the prime minister, you see. It was all fine for the first ten years, but then the Socialists got to work, you see. Well, we start tracing this back and we find out that the Socialists could get on his nerves because he had been a Socialist.

Being a prime minister could get on his nerves because he had been a revolutionary at an earlier time, you see?

And now, having been a prime minister and taken responsibility for the British Isles, he's a street cleaner and takes no responsibility for anything except one street of the British Isles. That leaves the entirety of the British Isles permeated but no responsibility for them, no matter what his identity is because it is only beingness after all.

People can try to shift their identities, try to change everything, but it is only their beingness that counts.

Now, if he's got a beingness hung up in his background which is associated with his identity and then he suddenly cuts his beingness down to nothing in order to limit his identity, he'll be in trouble every time. Every other street in the British Isles can be the enemy of this street sweeper. He gets – he gets Mott Street beautifully cleaned up. I mean, it's just slick as a whistle. And then the bordering streets and the crossroads and everyplace, anything intersects Mott Street blows dust and dirt into Mott Street and he's got it all to do again.

That's the way it looks to him. He cannot function on this limited sphere because he has already accepted a much larger sphere, so he's always in trouble. So we could ask him this auditing question... He's always, always in trouble with the British Isles, let us say – the government of the British Isles or anything. And if we by any means were able to isolate what he was really against, we could say to him, "What responsibility have you taken for the survival of (whatever the sector was; we'll call it the British Isles)." And he'll go *zoouuuuum, wog, thud*. And it gets very incredible to him, this tremendous zone of responsibility he's all of a sudden staring at. Because, you see, having been responsible for something he leaves an area in his reactive bank which is – which now, has an identity. And it can kick his head in.

I like these guys – they're – thetans are always doing this – having taken responsibility for the whole of Europe and having battered the whole of Europe to pieces in order to liberate it, all nations who took part in that activity, you see, now all draw back and say we're going to have peace and let the whole of Europe go to hell. They did that in 1914, 1918. They just skipped it after 1918. They told the British, they – pardon me, the Germans were told by the British and the Americans, you see, they'd all be patched up and the Weimar Republic was finally put together and nobody would take any responsibility for the Weimar Republic. And there was – every measure that was proposed in order to maintain peace in Europe was no responsibility for any of the Allies. But remember that the Allies had taken full responsibility for peace of Europe.

And then one fine day we hear a mutter of guns and we have World War II, which is just about twice, three times as violent as World War I and did occupy much more area.

Now, these powers, having done this and having... They did learn a lesson at Versailles and they got up to a point now, where they're totally supporting all of Europe. See, they're into Europe, they're afraid to pull out. See, they say immediately there'll be World War III if we pull out of Europe. Haven't you heard this? We get Kennedy standing up and saying "Well, Britain must join the Common Market. We're not going to join, but Britain can join the Common Market, you see, because we must have somebody take responsibility for Europe." And then pretty soon you will hear him getting anxious about it and say "Well, the United States must take responsibility for the Common Market and we've got to go into the Common Market, too, because we've got to take responsibility for Europe."

He knows better. They're now, dreading, you see, cessation of responsibility for Europe. They learned that in World War I. World War II came along, proved it. So they don't take any responsibility for Japan. And I think the – either the prime minister or the war minister – I think he's the prime minister of Japan – I think is the same officer that attacked the US Fleet at Pearl Harbor, which I consider rather interesting. And the president didn't dare visit Japan because it was too turbulent a few years ago. And Japan all of a sudden is on a full autonomy. So we must obsessively continue to take responsibility for Europe, you see, but we mustn't take any for Japan.

Where's the trouble going to come from? All of a sudden the United States Fleet gets up some morning at Pearl Harbor ... You see how it would be?

In other words, having taken responsibility and then taking no responsibility, we get a consequence. And actually, that's what a consequence is. We're withholding responsibility for, that we should take. And that, of course, is a withhold of magnitude because it's a withhold of ability.

So a withhold can be a withhold of anything that we have had a permeation into or a communication with, so when a communication is followed by a no-communication, the advent of the no-communication operating as a withhold, of course, reduces survival. And an effort to carry forward survival is knocked in the head.

So it comes down to survival. We've made a huge area survive. Now, we're only going to make a little part of it survive. Do you follow that? We're going to make all of Europe survive and all of Japan and Asia. Everything is going to survive except we're going to ignore China, Mongolia. Look at the fight they had in Korea because they wouldn't really take responsibility for the Japanese empire. See, there's war after war developing over in this quarter cause nobody's really taking any responsibility for it. That's pretty gruesome, but not in Europe. They won't let down that responsibility area in Europe.

So that'll go on, but there's going to be some contrasurvival. In other words, if you had a large responsibility zone and then you suddenly take a small zone of responsibility in that large zone, you tend to set up the area you've had full responsibility for as an opponent to what you are now taking responsibility for. That's your mechanics of individuation. And the mechanics of individuation are first, communication into and then refuse to communicate into.

Now, because it's "communicate into," you already have a commonness with it or a oneness with it. You have established a oneness with it by responsibility or communication into it. You follow that point? Do you see that?

Well, all right. I'll give you an idea. You live in a big house. You live in a big house and you take responsibility for every room in this house and the basement and the attic and everything and you're taking responsibility for the whole house very nicely. And then you decide to live only in one small room. Do you know, the noise from the remaining rooms as they pound against the wall of your one small room is going to be absolutely deafening. And do you know, eventually your little room will completely fall to pieces because nobody took care of the major house, you see? And as its walls fell down, so did your walls fall down. Do you see that?

In other words, you cannot segmentalize responsibility into a smaller plane or a smaller zone without consequence of some kind or another. You can't take responsibility for the physical universe and then take responsibility for one room in a boarding house in two successive lives and not have planets hit you in the head. It'd be the most mysterious thing. You'll be going down the street and meteorites always seem to land exactly where you are, you see. And there's hardly ever any air where you are and all sorts of wild things happen to where you are. All kinds of randomness is occurring. Weather – weather seems to be totally random all over the world. It is totally dry except right where you're standing it'll be raining. See, here's your huge sector suddenly cut down.

Now, if it's cut down by a sequence of withholds, which it always is, you of course have energized what you're not now taking responsibility for. And because that is now energized, it can kick your head off because it's right on your wavelength, man. You did it, see? See, you energized this whole house and now, you say, "Well, the whole house now energized and I'm only going to energize this little tiny room in this house." Man, the rest of the house is alive where you're concerned.

See, you could have walked into a brand new house that you'd never been in before and moved into one small room and you would have been all right, but thetans never do it that way. They usually get much broader and bolder. They usually walk in, occupy the whole country, then occupy a county, then occupy a town, then occupy a big house, then occupy a first floor room and then occupy a basement room, see and then eventually haunt the graveyard as a ghost and wonder why, if it is raining anyplace in the whole country, it is raining where they are, you see.

You know, it sort of looks to them like everything is agin 'em. That's sort of the way it appears. And it's absolutely true. It is. See, you've always been writing script on the basis of "Well, they're really not after me." They are, but only those guys who could cut your throat effectively, the only fellows – the fellows that could do it best – let me put it this way – is your own palace guard when you have stated, thereafter, that you will no longer occupy the palace.

You see, you were king for a number of years. Everybody was happy with you. You were happy with them. You were executing people and they were bringing people for you to

execute. And everything was just going along swimmingly and splendidly. And one fine day you said, "Well, boys, I'm going to retire."

And at that moment six spears sort of magically appeared in your chest. "Yeah, I'm not going to do this anymore." It's almost as though you pull everything in on you the second that you take that zone out.

So therefore, a survival process discharges all withhold processes. So therefore, the principle of survival is senior to all overt-motivator sequences.

In other words, the superior process is responsibility, as we already know and survival type processes – persistency processes, identity processes. See, these are all types of processes.

Now, you can take apart a fellow by the name of Joe, who is sitting in the pc's chair in front of you. You can take this person apart; you can make this person much more functional as Joe. But you keep wondering what's kicking his head in, why he's getting somatics, why three-quarters of his stomach is missing all the time, you know. He's got this hollow feeling where his ears should be. You keep wondering where these are coming from. Well, that's when – that's when he was Agnes. And he as Joe will now take no responsibility for women. Women is something he doesn't want to have anything to do with at all, thank you.

You see how that would be? In his last life, his name was Agnes. He was a woman and he was a very strong, powerful woman that hated men. [laughter] Because in his life before that he had been a man, you see, that hated women. Of course, any time you start to charge up or energize the bank or have him look at it in any way, he confronts nothing but opponents.

But the most horrible opponent a man can have or a being can have, of course, is himself because it's got his wavelength. Hasn't got his number, it's got his wavelength.

So you say with truth a man is his own worst enemy. And Scientology is that study whereby we're making a man his own best friend. That's true. Wouldn't you like to be a friend of yours?

Now, do you see what withholds are? Do you see what withholds are all about? A withhold is an effort to survive. If you find yourself withholding, you must be trying to survive, is the conclusion that you could reach at that moment. You see, you've done it so often this way, it's such a grooved pattern, that you must be trying to survive. So therefore you must be in danger.

Now, we have a pc, 1.5ing and tearing the roof off in strips. The pc has found himself or herself withholding. What are the immediate conclusions that run off automatically from that first conclusion? What are conclusions two and three? That they must be in danger. See, they found themselves withholding, so, (1) they found themselves withholding, (2) they must be in danger and (3) therefore that they must survive. That's sort of the actions that they take.

So you miss a withhold on the pc, he gets two and three automatically – *bang, bang*. It doesn't matter which we call two and which we call three. But those are the conclusions he comes to.

"Oh, I am sitting here withholding something and the auditor hasn't pulled the withhold." The instant reaction is "I must be in danger." And the immediate response is "I must survive" by which he means "defend myself." So he takes defending actions. He gets defensive actions at once.

You miss a withhold on a pc, you get a defensive action. Wild animals are savage for only one reason – because nobody ever pulled their withholds. Wild animals are not natively savage. They are – just happen to be in a state where they can no longer get off their withholds. That's all. See, they're individuated. A wolf is being a wolf. That he is being a wolf means he has withholds. So therefore, if he found himself withholding something, he would attack you. Or oddly enough, if he found you withholding something, he would attack you. Any withhold will restimulate a wolf. He goes savage instantly.

But do you know, wolves aren't necessarily savage? You know, they're the best fathers in the whole animal kingdom? They're rather interesting beings. But when they get the identity of wolf straight down the groove, they are very easily led to believe that they're withholding, that they are in danger and that they must attack. And these conclusions – it doesn't matter where you enter that triangle – they interpret almost anything that they're in danger. They interpret almost anything that they must attack. They interpret almost anything that they're being attacked and therefore they must interpret anything may kill them, so that they must withhold in the vicinity of almost anything. So you seldom run into them.

I haven't seen any walking down Piccadilly Circus for a long time. Along about 565 A.D., the total population of Rome was two wolves in the Forum. Total population. But it's been better populated since. And it was better populated before that.

But they just don't show up in public. They very seldom come in and say "How do you do." And that's because they couldn't say, "How do you do", if they had to.

Now, in order to handle a wolf so that he wouldn't bite you, you would have to demonstrate to him conclusively that he was not withholding anything. Isn't that interesting And do you know, that I handle wolves that way, very successfully? That there is no point in withholding anything, that there's just no point. They get into a very jolly frame of mind. They tackle you and you pick them up on both sides of their jowls and you throw them about twenty-five feet and you go over and pick them up and pet them. Well, it sounds absolutely incredible, doesn't it. But there's no point in withholding anything because they're not going to damage you any and also you're not going to damage them. It's quite remarkable, you get right down to it. You get an idea – there is a meeting ground at which nobody is hurting anybody. It's just jolly good fun as we wrap each other around tree trunks, you know. A wolf will take an awful lot of punishment.

You walk up to a wild animal as though you're withholding something and you've had it. You've had it right now. You walk up to a wild animal as though you're not withholding anything and he stands there and looks at you and wonders what you're doing.

So you show him what you're doing. You very carefully always show him what you're doing. You don't excite his curiosity so you don't have a withhold involved and you can actually walk right up to one, he'll never attack you.

It is – was not any magic that kept Daniel alive in the lion's den. It's just he never gave anybody the impression they were withholding.

All right. Now, you've given the pc the impression in Security Checking that the pc is withholding. And then you didn't pull the withhold to show the pc the pc wasn't now, withholding. What do you think the pc's going to do? He's liable to leap out of the chair with all fangs bared and does. Not that pcs are wolves, but the one-two-three applies to the pc.

If the pc is withholding then he must be in danger, then he had better defend himself. And that's how the missed withhold makes a pc so savage and what makes it such a deadly mechanism. And why you've to – you've got to handle this mechanism and stop fooling around with it.

If you're going to pull a pc's withholds, which is the only thing that keeps him – pulling his withholds is the only thing that keeps him from totally individuating, don't you see and he can now communicate and everything looks better and so on. But you just miss pulling the withhold and the fact that you are pulling a withhold or could pull a withhold restimulates the withhold, so he adds the consequences or the conclusions, you see, that he must be in danger and that you must be attacking him and that he must attack you. And he does, too.

He might not attack you from the auditing chair, he simply goes out in the hall, natters to somebody else about you. You see, but he's in danger. And that's the mechanism of the *missed* withhold. And of course, the *missed* withhold is far more deadly than the withhold. See, if you don't pull a withhold, that's pretty easy, so you don't pull a withhold. So you don't pull a withhold. You didn't ask for it. You didn't restimulate it. It wasn't important and you didn't pull it. The pc stays in there perfectly well. Otherwise, you'd have to pull all the withholds the pc has had in the last two hundred trillion years in one session. Otherwise, he'd tear your head off if that weren't true that I just said. No, you could – you can actually not restimulate or pull a withhold. Providing it isn't restimulated, you don't have to pull it and you can have a session.

Now, you've got reality on that.

But how about restimulating a withhold and then not pulling it? *Ooooooh*. That's what we're talking about. We're talking about a *missed* withhold. One that was restimulated and we didn't pull. *Oooooh*. Now, what do we see?

So when we talked about missed withholds, we're always making this one remark. We're asking the auditing question, "Have I missed a withhold on you? Has anybody missed a withhold on you? Has any withhold ever been available that nobody ever pulled in that session, E-Meters or no E-Meters? Were you ever in a session where some information was available from you and was not asked for by the auditor?" You get the idea? I mean, this is how far downstairs this can go, E-Meters or no E-Meters.

"Now, at any time in life were you in possession of certain information somebody else could have had by asking but didn't ask?"

And you will find immediately sources and areas where the person could have been angry at somebody thereafter? It's the *missed* withhold. It's *missed*. See, that's a different thing than a withhold. These are *different things!*

One of the hardest things to teach I think there could be because you say to somebody, "Well, did you pick up the missed withholds?"

And the person goes in and says, "Well, yeah, I picked up the missed withholds. Yeah. Of course."

And you say, "Well, what did you do?"

"Well, I asked him if he was withholding anything"

You have to say, "*No, no, no, no, no. No, no. No, no. No, no.* Did you pick up the withholds that had been *missed*?"

"Well, he – yes, yes."

"Well, how did you do this?"

"Well, I said was he withholding anything?"

You say, "*No, no, no, no, no.*"

The withholds that had been missed, that had been restimulated. The withholds that were available that weren't picked up. And the auditing question would be, "When you were being audited by Joe Doakes, did Joe Doakes restimulate any reprehensible activities or something that you were withholding and didn't ask for it all the way and didn't get the dope? *Missed* withhold. Joe Doakes' session with you *when he didn't pick up the information that he restimulated.*"

And you finally will get it through, but it – I'm sure that it's going to cause trouble. Because you say missed withhold, everybody knows exactly what you mean. Unless they've been here for training, they know exactly what you mean. Naturally, you're talking about a withhold. No, no, no. A missed withhold is a *missed* withhold. It's *missed*. It has been restimulated or asked for in some prior time to the time it is being asked for.

If you run a session on missed withholds, you never ask for anything the person is withholding during the entire body of the session. You don't ever say, "Are you withholding anything" You just say, "Has anybody missed a withhold on you? Have I ever missed a withhold on you? All right, who was the first person to audit you? The first person was Joe Doakes. Joe Doakes ever miss a withhold on you?" Got the idea?

"Did your mother ever miss a withhold on you? Did your father ever miss a withhold on you? Did your father at any time ask you where you had been after school? And if he had asked just a little bit more insistently, you would have told him where he was and you told him something different and you didn't tell him right and you told him wrong and you were thereafter mad at your father?"

"Well, I see what you mean. Yeah, oh."

"Yeah, some information that your father restimulated, in other words, on you, which he then didn't get."

"Oh, that's what you mean. Well, yes, we can ... Oh, yea, well, lots. Why didn't you ask something?"

Now, you say, "Well, were ..." – this is an entirely different thing – "Were you withholding anything from your father? Did you ever withhold anything from your father? Did your father not know something about you? What did you do? What was there about you that your father didn't know?"

See, you could ask all these questions and not get a missed withhold answered ever. "What didn't your father know about you? What didn't your father know about you? What didn't your family know about you? What didn't your father know about you?" You go on and never pick up a missed withhold.

"Now, at any time was it possible that your father could have found out what you really did in high school? Was there any period there when the information was available and your father didn't ask for it?"

And all of a sudden, why, the pc remembers having hidden the liquor – wine bottle under the bed suddenly before his father walked in the door. And the room was reeking with wine.

And his father never said, "What is that smell?" And he was always mad at his father afterwards and never knew why. Do you see how far this goes? See, the information was available, but Papa didn't ask for it. So therefore, Papa's guilty of a missed withhold.

Information available and not asked for. That is the thing which makes a wild animal out of a pc.

Now, I want you all to get a reality on it, that when a pc gets upset, you have a missed withhold, not that you have missed a withhold. That you have a missed withhold. You in the beginning rudiments said, "All right. Are you withholding anything? Oh, thank you very much. Good. Do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc was just on the verge of saying, "You know, there's something I've been doing lately that's out ... Oh, do I have a present time problem?"

Half an hour deep into the session, the pc says, "Why do you keep repeating the auditing question over and over? You're about to drive me mad."

What's happened here? You've restimulated him. You have told him that he is not going to survive. You have told him that he is going to have to defend himself and you've put him into the state of a wild animal. He can't do anything else but fight you. Asking for one and not getting it is the only real sin that you can commit as an auditor except not auditing. It's asking for one and not getting it, is what we mean by missed withhold.

We don't mean all those withholds that the pc has got. We don't mean all those withholds. He's got – I can guarantee you, ten to the twenty-first power binary digits squared, cubed and then after that, to the twenty-first power again would not begin to count the withholds he's accumulated in one trillion years. See, he's just got scillions of them. But restimulating one and not pulling it, you got a savage beast on your hands.

That's the whole source of ARC break and auditor upsets with pcs. Actually, your auditing poise and ability to handle the pc and so on is not anywhere near as bad as you think it is. It is better than you think it is in actual fact. But you believe that it is worse than it is be-

cause you've missed withholds and been chewed out by pcs so often. The pc was never concerned with your auditing skill. He was only concerned with your having missed a withhold that you might have gotten.

Now, you just put that down in your book and if I can teach you that and get you to audit by that principle and at the same time to get you to audit perfectly, wow, will you sail. Okay?

All right. Well, that's what there is about withholds. That's why they work and that's why they turn people savage. That's how they function and where they fit. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Any value to you?

Audience: Yes.

Good enough. Thank you.

MISSED WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on 7 February 1962

Thank you. Thank you. Okay. It's the 7th of February, AD 12 and here we have a lecture. You've just seen a demonstration. Did you learn anything from the demonstration?

Audience: Yes.

Any question you'd like to ask about the demonstration?

Male voice: Yes. Should you always look for tone arm and needle action on the E-Meter?

Needle action. Havingness is all with needle action. Of course, needle action is compounded by the absence of tone arm action and you start running Havingness on somebody without a quiver on the needle – doesn't work, that's all. It compounds the felony. Now, you would have to look for tone arm action on somebody who had one of these flying needles that was a hyperagitated needle. You'll see these needles once in a while on manic-depressives, asylum cases, people who are very agitated and so forth.

You don't ordinarily audit this type of person. And you seldom audit one. But that is, you cut the sensitivity all the way down to nothing and the needle's still flying all over the place, then on Havingness you'd have to rely on tone arm motion. That would be about the only exception there would be to the rule.

Now, I made a couple of small errors. One error is not advancing the sensitivity knob before I asked the first rudiment question. Both for beginning and end rudiments, I did the same thing, all brought about through the mechanics of the demonstration. That is to say I'm trying to keep myself out of the road of the E-Meter while I audit. And you notice that shadow that came across the corner of the E-Meter a couple of times. Well, that's my shoulder and the E-Meter has to be moved over just a hair before I can be totally comfortable about it.

So I was sort of avoiding passing up the E-Meter and therefore didn't monkey with it. But that is not a standard review of the thirty-six Havingness Processes. That is to say, of how you get them or how you use them but would be a review of trying to patch up somebody's havingness. You're just trying to find something that works on the thing.

And very often, if you know your business – which there is no substitute for knowing your business – you figure out, "Well, there is something going on here that we're not quite sure what's going on." So we try to find out what's going on, quietly. Nothing very ecstatically or something; just quietly try to find out what's going on with this pc, see? And we're running a Havingness Process and we're getting no needle action of any kind whatsoever. You noticed that, didn't you? Did you notice that before I did something about it?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Well, naturally, I just started talking about the aspects of havingness, you know. "Is there anything around here," you know, "that would keep you from having something," and you know, that sort of thing And finally got on the subject of nothing reaching her and we had a drop, see? Well, that was enough. Then let's run "reach."

"Reach" would obviously produce some kind of a reaction, if "not reach" produced a reaction. Of course, if I had run "not reach" very long, we would have had her on the floor. [laughter] It was good enough for a test, you know?

And sometimes you can spring something the pc is terribly allergic to – you know, just [snaps fingers] *bang*, you know – on some kind of a havingness test in the room.

Okay. Well, that was a successful Havingness session in that we got the pc to get some havingness and repaired the pc's havingness. And of course, what you're watching here, of course, is a little bit different than an auditing session in that you are not running a pc who is in a calm state of mind at *all*. And pc is quite upset by an invisible audience and that sort of thing. And before you get them settled down, why, you have to do a little bit of work on it. And they settle down; they work all right.

But actually, it takes a considerable amount of auditor presence. It'd take more, much more auditor presence to get anything done on a session of that character than it would be in an ordinary session.

The difficulties of handling a pc under demonstration with everybody present are just almost insurmountable. And they are surmountable on this type of demonstration. Of course, I'm used to this type of demonstration. I've done it before many times. Produced some rather interesting results. I'm against demonstration auditing by the way. I'm dead against it. I don't audit that way at all.

What I like to do is I like to get an auditing session going and do something for the pc. And for me, the session is always for the pc. And if I can't run a session on the basis of getting something done for the pc, well, I'm rather – I get rather upset.

I did learn something in setting that up that you should know. And that is, all due respect to having meters around... I was up at five o'clock last night trying to figure out how in the name of common sense to hold a session together, you see, underneath TV conditions, and I found out something: that I never audit with a meter dial out of my line of sight with the pc. That's got to be a straight line. The pc, the dial, me, the dial, the pc. And just by lifting my eyes, why, I can look at the pc and just by dropping my eyes, I can see what's going on with the dial. And I just found out I just never, never audit successfully at all with the pc out of line of sight.

And because the pc's treated to this all the time. You see, your head's being kicked over and that is, of course, a signal that "I am not interested in your case."

So, of course, a pc wouldn't stay in-session worth a nickel. And possibly some of your session difficulties – I just discovered this – some of your session difficulties is having a meter out of a line – out of the line of sight of the pc. There's the pc, there's the meter, there's

you, see? And if you can rig it this way, it's fine. Actually, we have no such thing as an auditing chair. An auditing chair, as Suzie was saying last night, should have an arm that comes across and no opening on the – or no closure on the left hand side so that you slide out of the chair, you slide into the chair. And you got a bar or a plate or something between you and the pc. And then you got the meter on line of sight.

Well, I learned that and you put a great deal of stress or pressure on an auditing session, that you really have to observe what you're doing and analyze what it's all about and you're – undoubtedly will learn something about auditing. And I just found out I never do otherwise. I wouldn't know how to run a session with my meter out of my line of sight.

See, actually, the meter is an extension of the pc to me and if my head is pointed toward the pc, all I've got to do is just drop my eyes slightly. I'll show you here, see. All I got to do is – I'm looking at you and all I got to do is drop my eyes, see. See? There's no motion to distract the pc, don't you see?

Give you a feeling like you're kind of in-session? [laughter] All right. End of session. [laughter, laughs] All right.

But an interesting little mechanic. It's one of these stupid things. It's like Dick said one day, "You do something that auditors don't do. You acknowledge the pc when he does something." These little – little bugs come up every once in a while. And we find out there's variations of them.

All right. Here we are. 7 Feb. AD 12 and I'd like to talk to you some more about missed withholds. This is in vogue just now. And the crash program which you, when you get back to Central Organizations, will have – will collide with and which you ought to pay some attention to because it sets up some new check spots in organizations.

You make sure that students don't sit around with missed withholds. You make sure that HGC pcs at least once during a twenty-five-hour intensive, but preferably toward its end, are given a check by a very good auditor separate from the auditor, you see, for missed withholds. And all you do is turn the pc back to the auditor to be cleaned up.

And you've got to keep this checked up, that's all. I mean, that's got to be straightened up. And on the – and on the auditing program of staff auditing, you've got to keep missed withholds checked up on all of those cases going through. The first step of the crash program is to pick up all missed withholds. And that's being done in most Central Organizations at this very minute at a high rate of speed.

And the other aspects of the crash program are not as important to you at the moment. They exist, however. One is to get org rudiments in and... But this business of missed withholds is susceptible to the greatest misinterpretation and if I've had trouble teaching people about missed withholds, then you're going to have trouble teaching people about missed withholds. I guarantee it.

Because you say "missed withhold," and the auditor asks for withholds. You say, "Get the missed withholds on that case."

So the auditor says, "All right. Are you withholding anything?" And that is [pounds the table] *not-the-mechanism!*

You say to somebody, "Have you missed any withholds on the case?" – he'll go back in and ask for withholds. And that is *wrong*. Wrrrrrrong! W-r-o-n-g exclamation point, underscore, in Gothic.

Now, a missed withhold is this whole mechanism of what somebody should have found out and didn't. And it is what somebody *should* have found out and *didn't*. And that is the whole works. It isn't a withhold. It's a should-have-found-out.

So you possibly will save yourself a great deal of grief if you tell people to get the should-have-found-outs off the case. Rather than the missed withholds. Now, am I communicating? Should-have-found-outs.

"You and me was sitting here six months ago and we was doing a process and should I have found out anything about you, whether I asked for it or not?" That's a – it'd be almost legitimate to ask such a blunt question, you know. You could ask such a question like that. You know, you just – it just falls out of the hamper, you know. I mean, there's fireworks and small rockets go off in all directions and a great deal of relief comes on the case.

Well, look at somebody now. We could ask her – she's a nurse, all right? And you could ask her, "What should a doctor have found out about you, the knucklehead." [laughter] And you produce the most fantastic amount of case gain.

Evidently, it's practically an affront not to be able to find out about something. Any time you want to go around wearing a bath towel with a Woolworth diamond on it and be a swami reading people's minds, also take out a large insurance policy and get your burial arrangements straight. It's probably why they hung Christ, if they did. That's right. That's right. If he was the Son of God, he should have been able to find out about all the orthodox malpractices. And he didn't. And they hung him. They didn't hang him. They crucified him. Common practice of the day. If he existed.

It isn't true that he led a good life, so they crucified him. You see, that wouldn't be the right story. He should have found out about 'em and he didn't, so you see they had to crucify him and that's just about the way it would be.

Now, if you go around telling everybody you can read their minds – I know this might get you lots of pcs for a little while – be sure at the same time that you go down to the Bide-a-Wee Cemetery and get yourself a nice quiet lot because – probably you won't have time a little while later. It's very hard to buy a lot when you haven't got a body to pull money out of the pockets of. But that's about how it is, you see?

If you set yourself up on a basis of being able to read minds and all that sort of thing, it isn't going to be an everytime situation, but it is going to be frequent enough that you will wish, for God's sakes, that you'd asked for what you should have found out and didn't. Naturally, if you can read minds or you're up in that plane or you're supposed to be observing things and you don't find out something about somebody, hell hath no snowball able to resist the fury. It's going to be a mess.

Now, you sit down there as an auditor... You don't know how many times you and I do mean you, have done this with an HGC pc or a pc from the field – how many times you have done this. You have sat down in a calm, cool, collected frame of mind and have started up an ordinary session and two sessions later have had a God-awful ARC break with the pc that you couldn't spot what it was all about.

Well, now, this would appear even more mysterious if you weren't using an – E-Meters and if E-Meters weren't being used at that period of auditing. You see?

This person's upset because you haven't found out about him. That's what that person is upset about. You've been auditing there for two days and at any time he has expected you to suddenly come up and ask him, "Well, when did you rob the bank, Bud?" You know?

And you haven't said a word about it and he gets very upset. Well, frankly, we don't care about the theoretical mechanism. This is not discovered from the field of theory. This is totally empirical. This is something that I have scouted down and have found to be true. And it is becoming more and more alarmingly, increasingly true. And the further I look and the more ARC breaks I check up on and the more dissatisfied pcs and the more ARC broke field auditors and the more upset people who didn't go back to the PE Course and all of that sort of thing – it is just getting absolutely overwhelming. And it's empirical; totally, completely empirical. It is gained from observation alone. And I don't care whether there – any theory under the sun, moon or stars fits this or not.

I've given you a theory yesterday which accounts for it very well. But I don't care whether that theory accounts for it or not and neither should you. It just happens to be a fact that all ARC breaks, dissatisfactions with Scientology, upsets in sessions, blows from sessions, failure-to-gain profiles are all traceable back not to withholds but to *missed* withholds.

You can straighten people out by straightening out PT problems. You can straighten them out by straightening out ARC breaks. You can straighten them out in all these other things and that is all true and you can do it. But you can reach beyond all this. You can reach beyond this and straighten this pc out so fast, he won't know whether he's riding a streetcar or a jet plane by just finding out what you – what others should have found out and didn't or what you should have found out and didn't. Because a pc has some very peculiar considerations with regard to this. And these considerations are so peculiar that you would never, never, never be able to guess your way around them.

We don't care what the mechanism is or anything else. We just wouldn't be able to guess your way around them. So just stop trying to guess your way around these things and just overtly continue to ask for missed withholds. Ask for should-have-known's.

Use it routinely and regularly. Take one teaspoonful three times a session. Sig: 1 t-a-d. [laughter] That's the way the pharmacist would state it.

Now, that's the way the cat jumps. That's all. Pc comes in, sits down in session, you run off an almost letter-perfect session. Halfway through the session, pc blows up, says, "When the hell did you learn how to audit? What am I doing sitting here? You haven't done this, you haven't done that, you just dropped the E-Meter on the floor and what was the idea

of making the cans explode in my face? You've just evaluated for me and you've done this and you've done that."

Now, let me – let me make this very clear: You might have done all those things, but it would not be cause for an ARC break unless you had missed a withhold.

So you can miss a withhold in the session, just overtly. You say to the pc, you say, "All right. Are you withholding anything?" And it goes *clang*. And you're using a Pembry meter or something of the sort, or an old Mathison or something. And it doesn't go *clang*, but it should have. A Mark IV would have gone *clang*, you see. And you say, "Thank you. Do you have a present time problem?"

The germs of war are sown. The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse have begun to ride. Because anywhere within the next five minutes or the next half hour or the next hour and a half, you're going to make some little fumble of some kind or another or you're not going to make one or you're going to make a large one or you're going to run a perfect session, but you're going to have a God-awful, screaming ARC break. And the pc, according to his modifier, will behave.

And for some reason or other, the missed withhold throws the pc's modifier of his main goal exactly and immediately into full cry. You can always tell what a pc will do when he has an ARC break, it will be the modifier of his main goal line. Now, whether or not you've fished this out, running 3D Criss Cross – if you've gotten to the point where you're getting a package and you're going in for the goal now to match up all the parts you've got – you will find the modifier on top of it and it will explain all of his session behavior.

Supposing the session behavior was – this would be very mysterious to you and you wouldn't quite know what an ARC break was if a pc had "and I'll cry and cry and cry and then afterwards go away and never come back." Supposing that were the modifier.

The auditor would sit there and say, "I got some nice grief charges off the pc, but he didn't turn up for the next session." [laughter]

You see, you could be very baffled. So you mustn't think that an ARC break simply climbs up with the smoke of the volcano. It doesn't. It follows the exact modifier of the pc and of course, as you know, if you care to look over a bunch of modifiers on assorted cases, you could see how varied this might be, how varied it would be. And it is very variable. But the pc's modifier goes into action and the pc starts to dramatize his modifier. And of course, from there on, you're just in trouble all the way.

And what starts this chain of material? What starts this one happening? Now, you can prevent it from happening by cleaning up ARC breaks as fast as they happen, by getting withholds off as fast as they happen, by making sure there is no present time problem. You get all these carefulnesses? Now, you can make sure that that is held in check. It's held in abeyance.

You can also, by the way, stop it from being dramatized if you know the modifier by repeating the modifier at the pc. This is rather poor show, but it's *in extremis*. You can always get a list to read again by chanting the modifier at the pc. It's a secondary action. It's not anywhere near as good as actually auditing the pc.

But something is going to happen here which is going to interrupt the session and you're going to have to do something about it. And as I say, there are many things that you could do about it. And of course you can't audit a pc with a present time problem and, yes, you shouldn't audit a pc with an ARC break and yes, this is all true, you see? And you shouldn't audit a pc with a current withhold. But if you really want to put all of these rudiments in, *clank* – wouldn't it be nice to have a weapon which would just put all the rudiments in, *swish, bang*, you know; I mean you wouldn't have any more trouble – you just run "should have known" to death and you'll have it all straight.

So in your beginning rudiments, "Are you withholding anything" – should undoubtedly be followed with a second line. I'm not going to necessarily insert this into any routine patter. It'd be nice to do so, but I'm going to say that it should be a technology which goes above patter because you should be able to use it at any time. And you should have it as a weapon which you will use, not park someplace back in a ritual, don't you see?

After you've said, "Are you withholding anything" say any version of ... And you see, there – one of the – one of the difficulties of putting a pat patter there is there are so many ways it can be asked. You'd have to ask it differently for practically every pc.

Let's see. Well, you could work it this way. You notice the pc's there and everything is fine and it's going along, but you know the pc is getting a Sec Check session by another auditor.

Now, you want to set yourself straight. So you say, "Well, have – has the other auditor missed a withhold on you?" See, you'd use that wording "Are you withholding anything?" all right, that's for you. Now, that's routine. But you understand it's not even a cousin to this other thing we're doing. You see, they're not even cousins. Let's just divorce them completely. They're in different families of action. You can say, "Are you withholding anything" and you're right on the line. But don't think you should drop out "Are you withholding anything?" because you're going to ask a should-have-know.

In other words, just – these actually aren't even cousins. "Withholding anything" is all new stuff, kid. See, let's get the new stuff on the line. Let's open up the stock room and let's find out how many paper dollies and pornographic comic books that we've got on file here, you see. And we're going to take new inventory and it's new stock and – get the idea? That's all brand new.

But this other – this other – this goes back to what people should have found out. And that's past. That's old stuff. So you say anything in – after that "Are you withholding anything?" that might fit the circumstances of the case.

All right. We know that we are auditing – I'll give you an example. We know we are auditing a girl who has a wandering eye. And she – she very possibly may have sinned against the twelfth or thirteenth commandment, whatever it might be, you see. And she might not have. But we know that we continue to get problems off of this girl with her boyfriend, see. We get problems all the time. Well, we're tired of these problems because they never lead to anything and they burn up about half the session. We just dispense with the whole lot. We get rid of this whole family of domestic, internecine warfares by simply asking, "What should your boyfriend, Ralph, have found out about you that he didn't?"

"Well, I was out with Joe last night, of course."

"All right. When was that?" All right. Good. Fine. You're not now going to have a present time problem to take care of. But omitting that, you see, at that point, the chronic favorite present time problem of the pc is going to pop up in the next rudiment. You've just short-circuited the whole thing by asking this.

You see why it can't be a pat rudiment. You note this girl's also getting Sec Checking. So you say, "All right. Did your Sec Check auditor miss a withhold on you? What should your Sec Check auditor have found out about you?" You know, clearing all these points. "Is there anything I should have found out about you in yesterday's session? Is there anything I should have found out about you when you sat down three minutes ago?" You know? All right. It's all clean.

I'll guarantee you that if you clean that across the boards, you won't have an ARC break or a rudiment out for the remainder of the session. You just sit there and audit like a little soldier.

Now, there's one reservation I would make on this. If you're all of a sudden tearing up tons and tons of new material and you're knocking the bank appetite over tin cup and you all of a sudden have a large area of track on which the pc has recall, you get right in there and ask it again. You got it? Because the whole thing is reversed. The condition of the case has changed.

Now, I know that an auditor who's being paid by the hour might occasionally, unconsciously with his Freudian subconscious, not his Scientological subconscious – he might possibly realize that if the pc got no change, he would go on being audited forever. That would be a very mean thing to even infer and the only reason I bring it up – not to be sarcastic, because I seldom am. What I wish to bring up is the fact that I sometimes am amazed by your lack of expectancy of change. I'm amazed by the fact that you apparently don't make a sufficient allowance for change in auditing a case.

And I've actually had auditors auditing me become very upset because my case was changing with too great a rapidity. Well, I was changing too fast.

No, an auditor should – is auditing to produce change. Now, of course, change will give him consequences. And the consequences are that the aspect of the case shifts. And you get a – you get this case and you're swishing along with this case and you're – and you'll – by the way, this never becomes more apparent than in doing 3D Criss Cross. It's very apparent in Sec Checking too. But in 3D Criss Cross, this could get quite dizzying.

You start out auditing a harlot in one session, you see and you wind up auditing a gleeful killer. And the pc will follow that terminal track through and you're auditing a different bank before you get through.

And if you've never noticed this, you better pick your eye up because at first, why, the pc is sitting there, [demonstrates something] you know, and at the end of the session, [changes voice, demonstrates something else, laughter] you've just shifted the bank.

Well, every one of those identities that you're going through has its own bank, see. You must realize that. It has its own bank. You are auditing different banks. You know? It's packages. It's whole packages of engrams and you got a new bank.

Now, when you're listing and if you're listing very effectively with the pc right practically coming straight through the E-Meter after you, you know – just right there, you know – man, that pc will be sitting awfully close to the terminal they announce.

And let's say you're listing at the rate of two new terminals a minute. That would be very slow listing. Two terminals a minute. All right. You've got two cases a minute if your pc is right in-session. Now, you talk about change, man. That's why I'm trying to boot you up the line and why I'm being so insulting and so mean and so vicious – which I'm not being at all, actually you'd be surprised at the number of withholds you give me in doing your pcs' reports, you know. Like, I never remark on it, "Oh, my God, not again. For the second day," you see. I just withhold it, and so forth. And it all has to be run out.

No, I'm trying to raise your level of expectancy of what you should get out of this, you see. And if you do it even vaguely right, you'll find... You think you've been running this old – this old Model T Ford, you see, you think you've been running this old Model T Ford down this back country road, you know. And it's going along at ten miles an hour and you're happy and so forth. And all of a sudden you slide into how to do it right and you find out that you're actually riding a jet plane that is outward bound for Arcturus, you know. And it's quite a shock when an auditor really starts grooving this thing.

You make 3D Criss Cross work for you and you're changing a bank, a bank, a bank, a bank, a bank, you see? You're going through these lock valences, lock valences. And they aren't very deep or they aren't very penetrating, but if the pc's getting any cognitions, the pc's shifting. The pc's just shifting all the time, shifting all the time, shifting all the time. And you've got a different bank – every time the pc goes through fifteen or twenty, you've got a *totally* different bank now, don't you see?

But every time you get an item, have you ever noticed the pc will dramatize the last item you found? Hm? In the next session, the pc dramatizes the last item you found. It'd drive you batty. You're accustomed to this pc throwing the cans down in the middle of the room. That's the custom. He throws the cans down in the middle of the room.

And all of a sudden with great shock, the pc carefully unclips the electrodes off of the cans and puts them very carefully on the windowsill before she blows, you know? [laughter]

But you'll see case changes if you're really pressing ahead on 3D Criss Cross. And you get into one of these case changes – which I'm trying to drive through in this lecture – you see, if you get into one of these case changes there's a whole bunch of should-have-known's. The whole aspect of should-have-known's has all of a sudden shifted. And you handle these in the sort of the sloppy fashion of the middle rudiments. You get the rudiments in, you make sure the rudiments are in.

Now, don't distract the pc all over the place. Just notice, just please, please notice when a pc goes a tenth out of session. Don't wait till the pc goes half out of session or three-quarters out of session or leaves the room. You start tuning your observational powers up to

knowing whether or not a pc is in-session or not. And I just won't settle for anything less than that. It's a human observation.

This pc has started to talk to you rather coolly, distantly and so forth. You're already too late. You should have noticed it ahead of that.

And at the time you notice this, the one you get in, basically, is "should have known".

Oddly enough, for that valence the pc is now in, there are some missed withholds that weren't missed for the pc that you had a minute ago. You see how this could be? So when a pc starts to slide out of session, that first tiny little slide out of session is the one I want you to get.

I tell you, the quality of an auditor is observable at the stage of ARC break that the auditor asks or acts. You know, it's the stage of ARC breaks which causes the auditor to act.

Now, an auditor who is – who is the rhinoceros-type auditor, you see, handles the ARC break as the pc is going down the stairs. That's the time that auditor handles the ARC break. Now, an auditor who's a little more alert, considerably more alert, handles the ARC break at the moment the pc stands up to leave the room. Another auditor a little bit better and a little more alert, handles the ARC break at the moment the pc throws the cans down.

Now, a little bit better auditor notices the upward flick of the wrist. [laughter] You see the gradient here. And now we're getting into a pretty good auditor. He knows that the pc has stopped talking. He notices the pc has not answered any question for a long time because it'll be a long time; the pc's gone on for a long time not really in communication, you see, before he starts throwing the cans down.

And then we get into the very, very perceptive auditor who notices that the pc is really not speaking sooth. He spake noteth sooth, he did. He – you ask him – I don't care what you're running; you're asking him for a list and he says, "A cotton picker. A cotton mouth." And he's been going on, "A cotton picker! A cotton mouth!" and now he isn't talking that way, you see? He's saying, "Cotton picker. Cotton mouth. Mm ... I um ..."

Along about that point it just – it takes just that much change of pace on the part of the pc for me to perceive he's gone out of session. I mend the session then.

And oddly enough, the pc doesn't ever recognize there's been an ARC break. I take a little bit of pride in knowing there's an ARC break before the pc finds it out. And, man, can you patch up a session in a hurry if you patch up the ARC break which has occurred but the pc has not found out about yet.

Now, you can be too anxious on this point and you can patch up nonextant ARC breaks and cause one. So you see, it's a very, very tight little dividing line which is very tiny. And the dividing line is: Don't patch up nonextant ARC breaks or you'll cause one; patch up extant ARC breaks before the pc finds it out. And it's right at that little barrier point that you should pick 'em up. And that is really expert if you can do that. You got it made.

Now, you start checking on this sort of thing, you'll find out that a should-have-known undoubtedly is the theory which lies behind what has happened – a should-have-known lying in there someplace. Case has shifted and a should-have-known.

So you could say, "What should I have found out?" Anything as blunt or stupid as this. Or "What should people have found out?" You could say anything like this as a question and it'll knock the thing back in. The session will go back in again. Go back in again right now. Clean it up.

For instance, a pc who is on an incipient ARC break, a pc who has a should-have-found-out is always on the verge of an ARC break. Always right there on the verge of it if he's got a continuous I-should-have-found-out, they-should-have-found-out, you-should-have-found-out, somebody-should-have-found-out.

And that is what you call the ARC breaky pc. He is riding on a should-have-found-out. And anytime you have called somebody an ARC breaky pc, just think of that person and then reclassify what was wrong with him on a "He was a should-have-found-out person" you see? "They should have found out about me" and they didn't find out about him and so therefore, he continues to be an ARC breaky person.

Anybody who is going to blow, who is going to give you any trouble, who is going to give you a bunch of upset, who is going to vilify the organization, who is going to all of a sudden become disinterested in auditing, who is going to be very upset by what you are doing to them – all of these various categories crawl under the heading of should-have-found-out. And a should-have-found-out in some category or another that may have relatively little to do with you, but you happen to join the mob that should have found out, you see? You happen to be classified in that zone. Anybody you're going to have any trouble with.

Now, this one principle, above and beyond all other principles, lies behind your ARC breaks and this one principle is that principle more responsible for loss of dissemination and loss of Scientologists and public to Scientology than any other single factor.

This means, this observational fact coming up means a considerable change of policy with regard to the functioning of PE Foundations, the functioning of co-audits. The reason you lose people on co-audits, the reason why you're having difficulty handling this zone and sphere, why they don't move over from PE to co-audit has nothing to do with recognized truth. The truth which you are trying to tell them is easily recognized. But the truth which they are wearing that you should have found out about, if you don't recognize that, *aah*.

So the way you could run – this is *in extremis* – the way you could run a PE Foundation would be simply on the basis that everybody in the PE Foundation is a professional finder-out-about. You know, they don't tell anybody about the ARC triangle and they don't tell anybody about auditing and they don't hardly mention the name Scientology and you'd have a tremendously overwhelmingly successful PE Foundation. I think that's your bug on PE co-audit.

Now, that still has to be tested and put in operation, has not yet been squared up. But I think you will find that it lies in that zone and field. Anybody who walks in for a PE Course should be – until you find out otherwise – should be classified as a should-have-found-out case. This is a should-have-found-out person. And the reason most of them come in is to find out if you can find out what you should find out. And that is why people come in to PE Foundations.

They don't come into PE Foundations to learn about Scientology or to be helped or any other of the reasons why we think they come into PE Foundations. The greatest bulk of them, apparently – subject to test and further figures – apparently appear to find out if you can find out about 'em. And if you don't find out about them, they ARC break, it is all the worse, they go out and tell everybody that you're fakes and frauds and there you've had it.

So that if your PE Foundation was totally composed of should have – of finding-out personnel – finding out about people who should be found out – and nothing else, why, you'd be very successful about the thing.

Now, if you take a profile, if you have a test department and you take somebody's profile and you take this profile and you draw it all up and you put him on the E-Meter and you ask them how they feel about two or three things and coordinate their profile and put this all on file and then you write them a big, long rundown on the subject of their profile and you get it into their hands, you think you're performing a considerable service. Quite a few of those people will be with you, but the largest lot of them are now missed withhold cases. How do you like that? And you have just created an anti-Scientology public.

Tests. You shouldn't be doing tests on these people. Put an E-Meter crew on the job.

"All right. Do you want to come down to this PE Course? Well, very good. There are certain requisites to this PE Course and we have a little form we have to fill out here. All right, Mrs. Zilch. Now, (sensitivity 16), just hold on to the electrodes there. There's a very small amount of current that goes through that won't shock you now. All right. Now, here we are, now. All right. What should we find out about you? Thank you." Then clear it.

"Now, what should the last group you joined have found out about you and didn't?" Clear it.

You say, "All right. That's fine. All right. Now, what should have been found out about you by your last group?" No reaction. "Good. We gotta go off now. All right. What should we find out about you? All right. We got that. Fine. All right. Here's your ticket to class." You'll never lose 'em.

That is what they mean by "You are the people who know." [*Audience: Aha! Mmh!*] You're the people who know. What do they mean by this? What about, what about, what know? Yeah, we know all about life. We know all about the mind. But the reason why we know is because we know about them. That's what their idea of knowingness is.

What is knowingness? That they robbed a bank. That is knowingness. Here are all the riddles of the human mind laid out here in a string. All you have to do is read on down the line. That isn't knowingness to this person. It's whether or not you robbed a bank. Whether or not you can find out he robbed a bank. If you can find out he robbed the bank, then you know. Now, you must be smart, you must be clever and you must know your business. And I don't think from that moment on you have to prove anything. Isn't that fascinating?

You go on and give them standard PE, of course, that sort of thing, afterwards.

Co-audit, unfortunately, becomes almost impossible under this particular line unless it's E-Metered. Then it would have to be Mark IV E-Metered. Then the people who were be-

ing run through co-audit would have to be checked out routinely on "What should have been known about you?"

You could possibly – you can always dream up the answers to this sort of thing, but I set up the impossibility that exists at the moment. If you continue to run a co-audit exactly as you're running a co-audit, you're going to lose more people off the co-audit than you keep on it. And that's why a co-audit doesn't build up. A co-audit builds up only if the should-have-knows are to be pulled off the case. If you were to pull all those off cases in a co-audit, then that co-audit would build up, up, up and you would get something done.

So that back of all rudiments lies the should-have-known. Therefore, we see the definition of knowledge to a person is knowledge about themselves in terms of their overts. That's hideous. But to the bulk of the public, the entirety of knowledge is just whether or not you know their particular overts. And if you know their particular overts, then you are a very, very clever person. And you are a true swami. And that's it. That's what knowingness is to them.

Now, we've been trying to climb this ladder backwards for a long time, trying to find out where bottom was. And that is the bottom definition of "knowing," the bottom definition of "knowledge."

Knowledge is overts. "If he knows about my overts, then he is a wise man. He is a typically wise man. He knows all the secrets of the universe because he knows that I routinely and customarily drink Gordon's Gin at work."

It's surprising, you see. You'd never really look for such an anticlimax on the subject of knowledge. But you see, that is the beginning of the ladder and after that, of course, you have to know. And the funny part of it is, you would have to know all about life and so forth to keep the ladder going on up. You'd have to know the lot of it.

And actually, apparently, knowing the lot of it really brings about this other datum which I'm just giving you, you know about these people in terms of their overts. You know what their overts are, then you are a wise man.

An auditor is always blessed who has pulled the pc's overts properly. He must be a good auditor. You ask auditors around, you ask pcs, "Who is really a good auditor around here?" And they say, "So-and-so," and this will be colored ... In a professional group such as this one, of course, it'll actually be who's a good auditor. But in a – in an HCA/HPA trainee level or something like that, you'll get a different aspect entirely. And it'd just be "who was able to get the should-have-knowns off".

Now, "get the withholds off" doesn't qualify. "Get the should-have-knowns off," that does qualify. You get the difference between a withhold and a should-have-known. You're a *smart* auditor. You are a *clever* auditor. You are an *expert* beyond all experts because you got this one pc's should-have-knowns off. Didn't get his withholds off, you see. That didn't count.

You put a lot of time in on him; you were very clever. And these are really what were making the pc well and climbing uphill and changing his case and everything else. Never notice those. You got off the should-have-knowns. Boy, are you a good auditor. You're a smart bunny. "That fellow is real clever. I don't know how he got that out of me. But he's certainly a smart auditor. He's really clever."

How did the auditor get it out of him? The auditor said, "All right, who are you having trouble with in life?"

"Well, I mostly have trouble with my family."

"Good. Well, what should your family have found out about you that it didn't?"

"Oh, that. Oh, really nothing. Yeah, well, well, if you insist, yeah. Well, there are a couple of little things. I used to throw my shirt studs – I used to throw them carelessly in the drawer. You won't – you won't buy that? All right. Let's see, uh – uh ..." And all of a sudden, why, you find out what his family should have found out about him.

Now, you know, you know life. You know life. You know. You know. You know what life consists of. I think that's the test that must be run on practically everybody as to whether or not they have intelligence or not. I think this is the IQ test administered by everybody on everybody. It's can they find out about me? If they can find out about me, man, they're a clever person.

So therefore, should-have-known does not dispense with but outranks all rudiments. Does not dispense with withholds but is much deeper and more profound than a mere withhold. It is a type of withhold in that it's a past withhold which has been restimulated. You've restimulated something and haven't pulled it. Well, you're in trouble right now. You've restimulated a withhold and now the person halfway knows about it and then you don't know about it. Well, now you're the most stupid person on Earth and preclears will gratuitously tell you you are.

Now, a lot of you – a lot of you and a lot of people who hear this tape will have at one time or another had their auditing mauled, damaged, pounded in the head, they've been scolded, screamed at, howled, decried, had their auditing confidence shaken and so forth, by ARC broken pcs. This is the lot of an auditor to a large degree.

I want to call something to your attention, is your auditing was never that bad. It was pretty bad, but it was never that bad. [laughter] The thing that was out during every one of those ARC break things and that caused this cascade of criticism of your auditing was a should-have-known. That was what was out in that session where you got reamed out. Your auditing skill has not been at fault. It was that little piece of technology that was sitting in there.

Now, knowing that, you should be able to come forward and do a much better job of auditing because you won't be going up against that unknown of "When is this pc going to ARC break?" and "What is going to happen in this session?" or "Can I steer this session right?" or "This person is a pretty mean sort of a pc to handle," or anything else that comes in, in that category. You can just jump that over.

Go ahead and improve your technology, your presence and your ability to audit. By all means, you should. But skill of auditing is basically speed of gain. This is what you measure skill of auditing on. The more a pc can be held into session, the more gain a pc is going to make in that session.

The better you are as an auditor, the more rapid your advance is going to be on the pc and the fewer things you'll have to patch up and so forth. And this can get down to a point of where your auditing skill is so poor that your pc makes no advance because, of course the frog is climbing two inches up the well and falling back two inches or three inches some-times. You see, and climbs up two inches and falls back two inches and climbs up two inches and falls back two inches. You never make any case gain because the auditing skill is so monkeyed up and wooden headed and double-fisted, you see? It's just poor.

We're now talking about skill, not what you run on the pc. We're talking about your use of Model Session, your ability to hold the pc in-session, your ability to handle your tools, your ability to get something done in a session, your ability to avoid corny mistakes of one kind or another. See, all of those – just auditing ability. Now, the better those things are, the better you are, you see, at handling all these things, why, the more gain the pc's going to make.

Now, over and above this, if you can hold cancelled and nullified all of your pc's jolts and no progresses and rudiments and so forth and particularly this button which goes back of the rudiments, what are you going to wind up with? Your pcs are going to fly. That's all.

I'm still sitting here waiting for you to make your pcs fly, you know. I don't settle for anything less than a sixty-five foot wingspread on a pc. And that's what I'm trying to get you to do, you see, is audit with such smoothness, such command of your tools and so forth, that you just go right ahead and make progress along the line. That's what I'm interested in your doing.

But now technically, we suddenly turn up this other tool that inhibits – doesn't wipe them out forever but it certainly inhibits ARC breaks. It keeps them from happening. It keeps your Sec Check sessions from turning out totally sour.

You've got this kind of a situation now. In this particular class before anybody is on 3D Criss Cross, there are certain basic preparatory things which should be done with the student. This is not necessarily retroactive, but we'll be working in this particular fashion.

We pick up all the missed withholds, the should-have-knowns, get those out of the road, get the last two pages of the Joburg and the shortened Form 6 – 6A. We square the person around on a flows process, get them flying in that particular line and then put them on to 3D Criss Cross and that's about the way cases are going to be graduated up here. There'll be some variation on what's done to them after their last two pages of the Joburg and their Form 6A – the little period in there. But this was – would be what is expected of a case. Not necessarily the auditing skill or what we're trying to train. Those things might be different, but that would be expected of a case. We expect him to make that particular line of progress.

Now, you see, that's enormously shortened the moment that you put the missed withhold ahead of the lot. So you tack missed withholds on to your rudiments, your beginning rudiments. Tack it on to the end rudiments in the form of "I – have I missed a withhold on you during this session?" you see. Now that's in addition to, you know, "Did you withhold anything?" or "Are you withholding anything" or something like that. And square up the whole of your middle difficulties with should-have-knowns of one character or another and get agile in

the use of this. Understand what it is and what you're asking for. And let me assure you that you will have a very smooth run of it with pcs.

I think all of you are getting some reality on this already.

Those cases which have a reputation for being rough to audit, out of session, disinterested or upset or anything else that you consider wrong with a case, the first thing you should try on such a case is to find some area of should-have-known .

I don't care whether it's familial, some other practice, medicine, we don't care what. Anyplace we could find a should-have-known, well, let's shoot it full of holes. And then let's take Scientology and let's shoot the should-have-known's full of holes with regard to Scientology and auditing sessions there.

And you'll find this person will straighten out. You'll find out this is quite remarkable.

And it's a weapon which I hope we don't lose sight of. We lose sight of even such things as Havingness for two years at a crack. So I can expect in 1965, why, we're sitting here and we've got five, six class members that are all ARC breaky and they're all upset, we can't figure out what's wrong with them. And somebody's combing back through the archives and they come up against this particular lecture and say, "Well, that's been dropped out since 1964. Something else came up that was far more important."

Let's hope that doesn't happen. But if we do get this kind of a condition rolling, let's hope somebody does break out this lecture.

Thank you very much.

you run out of paper over here, you know, and have to copy the list because you haven't got any room left to draw slants on. You got the idea?

And the rudiments keep going in and the rudiments keep going out and the pc keeps going out of session, and you have to keep getting the pc in-session. The pc, *hrhrhrh*, invalidates information. He's not in-session. And his mind isn't on anything, and so forth.

You want trouble? Write a short list on 3D Criss Cross.

Now, you can get away with a ten or twenty list on a Prehav level or something or other. I mean, other – other sources of 3D item lines. You can probably get away with it here and there as a short list. But not on a flows assessment. It's going to go on and on and on, that list.

If you have the pc on the meter while you're doing that list, you will notice that, as you are listing, you are getting tremendous rises and tremendous falls. Rise, rise, rise, rise, rise and then fall, fall, fall and tone arm goes down, the tone arm comes up. What is all this action? It's blowing charge.

And the main item that is going to be representative to the pc of that flow, that main item is so thoroughly charged that if it is not written down on the list, and that charge dissipated by writing it down on the list, you are going to wind up with that whole section of the Goals Problem Mass completely charged. And, of course, it won't differentiate and it won't null because nothing blew. You never got the central charge out of the flow.

It is something like fooling around with a fully loaded shotgun. You never emptied the chamber. So you have to handle it very carefully and you have to handle the pc very carefully and everything is going out and you can't get anything done and it's all a complete mess. And auditing is very complicated and such an arduous job and all that sort of thing.

Why? Because the charge isn't gone off that subject. You are auditing a pc who is in a restimulated area of charge.

Now, you have said, "An enforced outflow on others." That's what you said to him, and you kept saying this and it just kept charging up, charging up. You didn't charge it. The charge is residual in the bank. But you've restimulated it, ready to draw it. You're ready to take this charge off the bank. And then by writing an incomplete list you've failed to take the charge off the bank.

And of course, what happens? The pc doesn't get rid of any items. He doesn't blow any items. No items will null. He's all sitting there sort of tense, and you can see his fingernails sort of clawing into the sides of the cans. And nothing is blowing and of course your rudiments are going out and your pc seems to be interested but not really interested and sort of half mad at you and – get the idea? All this phenomena of a difficult session sets in from incomplete list. The rough session starts with an incomplete list.

Of course, I would say a rough session could start a little earlier with the symptom of no auditing. The auditor says in one fashion or another, "Well, I guess we've got to get through this session, so I don't care whether your case gets well or not. Oh, you got some

goals. Ha-ha. Well, who cares about them? Oh, let's see. Oh, isn't it nice outside. *Uuuuuuuuh, uuuuuuuuh.*" This communicates to the pc and you've got no session.

So I've said the trouble you have with an auditing session begins in 3D Criss Cross with an incomplete list. But of course, there can be earlier trouble. The trouble, however, is not with an auditing session. There's just no auditing and no session. See, you can sail into an auditing session without any auditing. Of course, then it ceases to – or fails to materialize as a session.

You'll find that, by the way, is your commonest point of trouble in Academy training and auditing, is they haven't a clue about starting a session so they just never have a session. And then, of course, if you can get this much trouble from an incomplete list, look at what the trouble you can get from a no session. You'll see Academy students in the second week sitting there, and their glazed eye, you know, and they don't know what they're doing and whether they should put their feet in the pc's lap or the cans in the pc's ear, you know? And this is not tense. If you struck one of them slightly, you know, they'd ring like a gong. [laughter]

And the pc says, "What am I supposed to do?"

And there's nobody to tell him. There's nobody interested in what happens to the pc. It's all "Am I doing the session right?"

See, the session doesn't have anything to do with the pc, so of course, his pc is omitted from the session. And if you want to get any *real* trouble in auditing, do that. Just omit the pc from the session. Don't have anything to do with the pc.

Just concentrate on – with all of your might on doing a session without any regard to the pc and you'll have lots of trouble. We're saying that if an auditing session exists, then the trouble you're going to get into from there on out, the most trouble you can get into is an incomplete list on 3D Criss Cross.

Now, of course, if we're dealing with sessions in general, the most trouble that you will ever get into is from a missed withhold. Just remember that. I'm talking about trouble with a process when I say trouble with 3D Criss Cross, you see.

Let me organize this for you for just one second. You'd say – all right, if you wanted to lay this out to HPA students, HCA students, and so on, you'd say, all right, the most trouble you can get into is by not giving an auditing session. Now, you're in lots of trouble. There'll be lots of complications, and everything is going to go to hell in a balloon. That we can guarantee. We don't include the pc in or give an auditing session. That's a condition we know as no auditing.

The next trouble you could get into in an auditing session would be a missed withhold. If you miss a withhold, then you really are in trouble, with exclamation points, because the pc ARC breaks, blows up in your face, throws down the cans, leaves the room. All of these non-sense activities that we associate with upsetting circumstances regarding auditing, all stem from having missed a withhold on the pc in one session or another or from somebody having missed a withhold in one session or another. And you have to pick them up as missed withholds, not as withholds.

All right. So let's get this in order. And then the most trouble that you can have with Security Checking would have to do with failing to security check the pc, but run some repetitive process that again doesn't include the pc in the auditing session. Do a Security Check, not of that pc, but try to do just a generalized – you know, say "I hope it'll all come out in the end," because inevitably you're going to miss a withhold. In other words, you got to security check straight on top of that meter crawling right down the needle, you know? And you got to security check against the meter. You can't do it a repetitive question or something like that.

The next trouble you get into is in all 3D items is to start a list in which the pc has no interest of the subject of. I've learned that. You take something out of your hat, an arbitrary assigned line. You say, "Well, we're going to have a line now that has to do with trees (comma), only God can make one," because the auditor is interested in trees, don't you see? And so he's going to do a list from trees. And the pc has never had anything to do with trees, plus or minus. Trees are just trees and you never get a list. And you go on and on and on.

Now, your like-dislike items have that liability. Your pc may be in a state where he doesn't like anything and he doesn't dislike anything and he doesn't hate anything and he doesn't love anything and it's all just *thing*. And then you get, of course, no list and you'll be in trouble. So arbitrary assignment of lines, from what we get lines.

An improper flows assessment will give you some trouble but nowhere near the trouble that you might think. An improper Prehav level will give you some trouble but it's the same trouble as the like-dislike. It's just you haven't got the level where the pc's interest lies. But any flows assessment almost picked out of the hat will find some interest in the pc. That's what's interesting about flows. The amount of precision with which you have to get the accurate flow does not equal the precision with which you have to get the accurate Prehav level.

You could just watch the pc for ten minutes before the session, and the pc is standing there rather quietly, you know, and he hears a door creak, and he flinches.

And you could say, "All right. Prohibited inflow," and list it and you would find that it would be quite an accurately interesting list, you see? So it's the lack of accuracy on this particular point is going to persuade some of you that you don't have to be accurate anyplace on getting a list. And don't let that fool you. It's only true with flows.

On Prehav you have to be right on the *bouton*. You have to be right on the *bouton*, perfectly dead center. If the pc is on "withdraw," my golly, you better have "withdraw." Don't for the heaven sakes have "kill." And the pc just won't ever give you a list. And so, of course, the pc is no interest and the pc's attention is wandering and the pc is going off in all directions, and so forth.

You have to have that Prehav level very positively accurate.

All right. Flows – sloppy. You almost pick it out of the hat. Look at the pc, figure out what the flow is, list it and you'll get someplace. Interesting, isn't it?

All right. An incomplete list on the Prehav assessment can be serious. It can cause upset, but nothing like the upset that an incomplete list on flows will cause.

Now, on some minor thing like O/W on self, and we take that and we get a list which is five items long and we differentiate it. What do you know. We'll be actually getting someplace on the case, see? And other methods of getting a list, like a dynamic assessment, we'll be getting someplace on it. We get a list of three items and we differentiate them and we null them out and then we oppterm it, why, well still be someplace with the case, you understand?

We won't really be in trouble. But of course, anything like a Prehav level is restimulative. So of course, if you don't get the complete list, you've got the case going *ngngngngng*. You hit him where he lives. All right. So that we'd better come right along with and get that list complete.

But you still can't be in as much trouble with a Prehav level as you can be in a flows level. Now, although you can practically pick the flow out of your 'at as what flow you're going to list on the pc, man, you've got to have a complete list. If you don't have a complete list, you're going to wind up with a charged list. The whole list will remain charged.

And flows, of course, as it indicates, the obsessiveness of the flow, the continuance of the flow, all of the other things with regard to flow indicate longevity or length, see? This flow has been going on and on and on and on and on forever and the pc just goes on with the flow. And to bleed any charge off of a flows list, it's got to be complete. And you've got to really have yourself a long, nice, arduous list. And while you're listing, it'd be an awfully good idea – it doesn't matter whether you have the pc on the cans or not on a Prehav list. It really doesn't matter unless you want to suddenly put him on the cans and bleed the list. You know, say, "Is there anything more? Any more items belong on here?" Something like this just to make sure.

But on a flows, you'd better have him on the list because it tells you how much charge is bleeding off the ruddy case. See, it wouldn't matter at all on the Dynamic Assessment list. Put him off the cans. Have a cigarette. It doesn't matter what you do, don't you see? Because you're going to get any kind of an item anyhow.

The Dynamic Assessment, any kind of an item, O/W on self, any kind of an item. It just doesn't matter. But on a flows, you're charging the living daylight out of the bank.

Now, why is this? Well, you've got two poles here and the flow is going from one pole to the other flow or backing up from one pole to the other flow, and you've got a flow going and that flow is exposing a certain amount of charge. It's also restimulating it. And while you have him listing, you've got a flow going. And if that flow is passing over the head of charged areas, you're just restimulating the living daylight out of the pc, that's all.

And if you don't blow the charge off the flow, why, your pc is all nerved up. He's in a wreck condition because it's only – it's just like he was – took a step and then he never got his foot down, you know, and that foot's still in the air.

So frankly, the trick is that you list as long as the flow runs. It isn't really how many items you have. It's the length of time you list. You just keep him giving you items, giving you items, so the flow will keep running, running, running, running, running, and somewhere in that you're going to pull the thing that is keeping this flow going. And the second you get the thing with the flow on it that kept the flow going, you see, *boom!* That – the whole thing

all dies. That's a dead mackerel now because you've located the pole from which the current was coming, you see? And as long as you have that thing still there and massed, *zhuuuuuu*. You see, it's still charged up, still charged up, still charged up and nothing will null, nothing will blow, nothing goes on at all. Don't you see?

And your differentiation – he leaves everything on the list, and when you start nulling it out, it's just on and on and on and on. Everything stays in, stays in, stays in, stays in, stays in, of course, because you've not discharged this flow. So you see, a flow and auditing of flows is a bit different than other ways of getting 3D lists and items and handling the Goals Problem Mass. There's a little bit of difference in here.

And one of the things about it is it's very, very fast. If done right, it is terribly, terribly fast no matter how long it takes you to list and differentiate and null. Doing a flow is faster case gain, very rapid, because you're pulling the things that keeps the bank cohesed. You're actually pulling the pins out of the reactive bank; the things that make it go together like a – like a bunch of busted glue pots. And you're pulling them apart. And you're taking the things that hold it together. There they are.

So doing flows, you're doing something just a little bit different than you're doing with other items. Therefore, I don't think that anybody should ever be started in doing flows from what I've – experience I've had here, as first bat. Let them get a little bit grooved in. I thought at first we could take almost an arbitrary item and get them started that way better. But the pc is inadequately seized up in the interest in the thing. The interest factor is not helping out the auditor there. So let's take the middle course and let's take a Prehav level as a good way to launch a case.

Now, this adjudication is not final by any means. But apparently there is evidence in favor of oppterming a flow item when found. There is evidence in favor of this rather than getting a second flow item. Oppterm it and then get. That's a slight change from your mimeograph sheet.

In other words, you find an item as a flow and now oppterm the thing and then you'll find another item. Now, that oppterming of the flow is simple because it's right there. Your oppterm list might not be three items long.

You say, "What would oppose a ring-tailed snorter?" And it's a square-tailed unsnorter, or it's a tailless unsnorter, of course, you know, and that's it. And you get a bunch of charge comes off the bank suddenly. So it's a good advance.

Now, you've got two items, and they make a problem. The pair makes the problem so if you've found one pole you can oppterm it and find the other pole of the particular piece of flow machinery and you can get a considerable relief on the pc rapidly, so that has value. So you might as well set it up that you do a flow and then get its oppterm and then do another flow the same way that you did the first one and then get its oppterm and do another flow and get its oppterm. Call each one of them a line, and you wind up with a whole packet of lines.

Now, it's not necessarily true that there is – that this is much better than continuing to do flow after flow after flow. You understand? There's just some evidence in favor of it.

Mostly on the basis that it apparently will blow a little bit more charge than doing the other flow right away. See, that's – we're not now dealing with critical points.

But 3D items can be found in one per line on and on and on and on and on. It keeps the Goals Problem Mass good and handy because in doing 3D, the Goals Problem Mass starts to depart and it starts to dissipate and it starts to fall to pieces. And it's very hard on the pc. He's so accustomed to living with this room full of sponge. You see, the room full of black sponge that he's accustomed to living with, it starts slipping. And it gets out of his view. And he misses it. And he knows he's supposed to audit it. And it keeps snapping back on the track and the track straightens out and things like this. And it's disconcerting.

So if you wanted to get an awful lot of lines, you would do one per line. You see, that's the other thing. I'm not now talking about flows. I'm talking about Prehav items. I'm talking about old type 3 items, I'm talking about Dynamic Assessment items, and so forth. Just rapidly get several line items. One, two, three, four, five, something like that.

You got the 3D mass good and close, pc's got lots of somatics, he's very uncomfortable that you've got this thing right up close to his chest and it's no difficulty trying to find items.

Now you oppterm each one of these things you've found. And you of course now have a problem and a problem and a problem. Every line now has two items on it. Well, if a line is opptermed, you now have a problem. You've got the valence versus valence that makes up a problem. You have the waterbuck and the tiger. You have the willow wand and the wind. And these things – each one of them – makes up the problem.

Now, there's some other things that you can do with this when you get a pair – when you get a pair. And you understand it really doesn't matter much whether you get one item per line and then go back and get a second item per line; or if you get one item on a line and oppterm it and then get another item on a line and oppterm that, and so forth, except the Goals Problem Mass starts to slide out from underneath you. Person starts going Clear and other embarrassing things. [laughter] So it doesn't matter too much.

When you start doing flows you start shooting this thing full of holes. It starts swiss-cheesing on you. And if you do, you possibly could inadvertently make a Clear this way. Just straighten the guy out. You know, he's had some – a lot of preparatory auditing. He's in pretty good shape. You're – easy to keep the rudiments in. Now, you find a flows item and then you find an oppterm to the flows item. And you suddenly find you can't read him on the meter and the needle is just floating.

Of course, that doesn't mean you disposed of the whole Goals Problem Mass. It's parked over someplace else ready to key in someday. But you theoretically might have that experience every fifteen or twenty pcs. You know, it'd be about the same frequency as we were clearing people with Routine 3. It just would *sstuuuh* – free needle.

Now, that's very easy to get back. That's very easy to get it back. I'll tell you how you get it back. You want to know how to get it back?

You find the goal for one of the terminals. You find out which is the pc's terminal by which one gave him a somatic and which is his oppterm by which one gave him a sensation or

a dizziness, you see? Sort that out. Repeat one or the other at him. Try to clue it in. But you might not be able to get it in that quickly.

And then find a goal for the terminal and an opposition goal for the oppterm. Sounds just like the old 3D package, isn't it? Well, that's just exactly what you're putting together. And then find the modifier for that goal for the pc's terminal and you'll have the Goals Problem Mass right back in your lap every time. He will unclear like crazy. See what I mean? Take the original 3D handout and simply fill in the sheet. Finish it all up, and you'll get the Goal Problem Mass back again.

Funny teaching auditors how to – how to get their hands on aberration after it slid out from under, but you to a slight degree face that problem now. We're into that area of Scientology where we have to audit carefully so as to keep the pc sufficiently aberrated to blow the lot. Because the pc is going to get very restive on us and want to get back into action, and the pc is liable to go momentarily Clear without having been made a Dynamic Clear on all dynamics and gone straight through the Goals Problem Mass. You see what could happen there? It would happen on you.

You want to make another kind of Clear. You want to make a Clear Clear. You want to make somebody who won't have any trouble with the Goals Problem Mass or any trouble with the bank from there on out, and all of his fondest hopes, and so forth.

And of course, if you keep doing that *in extremis* and then straighten out the whole track, and take up all fragments of the Goals Problem Mass in their turn and handle all them, you'll make an OT. You couldn't help it. So you probably could make a Dynamic Clear or a Clear Clear, a stable, a very stable Clear by moving straight on through the Goals Problem Mass and getting these valences parked in their proper places on the track so they're not troubling the pc, and so forth. And he'd stay that way. It's taken trillennia to get these things assembled into a black sponge. And it'll take him more trillennia to get them back together again because it's quite accidental that they remain in that weirdly balanced balance.

You mean somebody has got a package that comes from 10 trillion years ago, beautifully poised and balanced against a package that came from 110 trillion years ago, and he's got a 100 trillion year loop in the Goals Problem Mass. And these two things are opposing each other gorgeously. How does he do it? I ask you. Thetans are skilled, but I never expected them to be that clever. But they actually can do it.

Once you get these things unbalanced and unhinged, why, *heaaaaa*. There'd have to be a whole bunch more accidentals way on up the track for him to get these things matched up again.

All right. In doing a 3D Criss Cross, I want a case to be in this kind of condition before we say that we're very happy with the case. I'll give you the items that we would say we were happy with.

One, all the missed withholds available were off the case so it wasn't registering on any missed withholds. A Form 3, last two pages of the Joburg. That's a Form 3, last two pages. Missed withholds, last two pages of the Joburg and a Form 6A. That is the revised

eighty-question Security Check on pcs and so forth. We're talking mainly now about Scientologists as a case rundown.

And 3D Criss Cross in this kind of shape: at least five lines, at least two of those five lines flow lines and with an oppterm found for each line. That's only ten items, you see. Two of them are flows, and two of them are oppterms of flows and the other six could be from anything.

And if a case had all that done, and so forth, why, I would consider that the case was reasonably auditable without any special anything. I'd say the case should audit like a baby carriage. It'd be very easy to audit.

Now, you could go ahead and finish up from that. I'd know this character was on the road to Clear, you understand? I know he's well on the road. He's down there past the most crucial roadblocks and he's doing all right.

That doesn't sound like very much to do in auditing, does it? And frankly it isn't very much to do in auditing. And the results which you get on a case by just getting those things done on auditing are quite astonishing, however. And this is what I would consider – at this particular instant – what I would consider essential. And I'd call such a case, regardless of any – oh, regardless of any test or anything, I'd say the case was certainly a Release.

I'm not giving you a new definition for Release. I'm just saying he would have passed Release by like a jet car. Somewhere in his back track of auditing, the state of Release would have occurred. Probably nobody would notice it because he's too interested in pressing ahead.

But you'd say, "All right. Well, you used to sit in your room and quiver all morning and all evening and particularly at two o'clock in the morning when you woke up in a cold sweat talking to the black thetan in the upper right-hand corner of the bedroom. Now, are you doing that now?"

"Oh, did I ever do that? Come to think about it, I did. Yes."

That's the responses you're getting on the more severe upsets the person has been worried about in his lifetime.

A tremendous amount of aberration goes by the boards in the process of 3D Criss Cross. And you don't quite notice it going until the person does some kind of a fabulous back-track on the thing. You have to do a careful plot.

It's almost worth making a pc sit down and say, "Now, list all of the troubles that you have been having," so that you get this long and involved list.

"I always slam the icebox door on my hand when reaching for my stomach tonic that I take every night. And I'm afraid to go up broad stairs and I won't ride in tram cars. And every time I see a plate glass window, I look for a brick, you know, and have to stop myself," and all these various listings because these things are not going to be much in appearance. They're not going to be much in evidence.

They'll kind of slide by because they're whole package aberration, you see, and you get rid of a whole package and you don't get rid of a specific aberration. That's the trick. That's what will fool the auditor, see?

You actually don't get rid of the slamming the icebox door on their hand. You don't get rid of that. You get rid of some valence because it was – obviously you had gotten rid of because it was most available valence if they're dramatizing it.

Have you noticed that the pc will dramatize the valence which you're just about to find or have just found? Huh? Have you noticed that one?

Well, similarly, the valences which you get rid of with 3D Criss Cross are those which are most neighborly to the pc because they're the ones he's dramatizing so he must be right on top of them. So those are the ones which contain all the foibles and frugals that he has been worrying about. Those are right there. When you get rid of these on 3D Criss Cross, any way you'd audit 3D Criss Cross, these things would come up. In the process of getting ten of them, if two of them are flows valences, you're going to get rid of the most immediate difficulties of the pc no matter if you audit it or not. They're still going to haunt him a little bit, and he's going to work. He's going to find himself working some night.

He'll be sitting in a cafe, and he used to hate waitresses. And he's sitting in this cafe and he tries to work up a good, healthy hate for waitresses out of force of habit, you know, and he just can't make it. He's sitting there concentrating heavily on the waitresses and if you've run twenty 3D items out, why, he's heavily concentrating on how he should be hating waitresses. And one of them comes over and puts her arm around his shoulder. I mean, he's most surprised.

And then – then, of course, because he can't really make this aberration anymore, and so forth, why, of course he's had it right at that point, you see, because he gets friendly.

There's a liability to being sane, you know. You get friendly with all the people you used to hate. [laughter, laughs] Sometimes embarrassing when you're out with people you haven't been with for a while, and they know very well that you hate waitresses, you see? Embarrassing. And you have to tell him that you had some processing or something. Rough.

Anyhow, by the time you've got ten items, if two of the things are that, you've changed a person's pattern. You've changed his pattern of thinkingness quite markedly.

What you'll be impressed with is the fact that he was not all that influenced by that aberration. That's one of the things that you will be fascinated with. Yeah, he was worried by it. Yes, he dramatized it. Yes, it was throwing his whole life out of gear. Yes, he was walking on the – in the gutter when he should have been walking on the curb. But the guy is still the guy. That's one of the things which I find interesting. The guy is still the guy. His more charming aspects are still amongst us. And he evidently could function as himself. In spite of these aberrations, he was himself. And you run into somebody and you still know it's that person, only he's more himself. You see, he's more himself and less inhibited as himself.

And we get back to all of the endless arguments we might have had in Book One on the subject of what is insanity. What does a Clear do? Now, we really start opening Pandora's box, you see? "What does a Clear do? How does a person really behave? What would happen to me if I were really, really Clear-Cleared? Would I grow wings and so forth?"

Oh, I think they would find you very much yourself but a somewhat more charming self than you were. It's a disappointment, basically. Disappointment. Everybody expects you

to at once develop – you know, what they really expect to have happen is one of the most overwhelming valences they have in their immediate vicinity, you see? They think that they will get the attributes of it, like "magician", see, or something like that.

And they think that if they really got Clear, and then they immediately – you see, because they're going to get rid of it, the valence "magician" restimulates, you see? And they think, "Clear? Oh, I see what I would do. I would have piercing eyes." [laughter] "Piercing eyes and I would be able to hold up my fingers like this and long streams of fire would go out and blind any eyes I was looking at. I know what a Clear is. I'd be able to clear the hall by spitting. I could produce elephants out of spittoons. I know what a Clear is. Got it taped. Now, we're in communication. Now, I can talk to you about being Clear," you see?

And then you come along with 3D Criss Cross, and one of the first items you run across is "magician". [laughs] The guy ceases to worry about it, though. He doesn't have any difficulties with regard to it.

Now, 3D Criss Cross is more painful than any other type of processing we have. More painful. In terms of somatics and so forth, more painful early in its run. And you never saw a pc get so careless of these things after a while. But when done in the slower, older version of 3D, where you were just locating a goal and then getting a package from that goal, and so on, you unfortunately kept the pc hanging longer than he liked in the cold masses that are inevitably associated with a Goals Problem Mass. And everybody kept thinking that he was freezing to death all the time. And you go around and some pc would put his hand on you, and so forth, and the frost would gather on your coat sleeve. They were cold, man.

Well, don't think those entirely disappear on any pc that you do this on. In 3D Criss Cross it'll go through a little faster, but it'll still occur. The same things, the same somatics, and so on.

I would say that it would be enough for an individual to reject doing anything about himself, the somatics which occur in the very early stages of 3D Criss Cross, I'd say it would be enough for an individual – if he were operating on himself by himself, unsupported with an auditor, unaudited in other words – there'd be enough somatics and cold masses and pains and dizzinesses and sensations for him to, see, start in and say, "Oh, well, no, I don't think we'll go into that." Because he's been doing just that for trillennia. Every time he started to blow one of these things it started to hurt so he'd back right off of the thing and he's left them strictly alone.

Therefore, the task of auditing 3D Criss Cross is, of course, a precise task in that the pc has to be kept in-session. If you can't keep the pc in-session, the pc cannot on his own even vaguely face up to these things. He just couldn't do it, that's all.

You would just be *fascinated* at his inability to face up to them all by himself. It is just the fact that he's in-session. It isn't that the auditor has to work hard to get the pc to confront these things. An auditor running 3D Criss Cross doesn't have to get a pc to work anywhere *near* as hard as when running an engram. Running engrams, man, that, that was hard work. But the pc has to be in-session. He has to know he has an auditor, he has to know that the auditor is helping him out and pushing him along the line and that the auditor isn't on the side of the reactive bank. Therefore, be prepared for this to happen: for 3D Criss Cross to go gor-

geously in the hands of a well-trained auditor and for it to go splat in the hands of somebody who has just completed his third week in the Academy by being expelled. And then it will just lay the most gorgeous egg you ever saw. It'd just lay a gorgeous egg. It wouldn't matter if he went through all the motions or anything else because you'd have a no-auditing situation. And a no-auditing situation is frankly the only thing that could totally defeat 3D Criss Cross. Almost anything else could push it through. But a no-auditing situation, no.

A pc has to have a certain insouciance about the bank. He has to be able to feed himself to the lions. He has to be able to sort of – well, just as he gets down to the last rung of the ladder and sees that it's three thousand feet to the ground, he's got to have somebody there that persuades him to let go. And you say to him, "Well, it's all right to let go, Joe. Actually, it's just illusory, the three thousand feet down."

He says, "Yes, but those houses look awfully solid. And the air's blowing very heavily across my lumbosis here. In fact, it's getting worse."

And the auditor has to help him out; either gently free his fingers off the bottom of the ladder, or *stamp* on them. [laughter] But it's something that has to be done.

I don't wish to overrate the amount of skill that is required to run 3D Criss Cross. The actual skill – you can learn these technologies rather easily. The unseen, haunting factor back of all this is, is the session going? Is the pc in-session? That is the background music to all this.

And of course, to people who don't see this or don't experience it, they add all sorts of complications under what is meant by this. And in-session – well, that's just willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case. I mean, it's as simple as that.

The demonstration you saw a little while ago, you saw I was taking up any little, tiny cross band here that might have been interfering with the pc's willingness to talk to me under those particular circumstances. I was qualifying it. In other words, I was being awfully careful of that particular point. Did you notice that? I was monkeying around with this point and I went back to it a couple of times and I wasn't doing it very smoothly. I was just being very certain that the pc could talk to me about the thing. And finally I didn't get any reaction on it and let it go.

But you see, that's very, very important. The pc there was obviously interested in own case, but was the pc willing to talk to the auditor under those circumstances? Well, if that had been missing, he wouldn't have gotten any differentiation on the list. Pc would have gone over the items and said, "*Mm-hmm*, and so on, and oh, yeah, take it off. Leave it on." Or he might have just said, "Well, take it off, take it off, take it off. Take them all off, take them all off, take them all off. Take everything off the list. Who cares? Tear it up for all I care."

And that wouldn't have been optimum. Pc wouldn't have been in-session. But it isn't difficult. It really isn't. It isn't even like walking a tightrope or anything like that. It's just making sure of these points. And undoing all the silly complications that you might be adding on top of it, that's all. That's as important as anything else. Getting rid of now the all – all the ought-to's and the now-I'm-supposed-to's, and things that you might just complicate the session out of this world with, you know.

Well, for instance, spend – find out all of a sudden that your E-Meter couldn't be balanced on set. And be very concerned about this sort of thing and be very, very worried about not being able to balance your E-Meter because you just couldn't get it to read on the Clear reads or something. You get very upset and very worried about this.

Well, what's that got to do with it? We're not testing anybody for Clear. Are we? We got some vague idea of where the pc is, and so on.

Well, naturally, we want that to be right. If we can get that right. But if we can't get that right easily, we're going to leave it alone. You follow the rationale here? We're not going to do any of these things that are relatively unimportant if they're difficult to do or get in the road of our session.

We're not going to get the whole session held up because we find that we can't put through the – we can't get our ballpoint to work and write the auditors report. In other words, something as goofy as this, you see? And have to leave the room and get a ballpoint, and *huh-huh*. Well, we can't get a session going because we don't have a ballpoint pen, you know?

Now, a ballpoint pen doesn't make a session, see? So just drop that out of the lineup. And it's almost knowing what you can get rid of as an auditor. And if you'd make a list of the number of things you could get rid of as an auditor, you'd also have a list of the things that you'd never bother to put in if it interrupted the session in any way. You'd never let these things get in the road of the session.

So your ballpoint all of a sudden had expired. These things were originally, you know, advertised as writing forever. And they don't. On some of your first lists on flows, you probably will use two ballpoints getting the list. But the point is that that wouldn't be something you'd hold up the session for. You're going to list and differentiate. That's what you're going to do in that session. And you find out your E-Meter leads is busted just before you begin the session. You're going to list and differentiate in that session.

Ah, well, we don't drop that one out because we could never get the rudiments in, could we. So we go and steal a lead out of the auditor that's auditing in the next room, so he has to find them – proper procedure there! So that would be important. Pc's chair is not a very comfortable chair, and creaks. The pc's called attention to this several times. All right. As far as I'm concerned, pc can go on sitting in that chair for the next forty sessions. I couldn't care less. Audit the pc sitting on the floor. Who cares about the chair? Don't you see?

Your relative importances of what are the parts of a session are something that some auditors could sort out with great value. What is the auditor trying to do? In the rudiments, he's trying to get the pc in-session. With Sec Checking he's trying to get the pc freed up so the pc can get even more easily into session. And with 3D Criss Cross, he's trying to find the items of the Goal Problem Mass that the pc is dramatizing, has given him all of his trouble and all of his aberrations. They're all contained in this mass and its various component parts. Well, that's all he's trying to do.

And he gets these things strung out and gets the relative evaluation. He knows what he can throw out the window and what he's got to keep in front of him. Therefore, it looks very relaxed when you finally finish up because it all cones down to getting the pc in-session and

holding the pc in-session, and getting the pc to write complete lists, finish up lists, get them absolutely complete, get the item out, get the thing differentiated with the pc's interest right straight on it with all twelve cylinders firing. And then get your nulling out of the way, and you know that you can actually go over and over on a differentiated list. You know, you can go over and over, differentiate over and over, and you know it all disappears after a while? Every time the pc tells you it's an irreducible minimum.

If you were watching today on items or remembering items, you saw me go over the same column twice. That was, I went over the whole list once, but I covered one column twice. The first column I covered, I went over again before I ended the thing. And the irreducible minimum of the first column I covered had become one-half its size the second time I covered it. In other words, these irreducible minimums keep blowing because they keep blowing charge, so there isn't anything to hold him in.

Charge is that which prevents the pc from thinking on a subject. Prevents him from thinking on a subject or getting rid of a subject or approaching a subject. Sum it up to handling a subject. Charged.

You wouldn't go over and pick up the live wires out of a 220-volt mains, would you? Well, neither will the pc much think about doing it or do it. Not until he's sure the switch is off. After you've turned the switch off, he says, "Well, what – what was this bothering me for?"

Well, that's what happens. You keep bleeding charge off the thing and it's always an irreducible minimum. At any given instant the whole list is an irreducible minimum. But then you blow a little more charge off and the irreducible minimum, of course, is reduced. And then you blow more charge off and the irreducible minimum is reduced again. And you can just keep on doing this and you can actually differentiate a list right on down to one item.

I'm not telling you to do this. I'm just saying you can do it. You can omit the nulling of the list. Not good auditing to do so, but on any pc that was hard to null items on, brother, would I make sure those lists were long and, boy, would I differentiate them round and round and round. And when I got all down through the end of the thing, then I know it'd null. Because I refuse to spend any time nulling. That's what I refuse to do because it's the least beneficial of any of the steps.

So being the least beneficial of the steps, let's make it the least time consuming. The other steps are beneficial so let's spend our time on them. The pc always gets someplace if you make him keep on differentiating. And just for fun sometime, take a list and reduce it to one item by differentiation alone. And you'll find it continues to be an irreducible minimum.

But you'll still get one or two off every time you go around and it's still irreducible. But you still get one, two, three, four or six off. Isn't that weird? You're blowing charge off the thing. And of course, the last one stands up, "Well," the pc says, "well, why am I worried about this subject? Why am I doing anything with this subject? Because it is absolutely inevitable that a ring-tailed snorter is the only thing could do that. And I could have told you that at the beginning." He actually has the illusion that he could have.

"I could have told you that. I realized that all of my life. A ring-tailed snorter. Of course, naturally. Well, why are you so bothered with a ring-tailed snorter?"

By the time he's handling this ring-tailed snorter – when he first starts discussing it you'll see drop, drop, drop, charge, charge, charge and after a while he discusses it and he says, "Well, what's this all about, and so on."

And he can say ring-tailed snorter, you can say ring-tailed snorter and you only get the tick of the bridge from ring-tailed snorter to the rest of the mass. You get no charge on ring-tailed snorter. You only get the charge on the next item that can bleed to ring-tailed snorter. And that's what keeps the item ticking. It's never the item. The item you've found never ticks. What you get is the bleed of current from the item you haven't found. And that's why you keep – these things keep going tick, tick, tick, tick.

So actually, 3D Criss Cross, that's why we've obviated running items because the item you found and proved out, of course, is never charged. Isn't that fascinating. But the item you've got is serving as a short circuiter to the bank.

In other words, you've got ahold of a connecter that isn't itself charged. Electronically, you've got ahold of a condenser that has nothing in it. It's all gone but you'll still find current in the condenser because the condenser is still connected up to something over here that does have current in another condenser, see? You get this other one bleeding through to the condenser you got hold of. See how the thing works out?

So you could keep on differentiating and differentiating and differentiating and blowing current and blowing current and he'd eventually say, "Well, why are we worried about this?"

Yeah, why are we worried about this? It drove his father insane. It put his mother in her grave. It's what makes him drive cars off bridges every time he sees a bridge and is in a car, you see. And it's what has kept him impoverished and broke and made his wife into a wreck before her time.

And he says, "Why are we worried about this?"

And sometimes it's such a negative gain that I wouldn't blame you at all sometimes to be slightly provoked at the pc not realizing how important that was in his life.

But I wouldn't advise you to try to sell him on the idea.

Bleeding charge is all you are doing on the bank whether it is Sec Checking or otherwise. There are ways to bleed charge well and there are ways to bleed charge poorly, but almost any auditing, if you call it auditing at all, will bleed some charge off the bank.

Now, the auditing only becomes upsetting and a nerve-racking no-Lloyd's premium-risk activity – no insurance, uninsurable, and so forth – when you are auditing in such a way as to stack up charge and let none of it blow. You never let the pc get rid of anything, you never let the pc throw anything away, you never let the pc blow off any charge at all. The pc hands you an item, you hand it back to the pc. Only he had an ARC break on it, see? The pc hands you a cognition. Put an ARC break on the cognition; hand it back to the pc, you see?

Pc gets rid of a withhold. Put an ARC break on it and give it to him and say, "Well, that wasn't a very nice thing to do, was it?"

I can think of so many joyful ways of keeping the bank charged up, you see? Now, if you made up a little list of the number of ways that you could keep a pc's bank charged up and not let him get rid of anything, you possibly would embrace all the auditing errors that could be made, but that would be a theoretical list. But that's how you would make the theoretical list, is figure out any way that you could keep a pc from getting rid of anything and keep the bank charged up and keep his attention off anything – and just make a list of that sort of thing, all of which sums up to not permitting the pc to bleed any charge off the bank – and you will find consistently that you would have the bulk of the errors that could be made with auditing.

And then I will let you in on something. Then you will have a bunch of Academy students and they'll fool you. They will invent some more. [laughter, laughs]

I don't mean that to be sarcastic about students. I don't mean that to be sarcastic about auditors. But I will comment on the fact that they can usually outguess me on these things.

I wanted you to get a look at – in these demonstrations particularly, because I knew you – many of you might have a more complicated idea of auditing than it merits. But you look at all the parts as they go together and look at the auditing as it proceeds and it is not a complicated activity by which you're balancing a bowling ball on the end of your nose while standing on the middle of a medicine ball, you see, with a blonde on each hand, you see, while drinking whiskey.

It's not that type of an activity. It's a rather relaxed activity. But nevertheless it's a highly precise activity. You could make two errors.

The newcomer, the auditor, the Book Auditor, he makes the first error. He said, "It's so simple that anybody could do it and you don't need any training in order to accomplish this thing."

So therefore, he sits down, and I'll be a son of a gun, every now and then he turns in a fine job of auditing. That's because he doesn't know enough to make any mistakes. You'll see this every once in a while.

But then, all of a sudden, he starts hooking into the rough because he doesn't know what he's doing, see. And he starts hooking into the rough and he starts hooking into the green and he starts hooking into the sand traps, and so forth. And he starts having himself a ball and then he doesn't know what kind of trouble he's in. And then he says, "Well, it's because I'm not sitting on my chair with my legs crossed, and I'm not having the pc regard his navel. Obviously, that's why the sessions are going wrong." Because he doesn't know enough about the subject.

From that moment he goes on to greater and greater complications.

So at first he starts out with too simple a simplicity. He bridges rapidly over into a progressively complicated complication. And this complication gets absolutely top-heavy and

the end result of it is he's so busy auditing that the pc never gets included in the session. And when the pc is not included in the session, no auditing occurs.

There are several ways that you could make a no-auditing situation exist, but I wish you to cultivate your sense of observation, both as an auditor and as an observer of auditing. Cultivate the ability to detect a no-auditing situation. Just cultivate it. Know when no auditing is taking place. Not because of meters or because you've got a circuit that tells you. Just realize when it happens. Know when the pc's in. Know when the pc is out. Be able to look at an auditing situation and know whether that pc is in-session or not.

I'm not asking you to do anything very difficult. I can look into the Sec Checking room in there just long enough to open the door, sweep one glance around the room and close the door, and tell you every pc that's in the place that's in-session and every pc in the place that's out of session.

And that is not a terrific high level of skill. It is just that obvious. It is not my penetrative eye or my ability to permeate situations. It's nothing extraordinary at all. It's just my ability to look, but you can look, too, and you can see it [snaps fingers] just like that.

And when you're sitting there auditing the pc, all of a sudden – you're going along with this and that, it's just some, slight change of inflection in the pc's voice. And you say, "Well, there went the rudiments, okay."

Don't bother asking are the rudiments out. "Do you think the rudiments are out? Are the rudiments out, to you? Maybe if I set it up at sensitivity 16, I could find out if the rudiments are out."

Well, man, if they weren't out when you asked, you've got them out by now. [laughter] Just look up at the pc, you're doing all right, and you ask that question, not to find out how the pc's doing, but to adjudicate from the pc's answer tone if the pc is doing all right or not.

Get the pc to say something to you. Is the pc willing to talk to you? So you ask the pc, "How are you doing?"

And the pc tells you or the pc doesn't tell you. And if the pc doesn't tell you, the pc's out of session and you better get him in.

Now, you can start cranking up the E-Meter. But of course, you might have been a little bit cautious. And you say, "Well, are you doing all right?"

And the pc says, "Oh, yeah, I'm doing fine. Now, so-and-so and so-and-so, and this list, and so on."

You don't bother with it any further, do you?

And you say, "Well, are you doing all right?"

And the pc says – any such phrase, you know, no pattern phrase. Just some attention to the pc to get him to talk to you a moment. Adjudicate where that pc sits, and say, "Well, are you doing all right?" – something like that, anything.

The pc says to you, [in a low voice:] "I guess so."

Mmm. Crank it up. What withhold have we just missed? What has the pc just invalidated? Is it all right to audit in this room? Why did your grandfather have to marry the girl? But let's get the pc back in-session because that pc is not in-session.

"Well, how is this list going?" See, you'll hear a stray question like that. What is this question? This question is interest in the pc, certainly, but it's something else, too. It's a test of the pc's response.

It is you the auditor, not rudiments, that hold the pc in-session. And when you the auditor have let the pc go out of session, it'll be one of several things that will get him back in-session. And this list is covered by the whole word *rudiment*. And you'll get the pc back in-session again.

But there's no substitute for auditing. There just isn't any substitute. It's indescribably simple. It is too elementary to be pounded on the head.

Some of your biggest difficulties in auditing is that you have done nothing to bleed any charge off the pc at which end of session the pc is, of course, out of session gorgeously.

The pc sat there a whole session. You bled no charge off the bank. You didn't do anything to make the pc feel lighter, better or anything of the sort. You must have, then, compounded the felony since auditing itself will automatically make a pc better unless it's interfered with. See, you must have interfered with it in some way, so you must have handed the pc back as much charge as the pc got rid of to keep the pc in status quo or worse.

Well, the rudiments, running down the rudiments, tells you how you did that. How did you manage that? ARC break? You gave him a present time problem? He was unable to get rid of withholds? Something of the sort. But I don't care what the form is; the actual *fact* is that he did get rid of some charge, but you gave it back to him. You didn't *mean* to, but you did. Therefore, the pc didn't get any better.

These things are all of the factors of auditing. Auditing is a relatively simple operation if you have already sorted out all of its complexities and chances. So therefore, there is no such thing as simple auditing. Auditing is only simple and only looks simple, and listing and 3D Criss Cross and anything else you're doing, is only simple when you know all about it. And then it becomes terribly simple, and you say, "I wonder why I worry about this. Why did I ever worry about this? This is awful easy."

Well, walk into an Academy one day and look around and you'll see why you worried about it once.

A student auditor is sitting there. He's got the E-Meter upside down. He has got one eye on the Instructor and the other eye out the window because he has an appointment. The pc has not been sitting in the chair for fifteen minutes and he has not noticed. [laughter] You go over and flick him on the left ear, and he rings like a gong.

And you'll say, "Gee-whiz, what's he so worked up about? Auditing is perfectly simple. All you do is keep the pc in-session and bleed the charge off the case and get things that are bothering the pc and straighten them up and let the pc get rid of them and the pc's all right."

And you tell him this, you know, and he says, "Yeah," he says, "but what process do you run to handle a present time problem? I'm sure Ron must have changed his mind about this. Well, what do you do to get a session started? Do you say 'START of session' or do you say [in a low voice:] 'Start of session' or do you say [in a solemn voice:] '*Start of session*'?" [laughter] "How do you do that?"

You suddenly conceive you're talking to a person who is in a large area of unknowingness. They don't know what's important, what's unimportant, or anything else. But they're just swimming, flying blind, compass busted, radar soaking wet, no ports in sight and a gale coming over the horizon. [laughter]

This they know and sense but they can't figure much of anything else out. But, as I say, it's very simple. But there's nothing like familiarity to breed that feeling of simplicity, and so my advice on the thing if you're at all worried about auditing is just audit and you'll come out of it providing the pc survives.

Thank you. [laughter]

PREPCLEARING

A lecture given on 13 February 1962

Thank you.

Thank you.

And this is the 13th of Feb. AD 12, isn't it?

Audience: Yes.

What do you know? Got it right, without telling me a word.

All right, now, listen here. You've just heard or seen a demonstration of what happens with an incomplete list. Did you begin to realize that was the case? Did you? Did any of you realize that was the case?

Audience: Yes.

The liability of letting a pc go ahead and write a list themselves without bleeding it down.

All right. But that doesn't matter. But the symptom – I just learned something, you could probably tell. You know, every time I said one was in or out, you know, I got the same fall. Did you notice that?

Audience: hm-hmm.

I said it was in or out, and then the fall would interrupt the next read. So I couldn't tear along on the thing the way I ordinarily do at all. I was having a slow go of it.

And then, of course, I had a pc who was helping. She was helping with the session. And of course, she very badly wanted to get an item to show you how good that was, you see.

And then she tells me afterwards that well, she thought, "a data gatherer," or what was it, "a knowledge gatherer," was it. And actually, when she talked to me about the list one morning at breakfast, I blurted it out quite automatically. She was counting on my item. [laughter] Now, that's an incomplete list. But I learned something there myself. And that was you probably get a surge of that particular type if you got an incomplete list. I mean I – that's not equivocal because we haven't proven the list as incomplete. But would seem that was likely. Interesting, wasn't it, huh? Yeah.

Of course, you realize giving a demonstration like that under pressure is a little bit hard on the pc. But I was quite fascinated just from the standpoint of – all of a sudden what

was I looking at here, you know. Well, I was looking at something that wasn't usual or ordinary. Well, I was looking at an incomplete list was what I was looking at.

Because you ask her, "Are any of those – is the item on that list?"

Female voice: No, I don't think so.

Well, is it or isn't it? Do you know that it was? Did you have the feeling that it was at any time?

Female voice: Not really.

Not really.

Female voice: I can't wrap my wits around the enforced inflow myself?

How do you like that? See? I think that's pretty good. That's a good example. When I first asked her, if you remember, the other day, she said the list was complete. But now she doesn't believe that she could enforce her wits around the enforce of the inflow on self.

Of course, it's been invalidated now to the degree that I've nulled it all out. But that is not a vanished list because of rudiments out. That you should realize. Rudiments were in. If the item had been on the list, it would have showed.

What I'm showing you is it was heavily charged. The subject was charged. See that? We had a *bzzz* every time we charged the subject. Okay? All right.

Well, now you see that if I can miss them occasionally on completing a list, why, you needn't feel so blushing sometimes. And don't you ever fake one just because, see, you want to make the pc look good or something like that. Don't ever fake one, you know, say, "Well, it was reading a little bit, you know, it was the last one in," something like that. Doesn't work that way. If you don't find an item, don't find an item. You hear me?

It would have been very simple for me simply to have kicked it with my thumb and said it's in. [laughter] Of course, that's very embarrassing, you know, in front of all of you experts, you know?

I thought that was quite fascinating just from the standpoint – I've – about halfway through the session I suddenly realized I was looking at a charged subject – that the subject was charged – but that I wasn't getting any action on any item like that surge that I was getting every time I said one was in or out.

Now, the toss-up is this: Do you stop and invalidate the pc across the boards and say, "Well, this list is no good, we're gonna have to do another list," or do you null it out to nothing and add some items and so forth? It'd just be what made the pc unhappy. Well, you wouldn't do that. You'd do what the pc is happy on, and so on.

Pc is not upset, I don't think, because we didn't find an item.

Female voice: No, I'd rather have the right item.

Yeah, she wasn't saying that just for your benefit. But the fact that she'd rather have the right item rather tends to indicate that she knew there wasn't one on the list. See? Tends to indicate it.

Well, all that, 3D Criss Cross to the contrary, let us get into something that is very vital to you. Let's get into Security Checking disappears, and Prepchecking rises newly born.

In the first place, the word Security Checking has never been very popular with the public and it renders itself very bad to understanding. We're not checking people because of security, see? We're actually preparing cases for clearing. And so if you called it Prepchecking, it sounds slightly onomatic – onomatopoeic. That will be a shilling apiece, please, for that one. [laughter] Slightly onomatopoeic – you didn't think I could say it twice, did you? [laughter] So we'll call it Prepchecking if that's all right with you. What do you think about that?

Audience: I agree.

All right. And then we will call the operation of – not the operation covered in this bulletin. The subject matter that I'm taking up in this lecture is HCO Bulletin of February 12th, 1962, which I believe you have. But not because it isn't covered in this bulletin yet, but because I haven't given you all the dope on it and won't give you the dope in this particular lecture on how you do it. We've got a whole subject here, and we could call this Prepclearing Prepchecking, Prepclearing. We got a whole subject here. It's a subject that'll take a lot of the snarls out of your wits on how you do this.

Now, I've been trying to teach you here and across the world for a very long time, how to do Security Checking. And auditors have been missing withholds and auditors haven't learned it very well, so we have to understand that this is probably something that is very, very hard to do.

Now, instead of blaming everybody and trying to make you all guilty – see, that's usual, you see, the fellow who's standing up with his thumbs in his braces, you know, and saying, "I'm the big I am, and I know it all," will naturally try to make you guilty and say, "Well, you're just ignorant and stupid."

Well, there must have been something missing in Security Checking. Must have been something missing, and it's some element or another missing. So instead of blaming you across the boards, I have been working since the first of the year, very hard on this subject. Now, of course, I've worked on this subject of overts for more than a decade. But there must have been something, something missing in the whole subject of pulling withholds, and there must have been something missing about withholds. There must have been something unknown about the subject, otherwise, one could have articulated it well enough so that you could do it easily.

Now, I've done some remarkable things in pulling withholds. And I've caused some cases to have some fantastic gains in pulling withholds here and there and now and then. But I might not have been doing it all. You know, there might be a better way to pull withholds, and there might be more to the mechanism of what withholds are all about and all of that sort of thing.

Well, anyway, I've been working very intensely here for a period of about well, since the first of the year, certainly.

And since the first of the year, I've been aware of the fact that if I couldn't teach you how to do this so that you'd get a resurgent gain every session and every time you did, that there must be a bug. There must be a bug here someplace. Either it is hard to relay or it's hard to do or there's some accidental – there must be something here because there's a variable. And so I made up my mind to get rid of the variable. And the first time you saw that was when I started jawing at you about missed withholds.

And apparently if you restimulate somebody's withholds, if you restimulate a withhold and then you don't pull it, you have the sole source of ARC breaks. Now, for God's sakes, when I learned that, when I looked at it, when I proved it out – and I had it proved out by about ten days, two weeks ago, totally to my satisfaction – you have the source of all of your ARC breaks, of all of the *yap-yap* against the organizations, of all the *yap-yap* against Scientology, of all of the *nya-yak-nyak-nyak-nya-nya-nya-nya*, of all the pcs that are going into propitiation and anger and upset, and so forth – you've got the lot in a missed withhold. It restimulates the withhold, you don't pull it, your pc gets mad at you, you know?

A pc in the HGC goes out into the field and all of a sudden goes *nya-nya-nya-nya-nya-nya-nya*. Well, somebody missed a withhold on that pc, that's all. Because listen, this is the proof. You get a hold of them, and you bring them in, and you set them down, and don't do a blessed thing with them but ask them what withhold has been missed on them, in some fashion or another. Ask them effectively. And they give it to you – you'll find it – and they say the organization is fine, and you're wonderful, and they go off, and all of a sudden they get a case resurgence and a case gain that they didn't have at the time they left. Interesting, isn't it? *Ha-ha-ha*. Now, there's something to be known about this. There's a lot to be known about this. And somehow or another I've got to get you to get a good reality on this. But I made two tests right here. We had two auditor blowups. Two auditor-pc blowups, see. Two pcs blew up and the auditor kind of blew up, one auditor didn't blow up. The auditor grabbed the pc around the legs and hung on like grim death. And you know that both of those incidents were traced back to having missed withholds. And we went ahead and we got them afterwards.

The auditor had missed a withhold and you had a big pc blowup. Now, I don't know how many times I have to tell you this, but you might as well accept it because I'm just going to keep on telling you this. This thing is, this thing is not one of these variables. It's not a variable. This is not susceptible to difficulty.

It isn't true that every time you miss a withhold you get an ARC break. That is not necessarily true at all. But it is true that every time you have an ARC break you've had a missed withhold. Now, that's what's true. See, so you've gotten away with it for years without recognizing what you were getting away with.

So some pcs had ARC breaks, and some pcs didn't, you see. And on both of them you could have missed withholds. It's not invariable that because you miss a withhold the pc is going to blow up to the roof. But it is invariable that if the pc blows up to the roof, you've missed a withhold.

Now, as Scientologists, for God's sakes, get a reality on this. Mamie Gulch from Sad Bottom is saying, "Oh, the Central Organization is terrible and it chews everybody up, and it ruins everybody, and it's just a death trap because if you go near the place, and so forth. And

you know that I heard and so forth and so on. *Nya-nya-nya.*" [fast mumbling] And they come around and they're talking to you like this, and if I catch one of you explaining to them that that is not what the Central Organization is about, I'll – I'll – I'll – I'll – I'll revoke a portion of your thetan. Now, listen – [laughter] the effective thing to do is just reach for an E-Meter, because listen, there's nothing under the sun, moon or stars you can do but reach for an E-Meter. Now, let me tell you this. It's a fact. It's a fact. Please get some reality on it.

This character is going on and on and on, saying, "Central Organizations charge too much money. Besides, besides I had a brother once and so on and so on and so on. And the Registrar wrote me a letter and do you know what it said? *Nya-nya-nya.*" You've got no business whatsoever trying to explain it to them or trying to heal the ARC break. Honest. Honest, I've tried, and it just doesn't work. It just doesn't work. They just go on. You can overwhelm them. You can shoot them. You can – there's various things you can do, but look, man has been overwhelming them and man has been shooting them, and man has been trying to punish them into line now for the last 200 trillion years. And it hasn't worked. That is the unworkable phenomena. So all of your control punishment phenomena stems from this one fact. That man did not have the technology to pull the missed withhold.

So why should we keep on punishing them if we know what's wrong with them? Now, this is what's turned up in the last few weeks – a very intensive study on this. I've been burning the midnight Ron [laughter] and I finally got this thing sorted out as an invariable.

No, it isn't true that every time you miss a withhold, somebody's going to blow up the universe. You can have lots of withholds missed on you and on somebody else, and nothing much might happen. But where dynamite has begun to explode, where the fuses are burning, where this and that is happening, that is what happened. A withhold has been missed.

Now, this means this. That you haven't any business whatsoever, sitting in an auditing chair letting a pc chew you up, trying to handle the ARC break or be nice about it. You just haven't any business doing that.

The pc is chewing you up. You should immediately equate what has happened because nothing else has happened. You missed a withhold. That's all. What are you sitting there letting the pc *yap-yap* for, see? Because they're going to *yap-yap* from there till the end of session one way or the other. And you're just going to blow the session up.

No. Look at a pc's ARC break and think in terms of missed withholds, that's all. Don't think in terms of criticism of your own auditing and criticism of what you're doing and that sort of thing because you're doing all right. You understand this?

Now, the withhold that you missed is most likely to have been right in the session you're running. That's the most likely thing because it's much more important to a person that he dropped a match on his toe a minute ago than to have an elephant step on his head a trillion years ago, you understand? Present time things are much more important than past time things. So it's – the probability is it's right in the session you're running. You're looking right at it.

And if that's not the case, it must have been in one of the recent sessions you ran on the pc, and it took that long to blow up. And if that's not the case, it's back down earlier on the

auditing track, probably with some other auditor, as far as sessions go, or somebody should have known something about them in the last day or two. You know, it's an out of session thing that you're looking at. But, by the way, that isn't really going to make them mad at you. That's just going to give them a PT problem.

Now, where the missed withhold occurs monitors – or what it's composed of – monitors what rudiment goes out. Now, all rudiments go out because of missed withholds. All rudiments go out because of missed withholds. Now, all the rudiments processes are true and everything is fine about rudiments. And you've got, now, I think, about ten rudiments – could have processes connected with them – beginning and end rudiments. And all those things are perfectly true, and you could handle them all with the rudiment that is right there that you're reading. But the truth of the matter is, is back of each rudiment, if you look back of each rudiment, you'll find a missed withhold.

So out-rudiments are caused by missed withholds. And I'm going to make a further study on it and find out just what type of missed withhold causes what rudiment to go out. But each one of them is traceable, and I've been tracing back out-rudiments to missed withholds here until I don't know why we're processing problems. I don't know why we're processing ARC breaks. I don't know why we're processing any of these other things.

See, all you have to do is find the missed withhold. Present time problem is a missed withhold in life, not in the session. An ARC break is a withhold in the session. Invalidation of the E-Meter or something like that is a withhold, a missed withhold on the subject of the meter. There's something going here, you see? There's a missed withhold back of each one of these ten rudiments.

All right. So we look down the rack of these things and we find out that there's different types of missed withholds. And these missed withholds are all very intriguing but they're all missed.

Now, a missed withhold is a special thing. It is *not* a withhold. It's a "should-have-known." And if we stop calling them missed withholds, we might get over the semantic mess that we get into when we say – well, we walk into this staff, see, walk into the HGC, and the auditors there – perfectly good auditors, everything's fine, and we say, "All right, now pick up the missed withholds on this pc." And so the auditor goes into the auditing session and he knows what he's supposed to do, and he says to the pc, "Are you withholding anything?"

Oh, no. And you say, "Now look, I mean *missed withholds*, see. Get the *missed withholds*," and so forth.

And he says, "Okay, yeah. Well, all right. That's what I was doing, you know." And he goes back into session, and he says, "And what are you withholding? What are you withholding? What are you withholding?"

And you'll get hold of him and you just back him up against in the hall, and you say, "Now look, son, look. We're talking about *missed withholds*. The withholds that have been *missed*. That's what we're talking about. The withholds that have been restimulated and missed."

And he says, "Okay. Okay. I – you needn't get so mad about it. I'll go back in and do something about it."

So he goes back in and he says to the pc, he says, "Now, what are you withholding?" [laughter]

Well, you can go round and round on this mess. You see, semantically, the thing is disoriented. Yes, it means missed withhold, but a missed withhold is not a withhold.

And he says, "Oh, well, you don't have to pull withholds anymore. You can miss them or..." Lord knows what kind of a scramble you're liable to get into, but it's not going to be pleasant. No, call them "should-have-knowns." Now, I'm not going to keep calling them should-have-knowns. I'll keep calling them missed withholds. I'm giving you the explanatory thing, you know? You say, "Well, what I mean by a missed withhold is the should-have-knowns."

You find out what you should have known, and what the organization should have known, and what his auditor should have known, and what Ron should have known, and what other people should have known about him at various times.

Now you pick up all those should-have-knowns, you understand? The fellow isn't on the subject of withholds now, is he. He completely moved off it. Actually, what he's picking up is missed withholds. See, you've explained this by should-have-knowns – the auditing command. You understand?

It doesn't communicate well, so in an Academy talk to students about should-have-knowns and so forth, as your side explanation. You can call them "should-have-knowns" if you want to. I will continue to call them missed withholds because there's no more direct appellation that you could possibly assign to it than a withhold that has been missed. Just because this is hard to relay at first is no reason why we should abandon the whole thing. The fellow's withholding something, and somebody didn't find out, and that's the whole study.

Now, right along with this, right along with this discovery, I found out that you had gone into quantitative – quantitative thinking.

Have I mixed you up some way when I say missed withholds and no missed withholds, and so on? You understand what I mean?

Audience: Yes.

We'll go on and call them missed withholds. I'm just showing you, oh my God, you explain this to some new auditor on the subject, you'd better say, "Now, what I mean by a missed withhold is a should-have-known," you see, and it explains quickly. You say, "Just go in and find out from that pc what you should have known about him."

"What he should have known? What I should have – should have – he should have known about me? Doesn't seem to make any sense to me, but I'll go in. 'Well, what should you have known about me? No, I mean what should, should I have known about you?'"

And the pc says, "Well, well, you should have realized, you should have realized that I've always been a pervert, and you didn't find it out. *Ha-ha-ha-ha*. And you should have known... Well, you should have just known lots of things. You should have known I didn't

want to be here. And you should have known processing wasn't doing me any good and I was just pretending that it was doing me some good and..."

This auditor has all of a sudden become a citizen right on the spot. He's been sitting there processing this pc and all of a sudden there's this whole bank of mystery that has been going on that he didn't know anything about. And he realizes something.

Now, let's look a little bit further on this. Let's look further. A should-have-known simply is an unknown. And we're back to unknown Sec Checking – the Sec Checking of the unknown. And I've pulled out of that quick as a bunny because auditors were putting people into engrams and trying to run the engrams with them and it wasn't running well. They were running "unknown" on engram, and although people were getting their first glimpses of back-track and that sort of thing, it was too much and I wasn't about to teach auditors at this stage of the game – all auditors who come along – how to run engrams with "not-know." You see? So I pulled out of that, even though that was very successful. That was a few months ago, remember? That was a very successful process. You really could turn the bank upside down.

That's all you're doing when you're pulling a withhold, is you're curing an unknown-ness. The whole subject of withholds equates into not-know and unknown. It's just... A missed withhold is a half-known, half-unknown. So you get a half-know, half-unknown, and evidently there's enough charge just in having everybody not-know while you know, or in you knowing only half, and your reactive bank is an unknow of the other half, don't you see, that it causes a polarity of some kind or another that sets up a God-awful agitation in the bank.

So things that are half known – known to me but not to you, known to you but not to me, known to you analytically partially, but half unknown to you analytically, you see, so that you've got an unknown reactive and a known analytical, and it raises all the devil with you and that tells you all that is wrong with the reactive mind. It's an unknown area.

Now, you'll greet this head-on when you start processing these items you're finding so happily with 3D Criss Cross. We won't go into that just now but unknow plays a very, very heavy role in this.

Now, the not-know that is most important is the should-have-known. That is what is the most important aspect. It – that is the tense that is the most important. I've been looking for that for a long time. It's should-have-known. That itself is *regret* and that is what bunches the bank. I refer you to a tremendous amount of material on the subject of regret of many years ago. And that's very good material.

But should-have-known is what gives you regret. See, you didn't know it then, you know it now, so that you've got the time track now with the upper part of the track is know and the lower part of the track is not-know. And you've got these two things, not-know and know, and they come into a Godawful disagreement and collision. Do you see how that would be?

So you get your distress in the bank and your distress from elements, and so forth, from this half-known, half-unknown factor. However this traces down electronically, we're not as interested as we might be, because it certainly is observable.

A half-known fact is about the wildest thing that anybody ever had to do anything with. We hear a twig fall in the quiet and hostile forest. We hear this twig, you know, we hear it go *clatter*, and then we hear it go snap. And then we – there's maybe a little *thud* immediately afterwards. And a person just freezes. Where is the bear? See, we half know there is a bear there, but we don't know there's a bear there. We know something is going on, but we don't know what is going on, and it's a freezer, you see? So that is a very good example of your half know, half not-know, you see?

Now, this mechanism of regret is what turns a 3D Criss Cross valence into a ball. This is what loops the time track. Now, the mechanism of the looped time track is totally due to just one thing and that is should-have-known. And that is the swan song that the thetan is singing. If he only knew then what he knew now. And you get as a result of this, you get a looped track.

So that's what makes a black ball, bunches all the pictures up and smashes everything into one time zone of a valence. That's how a valence gets in to be a round ball circuit. That's the exact mechanic of it. It's the regret. It's the should-have-known. Regret isn't a strong enough word. Should-have-known.

We don't care what he should have known. He should have known better. He should have known about her. He, you know, he should have known about parents. If he'd only known about the outcome of the battle he wouldn't have engaged in it in the first place. And of course, all this thing adds up to is a feeling that one shouldn't have confronted. One shouldn't have done, one shouldn't have confronted, one shouldn't have experienced. So the prior pictures of having experienced are invalidated at once. So he just tries to say they never happened.

And then we get the occlusion of the whole track. See, nothing happened is what the final analysis is. He should have known. He didn't know. You see, what he's saying about the past all the time is that he didn't know, didn't know, didn't know. You know? He's saying at the same time that he should have known, should have known, should have known, didn't know, didn't know, didn't know, should have known, should have known, should have known.

"We didn't realize when we took off that morning for Germany that..." You know, here we go, here we go.

"When I walked up the aisle with that brute, I did not realize that..." And of course, the storybooks of life are filled with nothing but what follows.

In view of the fact that it – most of it's invented and created, we then get all kinds of loopy factors going on in valences and dub-ins and all sorts, and you can explain all other – all types of phenomena with this. Should-have-known. Now, that's apparently the most important button in the bank because it's the only one that out of hand can... But look, an ARC break is the only thing that can prevent a pc from getting results. Yet that not only prevents him from getting results but reduces his profile. That reduces his gain. And the only thing that creates an ARC break in the final analysis is a should-have-known. So add it up yourself.

If the ARC break is so deadly that auditing can't even – not only can't exist but shouldn't have existed, you see, the not have – the should-have-known must be more powerful

than the ARC break, because you can remedy ARC breaks by running should-have-known. Do you see this? Well, that's the equation by which we've worked this out and by which we can demonstrate these phenomena at any time.

But it's the should-have-known. That is the main thing that you're knocking on the door of.

Now, at the same time I worked that out – some time ago, articulated it a little bit better in the last few days so I can tell you what I was thinking about – but another thing came up. Your quantitative thinking on the subject of withholds is just this quantitative button that this universe has. It isn't the number of withholds you get. Nor is it the *bigness* of the withhold you get. Nor it – is it the *gruesomeness* or the *antisocialness* or the *newspaperheadline-ness* of the withhold you get. It is just the thoroughness with which you get a withhold. It's the quality of your auditing and the thoroughness of pulling a withhold. One withhold well, thoroughly pulled will give you tremendous case gain. And a thousand withholds indifferently pulled, will give you a case retardation. Now, what's the answer?

Well, right up there in that auditing room where you see the thing – I've started to audit in that room just to get practice on it and so on. I turn on all the screens and everything, and go ahead and audit the pc. I ran a session the other night that old papa Freud would have been standing around with his eyes bugged. You could have knocked them off with cricket bats.

He was always looking for tremendous resurges, you see, on the part of pcs. He was a – pretty much of a one-button man. I respect this guy but he was pretty much of a one-button man. If he could just get this *one* thing on the bank, you see, you'd get this tremendous resurgence, the drop out of the psychosomatic illness, and so on. He must have done it two or three times. He actually must have or he wouldn't have had such faith in it.

And if he could just, just hit that one thing, that, just that little hidden something there, if he could just get a – fingers on that something and produce this, well, he couldn't do it invariably, and he never taught anybody to do it, by the way. He must have done it himself a few times. And he never taught anybody how to do it. But he must have had some success with it.

He was looking for a withhold. That's all he was looking for. And you can cover the whole of Freudian analysis on the looking for a withhold. And in his particular case, because he was operating to a large degree with Jewish patients, he had tended to follow that mores pattern. Nothing wrong with that. It's just that it colored his work by having grouped too tightly. So he was looking for that particular type of aberration. And he was looking for it to have occurred in childhood.

And so he circumscribed the dynamic and he circumscribed the area of the track so seriously that he must have made a mess out of things here and there. He kept looking in childhood when it was a, the seventy-year-old man, you see, and the incident happened when he was sixty-eight. He's been nuts ever since, you know. And so he would not look in that area so much. He would look back in childhood all the time, you know. And maybe there was nothing there.

What he was looking for was a withhold of some kind or another. And he didn't quite know what he was looking for. But the few times that this had happened was sufficient to give psychoanalysis the springboard which pushed it out across the world. And that it happened occasionally, accidentally elsewhere – you know, other psychoanalysts had accidentally pulled a withhold one day and not quite known what they'd pulled, and then they'd go over the hills and far away. That was what put Freudian analysis up in lights. Just that one little factor. Look how – what a tiny amount is known about it. I mean you read Freudian analysis, you find there's very little known. They don't know very much. They didn't know even how to pull one. And yet they could get resurgences once in a blue moon, and Freud must have had pretty good luck at it.

Now, what was he doing. Well, I'll tell you one thing he was doing – he was restimulating enough withholds to make a lot of patients commit suicide and kill Freudian analysis – analysts, or try to, because you've never heard so many people get so mad at Freudian analysts as patients do. And the only way they handle this is by overwhelming the patient. Don't ever adopt those tactics because all you have to do – now that you've got the technology, there's no reason to punish the person. Just find the should-have-known. Just find out what should-have-known you've restimulated, you see? Pull it and he'll cease to be angry with you.

It's very funny. When you get very expert at doing this it's a very quick trick. It's just a *bing-bing* to keep a pc from having an ARC break. The pc has an ARC break, "What should I have known about you?"

"Well," he says, "Well, you should have known I've been uncomfortable for the last ten minutes."

You say, "Thank you very much. Do you have an ARC break?" You've got no ARC break.

You can have a pc *raving* at you, telling, "Your auditing *yap-yap-yap-yapyap-yap-yap-yap*. And you should have... And *wow-wow-wow-wow-wow-wow-wow*."

Just say, "Has somebody missed a withhold on you?"

And he says, "As a matter of fact, they have."

"All right." And it's liable to pull that quickly.

But, on the other hand, on the other hand, there are many of them that won't pull that quickly. You can get the moment that they weren't pulled and flip it, and knock out the ARC break. But then it gets flipped again and once more you've got a missed withhold because the basic withhold has not been pulled.

So there would be two ways you could handle this situation. One, is with the dress parade, the Queen's guard riding down holding up all the traffic outside of Buckingham Palace. Everything, you know. And let's really break it out, see. Let's troop the colors and the lot, you know. Let's spread this thing all over the place, you see? Let's do with the whole thing. Or you're – let's just knock out the key-in.

See, you've got two choices that you can go. Either you can knock out all the should-have-knowns on that subject in this lifetime, or you can – and this lifetime is just a key-in – or you can knock out the last key-in that happened.

Now, when you want to get a rudiment in fast, knock out the last key-in and then don't take the rest of it. And you knock that out with a lightly should-have-known – just a light two-way comm, should-have-known. *Bang!* If that doesn't work, you've got a dress parade to go on.

Now, when we talk about this dress parade, we're talking about HCOB of February 12, 1962. And we're talking about a specific system called the "Withhold System." And we're talking about something which runs off just about like you pull the levers on the slot machine and it comes out, except in this particular case if you pull the levers on the slot machine often enough, it empties.

That's not true of all slot machines, you know. I don't know if you've ever had that experience. I like to own slot machines myself, you see. And when I play them I go around to the back of them, you know, and fix the number of give and take, you see, on the thing. Fix that up so that it's 110 percent, you know. That gives me a great deal of satisfaction. But after a while I have to put more money in it so I can keep winning.

Well, you can almost run with a terrific regular – you can with this Withhold System, you just pull the levers of the slot machine and the money keeps pouring out. I mean, that's as far as that's concerned.

Now, the reason I mentioned Papa Freud is because if you work this system – that has nothing to do with it, this is just your added bonus, you see – if you work this system, you'd be absolutely fascinated to discover that all the basic buttons that you and everybody else have been searching for on this case, and the things this case had been worried about, and so forth, are just going to roll out on the rug. That's your added gain.

Now, in Prepchecking, the only thing you're trying to do – and that's the whole system – is you're trying to get in the rudiments so that they never go out during 3D Criss Cross. And that is the mission of Prepchecking. Now, we go into that later.

But you do this Withhold System, and something very funny happens. If you do this thing exactly according to the book, by the numbers, and don't get fancy with it and don't get careless with it, and you be very careful with it and handle every withhold that comes up with this, with this little system, all of a sudden the pc's bum ear and other things of this particular type, are all of a sudden going to straighten out. You're going to get yourself some fantastic gains. People will look at you like you are a wizard or something.

Well, of course, this is nothing compared to what you can do with 3D Criss Cross, but it's fantastic. It is darn well worth doing. And that's what's most fascinating about it is you straighten up the case so the rudiments will stay in while you do 3D Criss Cross. *Voilà!* Marvelous! Good-oh!

And at the same time you get all these extra bonuses, you see, of the person's arthritis and that sort of thing tends to disappear. Don't get too hopeful. It'll all come back on again while you're doing 3D Criss Cross. But it'll make life livable for the person. It's not an im-

permanent gain because it straightens up their present time environment for them to a very marked and marvelous degree.

And you get all these resurgences that Papa Freud got two or three times so remarkably – oh, maybe more than that, certainly more than that – and that Freudian practitioners get maybe twice in their career. See? And you get these things as routine about every five hours of processing, if you're doing this thing hot and right, see. The pc really knows he's going someplace. And all you're doing is straightening out the person so he can be run on 3D Criss Cross. That's the only thing you're interested in.

Now, Prepchecking is the system of getting each rudiment in with a crunch. That gets each rudiment in so it's more or less permanently in during the auditing in 3D Criss Cross. And that's Prepchecking. That is a different system than the one we're taking up here in HCOB of February 12th, but it uses exactly the same elements. So this Withhold System is applicable to any and all withholds, and it has very broad application – this exact system. We're going to use it in the narrow confines of Prepchecking.

Now, you could do a Joburg, Form 3, with one of these things and I'll give you just a rapid-fire example of how you would do a Form 3 question.

We have five parts in this system. Now, the Zero is the difficulty you're handling. That's your Zero. Now, the reason it's Zero is that's what you're trying to tape in, that's from what you are departing so it doesn't have a 1 because it's the place you're departing from. And that would be any question, any question that appeared in the Form 3 on a broad thing. "Have you ever robbed a bank?" That's not even a Form 3 question, but, "Have you ever robbed a bank?" see. That's giving you an example.

But that's what you're trying to clear on this pc, "Have you ever robbed a bank?" so you would write that in for your Zero.

All right. You've got a fall on that, so you say, "All right. What's that?"

And he says, "Well, I broke open a piggy bank once and took the money out of it."

All right. That's what his withhold was, you see. Now, you can write that down or not. That doesn't matter. You've got your What. Now, your What, "What about that piggy bank?" Now, for God's sakes, write that on the auditor's report. "What about that piggy bank?"

If you were doing a Form 3 this way, you would just take this other question. That's the question you're working on, and you just work off the form. But this number 1, you've got to write down because that is your test question.

"What about that piggy bank?" Or, "What about robbing that piggy bank?" We don't care what the wording of it was, but it's a wording that matches up to the withhold.

Now, the pc says, "I robbed a piggy bank once. I broke it."

And your question then would be the most close approximation you could get to this with a What. "What about robbing and breaking that piggy bank?" And that's what you'd write down in your auditor's report. Now, that's your number 1. That is your What.

Now, the way to handle this system is to memorize it on this basis of – it's, "What, When, All, Who."

All right. Now, you say, "What about robbing and breaking that piggy bank?" And it gives you a reaction, of course. He can say something else, but we don't care what he says. We frankly, really don't care for what he says from here on, as long as he keeps talking and giving us data.

Now, I call to your attention that a pc never refuses to talk to the auditor. He never refuses to give up the withhold. But he often doesn't know what it is. And it's the auditor's job to get him to look. And I don't care how harsh an auditor has to be to get a pc to look, but I don't want to ever see an auditor harsh because the pc won't tell him. That is idiocy. The pc *will* tell him. If the pc is even basically, even vaguely in-session, he can think of the gummiest, slimiest, horriblest, most anti-survival data, and he'll tell the auditor. But he very often can't find out what it is. So your job is to keep him looking, because it may be so frightening and so horrifying and so charged that he won't go on looking.

You know, he doesn't want to look – he, and so on. No, you can be as histrionic as you like from that point on, but get him to look. And never start chopping the pc up because the pc won't tell you, because you've told him he's out of session.

No, the only thing you want the pc to do is look. The pc says, "Oh, I don't know anything more about that, and I'm going..." And you get a fall on the meter.

"Ah," you say, "there's a great deal more about this. Now look at it. Now just look at it and give me some more about this."

I don't care how positive you get about it. The only mistake you can make is telling the pc "Well, now, you've got to tell me. You *know* that you know all about it."

Oh, that would be a horrible mistake, because you're admitting the pc won't talk to you, and of course he goes out of session, the games condition enters at once, and the whole thing goes up the spout, and you don't get any further, and so forth. So you never admit that point. That point never comes into the session. The pc will always tell you if the pc can find out. And your job is to get the pc to look and the pc to find out.

And the pc's sitting there all fogged up one way or the other and, "*Blooeey*," he says, "*blooeey, blah*. Oh, that's just all there is to it. There's – that's all – I just know that must be all there is to it, because there isn't anything else to it." And so on, you see.

"All right. Now look, it's still falling on the meter here. Now, is it falling because of an ARC break? No, I don't get any reaction from that. I tell you there's more to it. Look! What is there? You tell me what's there now. You just look."

"Oh, well, it's so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so, and well, huh."

You say, "Good. Fine."

But in this particular system, we can be insistent. But we take anything the pc gave us as the answer to the question. You're getting data the whole while.

So you say, "What about robbing and breaking that piggy bank?"

Of course, that's going to fall. He just told you, and it is not going to be released. That's for sure. But if you say it, and it now doesn't react, you haven't got a number 1, have you?

So you'll have to ask him for another one, won't you, to get a number 1.

You say, "Well, have you ever robbed a bank?" And that doesn't react now. You've cleared the question. That was it. So he broke a piggy bank once, so robbing banks registered and he phrased it, and he gave it to you, and you can't get any more read, and you've had it. You understand?

That's why number 1, the whole system is dependent on: number 1 must be cleared. And eventually, number Zero must be cleared. But the 1's must all be cleared, and eventually, Zero will be cleared.

All right. Now let's say, "What about robbing and breaking that piggy bank?" And it fell.

All right. We immediately go into *when*. "When was that?" Now, you don't have to hit that very precisely the first time. The more times you hit it, and the more times you go over it, the more precise you're going to get, until you could finally take a meter and spot it into within a fifteen second interval in the middle of some precise day and month and year and so forth, and the position of the planets, you know. I mean you could really zero that thing in with an E-Meter if you had to. But ordinarily, "When was it?" You see?

But the more often you have to ask that – go over it the first time you say, "When was it?"

He says, "Well, that was when I was a little boy."

That's perfectly good enough. Next time you go over it, well, "How old were you?" See, "When was it?" See?

"Well, I mmm-mmm." Get it down to the year, you know.

Next time you have to go over it again, you'd better be suspicious that there must be something wrong with the When if it's not cleared yet. So you've – it's very, very precise. So the more times you go across When the more precise you get on spotting it. You see the idea?

If you had to cross it once, you can do it loosely. Twice, a little more precisely. Three times, a little more precisely. Four times, man, you better start zeroing that thing in. You better be getting on the E-Meter by this time and really finding out if it was earlier than 1936 or later than 1936, you see? Let's spot it in.

All right. And of course, 1 fell, or we wouldn't be going on with it, you see. "What about robbing and breaking that piggy bank?" So we're going to do 2, 3, and 4 in rotation every time that we find 1 reacting. We don't do a thing about 1 but run 2, 3 and 4. That's all we do about 1 is run 2, 3 and 4 until 1 no longer registers. And at that moment, we go back to our Zero and see if it's registering. And if it's registering, we get another What.

Well, we could get another little withhold. We don't care what the withhold is as long as he gives us a withhold. And whatever he gives us a withhold on, we run back to it. But right now we're involved in clearing up this piggy bank.

All right. "When it occurred, is that all of it? Is there any more to it?"

Now, we find out, well, he says, "I was – I was just a little kid" – the answer he gave us. We don't care, by the way, what 2, 3 and 4 do on the meter. We're not really very close to a meter here.

We only care about Zero and 1 on the meter unless we're dating for 2. And we can actually pull our head out of the meter and talk to the pc on 2, 3 and 4 straight, every time. And he'll much more tend to hold in-session that we don't care what the meter reactions are – 2, 3 or 4 – we're always going to cover them, regardless of whether they react or don't react. We don't care. We only want to care if 1 reacts. So when we get back – when we've done 4, then we get our nose back into the meter again, and we say, "All right. What about robbing and breaking that piggy bank?"

And we don't got much reaction here. Except we might get something on "robbing" because it's still hot. But we don't get anything on the whole question. The whole question is not reacting. So we desert it, and we go back to the Zero, and we say, "Have you ever robbed a bank?"

You always leave these things with the same line that you get into them, which is why you wrote this What question down on your auditor's report. We'd much rather have the What question on the auditor's report than all the gruesome details.

So as long as we get 1 reacting, as a whole question of course, we keep on doing 2, 3 and 4, and 2, 3 and 4, and 2, 3 and 4. As long as we got it reacting, we always do... If we've done 2 – if 1 reacts, we do 2. If we do 2, we do 3. If we've done 3, we do 4, you see? And then if we've done 4, we test. So it's a matter of 2, 3, 4, test; 2, 3, 4, test; 2, 3, 4, test; 2, 3, 4, test; 2, 3, 4, test. Test. It's clean. Cheers!

All right. Now we go back. "Have you ever robbed a bank?"

That's the difficulty, see. "Have you ever robbed a bank? It's clean." And we find another withhold difficulty to monkey with. We can't get any more reaction on that one. We go elsewhere. We get another difficulty.

You see how this works now? It's very precise, by the way. And it is not any strain to amount to anything on you. And it's quite magical. Because a 2, 3, 4 are the three elements necessary to blow a withhold from here to Halifax so nobody will ever hear of it again.

All right. Let me give you a very rapid, little rundown example of this robbing the bank. All right?

We say to the pc, "Have you ever robbed a bank?"

We got a reaction. You say, "All right. Come on, give." The pc has had a chance to answer before we start plaguing him.

And he says, "*Wha-heh-ha yuh-uh huh-hmm*. I robbed, robbed and broke a piggy bank once."

And you say, "Good. What about robbing and breaking a piggy bank?" That is your What, and you write that down on your auditor's report – what about robbing and breaking a piggy bank?

Now, here we go. You say, "When was that? Is that all there is to it? And who should have known about it? Who didn't find out about it? Who should have found out about it and didn't?" Of course, you remember that "should" is much more important than the "didn't." But you can play this for variation, you see.

And so he says, "Well, so-and-so." It doesn't matter what the pc says. The pc's talking to you. That's all a part of the session, see. Pc's giving you dope.

And you can run back up here to 1. And you say, "What about robbing and breaking a piggy bank?"

And it goes, "What about robbing and breaking a piggy bank?" *Clank!* You say, "Good. Now just exactly when was that? Oh, how old were you?"

"I was six."

"All right. Good enough. Is that all of it?"

"Well, no. Actually, as a matter of fact, I hid the pieces afterwards, and so forth, and so on."

And you say, "Well, who should have known about that?"

And he tells you.

And you go back, and you say, "What about robbing and breaking a piggy bank?" *Clank!*

And you say, "All right. Now, how old were you at that time?"

"Well, I was six. No, no, no, my little brother was six. No, I was twelve. I was twelve."

And you say, "Well, is that all of it?"

"Well, no, it was my little brother's piggy bank."

"Well, all right. Good. Now, who should have known about it and didn't find out?"

"Well, my mother and father should have. I've been saying before that they should have known about my robbing the piggy bank. But they should have known about the fact that I beat my little brother up when he said he'd tell them. *Ha-ha-ha-ha*. I prevented them from finding out about it."

"Well, good. Good. All right. Fine. Now, what about robbing and breaking that piggy bank? *Click*. All right."

"Now, just exactly when was that?"

"Now, you say that was – you say you were twelve. Let's see, what year would that be?" And let's just ride it right in on the E-Meter. As a matter of fact, we find out he was sixteen, and his little brother was eight. *Heh-heh-heh-heh*. And it's beginning to put a greater and greater complexion on this thing. That would be a horrible thing to have happen to him, you see.

"Now, all right. That's good. Now, let's find out, well, now, is that all of it?"

"No, not all. Well, no, as a matter of fact. [sigh] They found the pieces later and I said my little brother had done it, and they beat him." [laughter] "And I said, I said I'd seen him do it." [laughter]

"Oh, all right. Thank you. All right. Now, who should have known about that?"

"Well, they should have known I was lying because all I did when I was a little kid was lie, lie, lie, morning, noon and night, you know." [laughter] "I never told them the truth. I never told them the truth from the day I was born practically, and so forth, and made a liar out of my little brother, too."

"All right. That's fine." And you say, "Good. Now, what about robbing and breaking a piggy bank?" And the thing is just as quiet as it can be.

So we go back to – we say, "All right. Have you ever robbed a bank?" Now, if "have you ever robbed a bank" still falls, we might compartment the question into, "Have you ever robbed?" "Have you?" "Have you ever robbed? A bank?" And suddenly find out that, "robbed," is still hot.

Now, we might have found in the What question that "robbed" was hot, so we just dropped that, you see. So it just went at robbed, but it didn't go on the whole question, you understand?

So we drop here back to, and we say, "Well, have you ever robbed anything?" But remember, remember if we've done that, that the question, "Have you ever robbed a bank?" is now null, and we are working on a new difficulty derived from a compartment, and our Zero Question is now, "Have you ever robbed anything?"

And he says, "Well, nothing much. Filling station once." you see?

"All right. Now, what about robbing a filling station? That got a reaction. All right." And you write that on your auditor's report, and then you just go 2, 3, 4, test; 2, 3, 4, test; 2, 3, 4, test. Test is null. Go back to your difficulty, "Have you ever robbed anything?" Null. We got it. Scrub it. Get something new to clear. Okay?

Now, that's that Withhold System. And I think you will find it works like a dream. But it's more important – now get this – it is more important to handle one little, cotton-picking withhold well, than to handle thousands indifferently. It is not the quality of the withhold that counts. It is how much of it is submerged. How much of it has dropped out of sight. That's what counts.

It isn't that the pc has blown up the whole southwest quarter of the universe. If he knows he's done that, and there's no more to it, and the 2, 3, 4s produce no reaction on that

whatsoever, that isn't what's wrong with the pc, no matter how inviting it is to blame his condition on having blown up things.

And we find out one day he was walking down the street and he kicked a parson in the shins. And out of this little, stupid incident, we suddenly run back a wild dissertation of stuff, of things the pc actually did that you really recover recollections on that is all gone now. You bring them back to view. We plow them all out. We square them around. The pc confronts that fact, and there we go. And the way you get him to do all these things is just your – the Zero difficulty that you're trying to clear, which at the moment to you would be called any Sec Check question.

It'd be a very good thing for you to pick up any Sec Check question that a person has given you recurrently. He has given the same withhold to several pcs [auditors]. Just put that down as your difficulty and get your What from thereon, because your What will probably be the same as your difficulty in that case. And clean the living daylights out of it, and you're going to find something that will practically blow your head off. It's only half known or it wouldn't be recurrent. See? And it must be a missed withhold. That's all.

And any difficulty could be handled that way. It's a fundamental. It's a fundamental question. Well, let's say this way. The guy's got a bad head. Let's just go into it. Let's clear up a difficulty. Pc's got a bad head. Well, you say – "Have you" – this is our difficulty – "Have you ever done anything to a head?" Our terminology at that point might be better. But the question, the fundamental question was "Have you ever done anything to a head?" Not "What have you done to a head?" That's our fundamental. That's what we're trying to clear up. That's his difficulty, and we've got to put it in some kind of an overt tense.

So he says, "Well, no, not really, except, well, there was punching a little boy in the head once."

You say, "What about punching a little boy in the head?" and you've got your 1. Now, you treat it from there on out. You could treat psychosomatic – you could do all sorts of wild things with this. It has enormously wide application.

What I want you to learn – and those that are leaving here on Friday certainly have very little time to learn this – what I want you to learn is just the simplicity of the little drill and what it produces.

Now, the fact that you don't have to read, except when you're dating, 2, 3 and 4 on the meter, you give your undivided attention to the pc. The pc can really talk to you. He can really tell you things. He tends to stay in-session and so forth. And you only go back and test that, see. *Bang!* If it's still alive, well, you just got 2, 3, 4, 2, 3, 4 and you'd be surprised what you will plow up.

Now, for a little while on any one of these lines, you're liable to be – find that you're somewhat plowing bum ground. That is to say there's no cognition. There's nothing much happening. You clear withhold and nothing happens at all. And you go back to your difficulty and you find the difficulty is still alive, and you get another withhold, and you get another What, and you clear all that up arduously and arduously and you clear it all up, and it didn't amount to anything.

And you go back, and your difficulty is still registering, your Zero is still registering so you find another withhold on this subject, and you clear all that up with great ardure and arduousness and so forth.

And you do your 2, 3, 4, 2, 3, 4 and it doesn't amount to anything. And it comes out no place, and the pc is looking gray and beaten, no cognitions or anything. And you go back to your difficulty, and you get another withhold on this particular subject, and all of a sudden the pc says, "*D-d-d-a-a-ahhhhh*. I didn't know that. You know it did, you know. It's true."

And you go through your 2, 3, 4 and wow! What do you know, wow! And your 2, 3, 4 and your 2, 3, 4 and you can just see your difficulty – your Zero – blow. You can see the whole thing blow out as a charge.

Nothing will fall on an E-Meter that is not significantly charged. And nothing will fall on an E-Meter that is not unknown in part to the pc. Interesting, eh? And if you get an E-Meter registry, there must be something unknown. You saw a session today which tended to demonstrate that there was an unknown item on the list, because every time we said one was in or out, we got a surge. So there must be something unknown about the list. See how easy it is to read an E-Meter?

If you said an E-Meter registers every time the pc only knows in part or not at all about something – he only partially – it's an unknown. The E-Meter registers unknowns, that's all. As long as an E-Meter registers, there's something unknown about it.

All right. It becomes very simple if you handle it that way. I want you to become very adept at this Zero, 1, 2, 3, 4. And the only thing you're going to get into difficulty with seriously, is converting the Zero to the What, and then holding the What constant for test. Now, you're not going to have any difficulty with it because I have already gotten ahead of you. You didn't show me this difficulty. I showed you. All right, see, it's no victory for you on it.

You don't vary 1. You don't vary 1. You don't vary Zero. You can become a little bit yappy on 2, 3, 4, but try to stay somewhere close to the wording. Stay close to the spirit of the thing. You could actually do it by rote but you won't hold your pc very well in-session.

But the variation I'm asking for is, "Well, is there anybody else who didn't know anything about it at all. Well, should they have known about it?" You see? That's a variation of wording. "Well, now, are you sure you've told me all about that? Have you recalled all there is to know about that?"

"Well, there's this little scrap."

"All right. That's fine."

So what you're actually doing is using the E-Meter just to test Zero and 1, and you don't vary 1. And what we call varying the question is a point you have never been able to cope with easily. We've always had difficulty. Some of you can cope with it quite well. But on the majority, they don't cope with it, in varying the Sec Check question so as to get it out. Well, this gives you the system by which you vary the Sec Check question. So there is no further difficulty about varying the question because the question is the same question on 1

every time just for test, and the variation on 2, 3 and 4 is practically microscopic. It's just so as not to get monotonous.

Well, it's just, "Have you thought of anything more about that? Have you remembered anything else about it now? Is that all there is to it?" You get that as a variation.

"All right. Just about when did that occur?" That's a variation on when, see?

See, your variation is microscopic. You have to stay on that sense. You try this, you work with it and I think you're going to produce some interesting looking miracles. I think they will be very minor.

Now, there's one thing I must tell you, even though it is very late, there's one thing I must tell you – is you go out of this lifetime with this thing and you accept a past life answer from anybody using this system and I'll have the other part of your thetan. [laughter]

No past lives at all. *Nothing* to do with past lives. We're not invalidating past lives. Pc says, "Ooooooh. All this stems from the fact, it stems from the fact when I was a pogo dancer on the top of a southwest pyramid."

And you say, "Good! Thank you. I'm very glad about that. Now, in this lifetime..."

You hold him in this lifetime because pcs will duck into the unreality of yesterday to avoid the withhold in this lifetime or, or they're trying to run the whole bank on it and this process won't run the whole bank. So whether they're just trying to duck or trying to audit the whole bank with this Withhold System, we don't care. You'll find it will all register in this lifetime. If you've got a registry it's in this lifetime. Now, what you're doing is keying out. The time to take up past life is with 3D Criss Cross, not with the Withhold System. And you'll find out that if you let them go into a past life, you'll miss all the gain of the Withhold System.

They duck back, and they start to clean it up. Well, they don't know enough about it, and frankly you couldn't even reach it with this system. This system does not have the strength or power to reach back into the past and that much occlusion and that much unknown. It just isn't that, isn't that strong a system. Terrific system for this lifetime. It's the greatest system ever developed for this lifetime as far as that's concerned. So it would be valueless on past track.

What you need on past track is 3D Criss Cross, and all your Withhold System does is put the pc into some kind of shape so that you can run 3D Criss Cross on him and then is the time to take up the past track. Okay?

So there's the limitations of the system. There are its purposes, and there is its use.

Now, anytime you strike a withhold, if you're going for the dress parade, if you're going to do it lightly find out who should have known about it, see? That's just the light punch, that's to get the rudiment in or something like that. But if you're going to clean up withholds, and you're straightening up the case, you break out the Queen's guards, drawn sabers, troop the colors, you got it. And that's the system. That's all. *Brrrrrp-brrrrp-brrrrp-brrrrp*. Grind it out. And you'll find out you'll get there.

Now, undoubtedly, you're going to find some holes in this system, but I don't think you will find any holes in the system itself. I think you will find that by doing some additives,

you can make it clumsy or unworkable. Now, that's between you and your conscience and your use of it.

I want you to get good reality on this, not just a good reality on missed withholds because this, of course, takes care of missed withholds from the word go. Okay?

All right. That's it. Sorry we were late tonight.

Thank you very much.

DIRECTING ATTENTION

A lecture given on 14 February 1962

Now, what date do we have? What date do you have?

Audience: Fourteenth of February.

Fourteenth of February, Valentine's Day. Will you be my Valentine?

Female voice: Yep.

I didn't hear any volunteers.

Female voice: Yeah.

All right. All right.

I didn't put the year on it. AD 12. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

We just had a good example of distracting the pc out of session and collapsing the bank on the face. Did you notice that?

Audience: Hm-mm. Hm-mm.

Wasn't that an interesting example? And do you notice that it dropped the havingness right out. Hm? Interesting, isn't it? The pc's attention – flick, bang!

Of course, the patch-up is to get the ARC break off fast. If you can't get the ARC break off, run some Havingness and get the ARC break off. Got it?

If you can't easily release an ARC break or easily get a rudiment in, it's always safe to assume that havingness is out. I don't know if you noticed that example. Just the flick of some paper and bang! – the pc's attention is out of session.

The gimmick you saw about illustration: I should mention something about that. It'll probably be a part of your flows. You see, your 3D Criss Cross – how you get a list and that sort of thing – originally was designed before we had flows. So it'd be only a special gimmick for flows. But we could broaden it and say, well, you get the pc to define what you're going to get the list from so that the pc understands it. And that way you wouldn't run into the trouble you've run into earlier on "like and dislike" lists.

So the pc – you don't know whether the pc likes it or dislikes it or, you know – and the pc finally says, "Well, I don't dislike anything actually. I *hate everything!*" you know?

And read – right away you say, "Well, let's have a hate list." See?

But let's be sure that the pc understands what we're going to list from as an additional step. We would do a Prehav Assessment or a flows assessment or take an arbitrary item. And in any event, let's make sure that the pc understands thoroughly what we are listing from before we start to list. Okay?

Another sign that is very interesting is: If you have the right flow you will get some tone arm action; and when you have ceased to get tone arm action on the list, you don't have any more items.

If you leave the pc on the meter during a listing, if you're on the right track you've got some tone arm action. It'll be anywhere up to about the one tone arm division – 3.0 to 4.0, 2.5 to 3.5 or something like that. It'll be at least that. You'll have that area. And the tone arm will wander around and as long as you have tone arm motion, your list is incomplete. I had to do some work on this just because we needed some additional indicators. Slight change: leave the pc on while listing.

Now, if you leave the pc on while listing and leave the pc on while differentiation, you will see the item itself discharge. And you hit the hot item on a list, you may get a discharge of two or three dial drops. The item which you will eventually assess, by the time you begin to null, has already been discharged. It's quite interesting, if the item is hot, that you will get a two – or three-dial drop. It'll just go *zooooom, zooooom, zooooom*. And you all of a sudden – the way you'll probably notice it on differentiation is that your tone arm suddenly is way out. Your needle is hanging over here on the side of the meter; you possibly won't see it go at all, you see, and you – because you aren't watching the meter very heavily – and you'll suddenly notice that after we read that item, we'll have to move the tone arm down about a division or two.

You decide that the one you just did must have been a very, very hot item indeed if you don't see the needle go. You got the idea? Because nobody expects you to watch the needle, you know, like the cat to the mouse hole, while you're doing listing and differentiation. Just keep it centered and try to keep your needle up to set. Keep a very low sensitivity setting, because it doesn't matter much.

See, the lower the sensitivity setting, the more your needle stays somewhere on the dial – the less adjustment you have to make of the tone arm. Of course, doing rudiments – oh man, that needle is just all over the place with rudiments; all over the place. Get that thing set at sensitivity 16, you know, and *rrwow!* I don't care how corny you sound. You notice that I'd rather you sound corny than – and careless or something, and be careful, than to be imprecise. Don't ever neglect to say the rudiment twice. See? Always be sure. Always be sure.

There's probably some characteristic in my auditing that you've been picking up, because there's a terrific amount of carefulness with regard to reads and that sort of thing. If I don't get them the first time, I'll ask them the second time. You never invite an ARC break, because you're interested in the pc's case, of course. And if you don't get them the second time – you're still not sure – why, get it back there and...

Of course, at sensitivity 16 your needle is flying at such a wild rate across the dial that it sometimes gets to the left-hand side of the meter, you see, before you've finished the ques-

tion. And you're left with the great embarrassment of having uttered your question and come to the end of it and your needle is sitting over there parked and unreadable.

Don't worry about things like that happening. Don't strain at that sort of thing. What I want you to strain at is being *awful* careful.

It looked like the thing did a slight acceleration. You know, it looked like after – right after you said, there was a slight acceleration, but you couldn't quite tell, you know? It was so indefinable. Ask it again and see if there was something there.

Then you look at it, and the needle just is – you're asking on a fall or something like that. Work a flying needle – it's perfectly all right – but work it carefully. One of the things is, please, as an auditor, don't put looking good *ever* above being a good auditor. Please.

You know, you can make yourself look awful good sometimes, you know? Pc is very happy because you've found an item, and you haven't found one. Don't tell him you've got an item unless you've got one, you see? Don't give him any hope, because there must be something wrong. There must be something wrong there that needs patching up. And your pc will just ARC break on it, that's all. You say, "Oh, yes. Well, we're very happy. I – we got an item," and so forth.

But be very careful and always put accuracy above looking good. And if you fumble, fumble, for God's sakes. I don't care how hard you fumble, but just do a good job. Do a good, thorough job on it. Don't try to look good. Because the only person who loses, you see, is the pc. The pc really loses.

You can err in several ways in auditing, all in the direction of reputation, of looking good, being kind – that is the main thing. There was a lecture last summer about being kind which is as bitter as I think I'd care to state it. You can kill people with kindness, man; you can kill them dead.

Failure to direct the pc's attention, letting a pc run on and on and on – being kind, you know? "Let's be careful that we don't have any ARC break." Well, I'll tell you what causes an ARC break. It's no auditing. That's what causes the ARC break.

As long as you're interested, as long as you're doing your job and as long as you keep clearing up the "should have knowns," you're not going to have any ARC breaks with the pc. But the way to have ARC breaks with the pc is to be kind and then not do your job because you might upset the pc or something like that.

You haven't seen this yet in my demonstrations, but I have been known to tell pcs to *shut up, that is it*. Oh, you did see some? No, no, you didn't see this. No, because this was a demonstration; it wasn't on the air. Got fooled for a second because I remember all the sets were on. I turn all the sets on up there and get used to auditing under those circumstances. It's a little bit rough because the meter is never in – it's not in the position I ordinarily use a meter, and so forth and I'm having to adjust myself to exactly that auditing circumstance. And – pc said, "You know, this goes back to a past life of – and I know this has its foundation in a past life." And we were looking for a withhold, see, in this lifetime.

And I said, "Good. You just leave that alone for the moment and we'll get around to that later. Come on now." And so forth.

And the pc cheered right up and smiled. Pc knew when she was getting away with something. And sure enough, there was a hot withhold right there. *Bjoo-bjoo-bjoo!* We had it practically in the next twenty words. But we were going to get all about this past life, you know?

You look up Sec Checks, and at the point where – old Sec Check forms – and at the point where the person just about connected, but the auditor didn't make him connect it, they immediately went into a past life. It is not a dodge mechanism so much as of – the fact that that withhold is connected, but it is restimulating the past life. So the closest thing available is the past life. You don't want it. All you want it to do is key it out.

And you look it over and it's very, very amusing. You look it over and you'll see the missed withhold, the question which you're now have to – going to have to clean up with the withhold system, can be found on these old forms by just locating where the auditor noted down the pc dived into a past life. You take *that* question and you clean it for this life, and you'll have the hottest firecracker withhold you ever wanted to meet. That's an interesting little trick of the trade.

Now, it is perfectly true that withholds in past lives are causing all the pc's real difficulties, see? So you don't want to invalidate this and come down on it with a crash and say, "We don't care about past lives. We're not auditing past lives. To hell with your past lives." That'd be the wrong way to go about this, you see?

The right way to go about it is to say to the pc, "All right. That in its place and this in that place. And what I'm looking for right now is what you did to the cat – now, in this life. We'll take the other up later in 3D Criss Cross. But right now we want to know what you did to the cat in this life, the cat named Joe," whatever it was.

All right. Now, that is what we're interested in. Now, if you can keep the pc from diving, you can control a pc's attention. If you can control a pc's attention, you can keep them from diving. And if you're controlling a pc's attention, the pc is *uhrrr – crank, crank – hrrmm-hrrmm*. And he's – he's, "No, no. I don't want to look over there."

And the auditor says, "There it is. There it is. Look."

And the pc says, "*Hhrn*. No, no! Really, it's w..."

And the auditor says, "*Mnnn-nnnn*." And the pc says, "But that's much more attractive right now."

And the auditor says, "Mm-hm."

And the pc all of a sudden blows 15 milli-megatrons of charge on this thing. See?

And the pc never forgives you if you let his attention go out of it. It's not kind; it's suicidal! The pc never forgives you if you let him give up or let her give up. I don't care what the pc says in the session. I don't care what argument the pc advances. It is read right at the bottom of your right hand column on the auditor's report: "Goals" and "Gains." And if you didn't

direct the pc's attention, you'll see "Goals made: No. Gains: No." Every time. You've got to get the pc's attention directed.

Now, if you let the pc wander into a lot of overts... This sounds like a generalized lecture; it's not a generalized lecture. I'm telling you how to run a pc on Prepcchecking, how to handle the pc's attention in pulling overts and so forth – what's expected of you.

You think that you're going to get an ARC break, you see, if you're mean to the pc. You've actually – would believe this on first inspection – that if you're mean to the pc, you'll get an ARC break.

Now, listen. It has nothing to do with being nice to or mean to the pc. That does not have any monitor of the session. That does not monitor the gains of the session or the attitude after the session of the pc toward you. See? That has nothing to do with it. Just discount niceness and kindness and being mean to the pc, being kind to the pc. Your attitude toward the pc: just pretty well cancel it out. See, you can't wipe it out entirely, but you can – whether you're mean or kind to the pc has nowhere near the bearing on the situation as whether or not you're effective with the pc. You can have that pc screaming at high C in the middle of a session, apparently all ARC broke, chewing you out like mad, and you're saying not, "Oh, well, I'm sorry we got into it." And you are saying, "All right. Now, what withhold did I miss?"

And the pc says, "Well, you're the lousiest auditor I ever had anything to do with!"

You say, "Come on now, what *withhold* did I *miss*? *When*?" And the pc says, "Well, that's something else. You needn't be cross about it and so forth. Well."

You say, "Well, I'm not being cross about it. I want to know! What withhold did I miss?"

"Oh well, in the very beginning of the session, of course, you failed to find out that I have an engagement at 3 o'clock and it's now 3:30."

"Oh, all right. Let's continue with the session."

And that pc will go out and he'll just *swear* by you as an auditor. "Oh man, that – that's my auditor, you know? A terrific auditor. Oh, terrific. He won't let me get away with a thing! Hm-hm-hm."

But the auditor who's nice and doesn't direct the pc's attention, and the pc goes out of the session and says, "Natter, natter, natter. Well, he's all right. He tries." You'd be surprised. You could be the most gentlemanly or ladylike auditor in the world, you know, and never have a gain on the pc, because that isn't what makes the gain. It's whether or not you control that pc's attention.

Now, you'd just be amazed how far you would get. Now, I'm not asking you to overwhelm the pc, because you actually don't overwhelm the pc with mood. What you overwhelm the pc with is evaluation and invalidation: the fact of invalidation, the fact of evaluation.

You say, "Well, I don't think that's the list. I don't think that has anything to do with it. That item doesn't belong on the list. What your item is, actually, is 'a spendthrift.' I've watched you for days and I know that." [laughter] And that overwhelms a pc. See?

And, "Well, you actually don't know what you're thinking about, actually. That's what's the trouble with the session. If you just knew what you were thinking about..." You know, invalidation of some kind or another. That's what ruins a pc.

Mood doesn't ruin a pc. I've had a pc fly out of an auditing chair and I've taken that pc and slammed that pc down into the auditing chair and say, "Damn it, sit there and get audited."

Pc after the session: "Wonderful session." Didn't even clean it up as an ARC break. See, it's very fascinating. That's the one thing you should learn. Yeah, be nice, be your cheerful self and so forth, but *direct the pc's attention*. What I'm not – I'm teaching you to be a mean auditor – I'm teaching you not to pay any attention to that factor.

If you're an *effective* auditor, and you *do* what has to be done, and you *direct* the pc's attention, you will get further by directing it crudely and badly and misemotionally than by not directing it at all. I assure you of this. Naturally, after a while, you get to be an old smoothie. You see that pc start out in-session, go somewhere or the other – just go zing, bang, thud – and you do the effective thing and so forth, and there it is.

But even then, now and then, you will get caught out in a storm. You say, "Where the hell did this come from," you know? And that's going to happen to you on Missed Withhold System, Prepchecking, time and time again, because *every time the pc comes close to the key withhold, the pc is apt to get cross with the auditor*. Now, that's the liability of Prepchecking and this Withhold System.

You start sailing down the line – it's an *indicator*; it's an indicator. The pc, right there at that crucial moment, gets some kind of a – it's the missed withhold mechanism, but it's a little bit in reverse. Just a little – got a little more curve on it. And you say to the pc – quite innocently – you say, "Well, who didn't know about that? Who should have known about it?" Anything you're saying for that third question – you can, you know, you can say, "Who didn't know about it?" just to salt the thing down. You can say, "Who did you make sure wouldn't find out about it?" That puts it in the future, you see? You can play it on the three tenses if you want to. I'll give you a list of the permissibles, you see? Down at that end, you can ask any one of these. The standard one is just "should have known and failed to find out," see. But you can vary this song anything you want to in the same breath, you know, and you'll just manage to pull it off.

But anyhow, you'll be sailing down along about the thing and you'll be getting to the "Well, is that all of it?"

"Oh, pity's sakes, it certainly is all of it. I'm – matter of fact, I am getting *sick* of it. *Aren't you?*" No man, you're standing right on the threshold. You're getting right there. That's all that is. Doesn't mean ARC break; doesn't mean anything at all. Pc is going misemotional.

All right, got the pc headed right down that alley. And if you don't head the pc down that alley, the pc will wind up saying you're the worst, lousiest, bummiest auditor he ever heard of. See?

Well, of course, you didn't torture him to death by... He's got to be made to *face* that withhold, and that's your whole job.

Now, the pc is sitting there – I'll... Let me tell you some of the primary and early withhold flubs.

The pc said, "Well, I don't think very much of Joe. Joe – Joe will never – never has anything much to do with me and so forth, and I really don't think very much of him. Matter of fact, one day he dropped me out of his car and so forth. Didn't even – didn't even accompany me to the door."

Auditor: "What else did Joe do to you?"

"Well, he was insulting – often – very insulting."

On and on, see? Buy a motivator, buy a motivator, buy a motivator. And by the time that session ends, your goals and gains – my God, the poor pc is just plowed into the ground. What you've done is run up a bunch of new overts and the session was used just to run up new overts. So that is the broad classification of a bad withhold-pulling session. It's just permitting the pc to go on and run up brand-new overts on the thing. In other words, he's giving motivators, he's making damaging statements, or she is making damaging statements, and that sort of thing. He'll run up at the other end, you know? Well, that was a common – a common thing.

Pulling other people's withholds. Now, that's the one you will face every time you try to train a Class II Auditor. Sooner or later, as he starts into this thing, you will find him sitting there pulling other people's withholds off the pc: because it's so intriguing; it's so interesting; it's like reading a scandal sheet. You know?

And all so true. And amongst those is running you down covertly, you see, by saying what they have heard about you, what the pc has heard about you. So that's other people's withholds, you see?

And the pc has heard from Pete about how you – so forth. And that's a withhold from you – *heh-heh, heh-heh-heh-heh-heh* – and that's a withhold from you. Brother, I just wouldn't spend three seconds' worth of auditing time on it. You know? I just wouldn't spend any time on it at all. Because if you permit the auditor to go on and pull other people's withholds, including withholds he has heard about the auditor – any brand of this – you wind up with that right-hand column right at the bottom: "Goals: None. Gains: None." Every time. It's just a wasted session. You see, it's ineffective. So that is one of the old-time common errors.

And the other one – there's another one on this now – is the critical thought mechanism. Now, that was too thoroughly banished, because I will use critical thoughts – ho-ho-ho – in old-time-style Sec Checking. You give me a string of critical thoughts and I'll show you the prettiest array of overts you ever heard of.

It's just an indicator. So you say to somebody, "Now, have you had..." It's a trap, you know? It's a great big, dirty trap that you've laid right in the middle of the boulevard. And they're going down this boulevard at 70 miles an hour and they're going to go right on by and they're not going to get any goals and gains by session end.

Well, there's – one of the ways to stop this is to ask them a leader, such as, "Have you ever had any critical thoughts about anyone?" And they merely tell you, at once, about all the critical thoughts they have had about Angela. And the only critical thought you listen to about

You say, "Well, is that all of it? Did you do anything *else* to him?" See, that's a good one to slide in on the end of that thing. "Did you do anything else to him?"

"*Hmmmmmm*. Did you do anything else to him? Hm. No. I mean, you know..." The needle is falling off the pin with a ni... "Well, wrecked his – heh-heh – took his car without his permission."

And you say, "Good. All right. You took his car without his per... very good. Fine. Fine. Fine. Who didn't find out about it?"

"Well, he didn't find out about it, of course. *Heh-heh-heh-heh*."

"All right. Very good."

And well, why test it? Why test it. You're going to town here. And you just say, "Well, just form's sake, you know. Well, what about thinking that critical thought about the auditor?" and so forth.

"Well, I..."

And "When was it?" And: "Well, it was – not 1954, it was 1958."

"Oh, all right. Well, is that all of it?" and so forth. "You said you did something to him again?"

"Well, yes. There's something about – well, about the car. I didn't tell you about the car. But – I wrecked it. Ha-ha."

Now, if you want to keep your 2-3-4 going on some allied thing, where you set it up with a 1, with a critical thought, then that critical-thought thing is not really going to clear until you've got the other material from it. Do you see the difficulty which you've set up? It's an internal difficulty. Now having pulled the critical thought, you get a real withhold.

All right. Your 2-3-4 is actually working on the real withhold and your critical thought one is working on a critical thought. But actually, your critical thought one will not totally clear until you've cleared the other one.

So you have to be smart enough to realize that you – you're really not working on the critical thought one. You're really not working on it. It's simply a test item. You really are never working too thoroughly on 1. One is your tester. But other material will come up after 1 and if – if 1 is of the variation or variety of a critical thought, you should know that there's a real overt behind it. And when you get to "all of it," throw the "done" on the end of it.

Well, that's the commonest waste of time. But the failure to direct the pc's attention can come out along something like this: The pc goes on and on and on, and they tell you so. I mean, you go into a stenographic audit – totally stenographic audit. If you don't direct the pc's attention during a Sec Check at all, he just winds up with no goals and gains, because he's talked all of his havingness down, he's upset, he's upset with you; you've talked him into a hole, that's all. And you've let the pc run up a bunch of new overts of one kind or another. The pc has actually probably damaged someone in the session.

You have to really sit there and control that pc's attention; you have to control it hard. Now, your Withhold System does that to a marked degree for you. That controls the pc's at-

tention by putting the pc's attention on what the pc's attention ought to be on. Now – that's your 2-3-4. Your pc's attention is on this withhold and it didn't clear, it continues to fall: Therefore, your 2-3-4 situation on the thing is the right order of questions, see? You don't have to go out into a bunch of other random things. But these questions still have to be asked intelligently.

You can't just say, "Well, stole Joe's car. All right. When was that? All right. Is that all of it? All right. Uhhh – all right. When didn't – who didn't find out about that?"

"Joe."

"Okay. You stole Joe's car. Good. When? Good. Is that all of it? Good. Who didn't find out about it?"

"Joe."

"Good. All right."

"Did you steal Joe's car?"

You know, it will almost work that way. What is fascinating, is it almost works that way, see? But you're working here where there's a little more bonus to be gotten on the thing, see?

Now, if you're paying not much attention to the E-Meter, except to see out of the corner of your eye if it starts to surge like mad, or something like this, on your 2-3-4 – well, you're – you know you're working something hot, and your interest is on the pc and you're looking at the pc, you're talking to the pc – you're not squinted over a meter, you see? You're asking the pc. Well, please, put a little bit of invitation in it to give, huh? Put a little bit of – a little coax, a little assist. And add to that a little insistence that he look at it.

I have been known to say, "It's perfectly all right to sit here the rest of the night, because of course until we get this particular withhold, we're not going home. But that's perfectly all right, but I think it would be much faster if you simply looked and tried to see what it was."

The person says, "Sitting here all night." And they look at me and they say, "By George, he *would* be willing to sit there, the *blank* – he *would* be willing to sit there all night until I spilled this withhold."

"Well," in desperation, you know, "Well, let's get working on it! Let's get working on it!"

"All right. I'll look... Hey!" [laughter]

But you can let any session go to sleep, see? You can let any session go to sleep, so that it's just *daw-na-dy-yahng-nyah-nyah*. See, everybody went to sleep in the session. And I don't advocate this as good auditing.

What you want to do is you've got your What and you're trying to clear that What, and when you come to 2, well, "When was it? Just about when was that?" Well, get interested! "When was it?"

This is the difference, you see? If you want to know when it was – that's what we're asking you to do, you see – if *you* want to know when it was. Don't just ask it because of a form.

Besides, you want to know when it was, you know? Well, let's find out when it was. Hasn't cleared up with two runs on 2-3-4, well, there must be something wrong with the date. There was something here unknown someplace, and so forth.

Well, let's get *awful* interested by that time. Let's date it down to a fraction of a second on a meter. Oh, I haven't showed you how to do that? Well, just go ahead and learn it. People have known how to do it for years. Don't expect me to teach you everything

It's the over-and-under system actually. "Was it before 1936 or after 1936? All right. It was after 1936" – biggest needle reaction – you know, the trace-down.

Pc all of a sudden finds out that things which happened in 1936, he has thought happened in 1957. And they tend to get their track scrambled because withholds group the track. So you're apt to get almost any date out of one.

But if this is also done in the spirit of helping the pc to look, you'll find that you'll get a lot further. And your rancor ought to be only directed in the direction (if you ever employ it at all) of making the pc look. Don't ever direct with the idea of: "Damn it, you better tell me or I'm going to be real upset with you!" No. The pc doesn't know, you see?

What you want to know is – you can say that perfectly well. You say, "Well, damn it. Will you please look and find out?" See? And you get away with that.

But the other one, you see, is untruthful. There's a lie connected with it. Frankly, the meter is reacting but the pc doesn't know. Now, you can bung the pc right out of a session into a games condition at a heck of a rate of speed by insisting he *tell you* something that he *doesn't know*. And he winds up in apathy.

No, what you use the Withhold System for is to get him to look. And any spare chatter that you handle there should be in the direction of directing his attention so that he will find out more. Persuade his attention there. Direct it with an ax; direct it with honey; direct it with gypsy music – but damn it, direct it! I don't care how you do it – particularly some of you girls have enormous skill – on the direction of attention. Terrific skill. Employ every bit of it.

Well, there might be some little salacious bit there that might be interesting to hear. "Why don't you see if there's something a little more interesting there?"

Pc says, "You know, that's true. There might be something interesting in this?" [laughter] I don't care what trickery you use. You can use any trickery that anybody has ever employed. You can use any persuasion anybody ever employed. But don't let me catch you *not* directing a pc's attention.

If I see reams of withholds written out, not sequitur, not one after the other that have to do with the same thing, I know definitely the auditor is not directing the pc's attention. You want to clean up what you want to clean up. That's what you want to clean up. And you better decide the thing is cleaned up or is not cleaned up, and you better continue to direct the pc's

attention until you decide the thing is clean. Keep directing his attention. You're still getting a reaction on the meter.

Well, I check every once in a while to find out if there's an ARC break. That's about the only time I ever use an ARC break or the phrase "ARC break" anymore, you know? Just ask the pc, "All right. Is a repetition of this question causing an ARC break?" I use that fairly often when I see an irregular bang on the needle and I can't get anyplace with it. And I'll ask the pc, "Is this question causing an ARC break?"

In 3D Criss Cross, use it the same way as this: "Has this – I've asked you for more items. Is that causing an ARC break?" I don't get the same response. Then I don't get any response at all on the ARC break question – I must assume, you see? But the E-Meter can confuse those two things. It can confuse data in the bank with an ARC break. And it does have a confusion point, so you must straighten out that confusion point.

You ask for more about the withhold, and you actually can be so insistent on it – get a pc half out of session – that an ARC break is created and you get a fall or a rock slam or something starts up. And you say, "Oh well, on this third question here, he hasn't told me all of it." And yes, he has. That's just the trouble. He has told you all of it and you haven't bought it. So you actually are building in a missed knowingness, you know? So that's what you get as your ARC break. It's just your missed knowingness.

So you say, "All right. Have I failed to find out something here?"

And you get the same reaction that you were getting on "Is there any more to this withhold?"

And the pc says, "Oh well, yes, there is."

"Well, when did I miss that?"

"Well, several minutes ago." And so forth.

And you say, "That's fine. All right. Do we have an ARC break?" and now there's no reaction on the thing, and so on.

Now, you ask the same question. You say, "You don't mind if I ask it again just to make sure if it's clear? Is that all of it?"

"Hm-mm."

You're getting to there's no reaction on it at all – just be clean as a wolf's tooth. More people ran terminals and goals lists up to the hundreds and thousands mark because when – by the time they ask, "Is there another goal or "Is there another terminal?" don't you see, the pc was so ARC broke and so out of session on it that you'd get a needle reaction. And so they'd say, "Well, of course there's more items."

We learned that one the hard way. If you think there is any suspicion at all that your question itself – it's always a repeated question, by the way – a demand of more, has created an ARC break, you always try to clear that up, just *drrrrrr*. Just rapidly clear it up just to make sure that your reaction is not an ARC break reaction. And then you get a true reaction.

The usual thing about it is that the ARC break shows up, blows off and then there is more of it. Now, that's more to the point. That's far, far, far more to the point in this Withhold System.

Pc has an ARC break and more data, too. Because there's where you get over this little hump. The pc becomes misemotional when approaching a real hot spot in the bank. Has nothing to do with the goodness of the auditing. As a matter of fact, the better the auditing is, the more certain it is that the pc is going to hit an ARC break attitude. Not an ARC break attitude; it's a misemotional attitude.

He starts to get cross with the auditor, because the auditor at that moment is a substitute for all the people who should have known about it and didn't. Of course, you're asking for a "should have known about it" and you'll see that rekindle. And it won't be much. It'll just be a little bit of "*Myng-myng-my-mu-mu-m-m-mo-on*," and so on and so on, and there it is. Everything is beautiful and shining, you see?

It'll be there somewhat, even if terribly faintly. And it can come up to a roaring storm. You've asked for the thing. You've said, "All right. What – what don't I know?" or "What haven't I found out about you in this session?" – you ask this perfectly innocently – and the pc says, "*Roouoo-ow, roouoo-clack!*" And you say, "Now, *what* don't I know about you? What did I fail to find out about you? What anything? What went on here? What part of the session...?" And you just cut through somehow, all of this chop and get that question answered.

And you'll find out that that will become a sign of a routine action in doing the Withhold System. So you might as well learn to buck up to it and do it well. Don't ever back off from it.

Pc is upset with you: pull the withhold. Pull the missed withhold. Pull the "should have known." That would be ordinarily. But in the Withhold System, just be sure that you just better go right on doing the Withhold System, because in the next question or two it's going to drop out of the hamper.

And the pc: "Well, I don't see why you're asking that. You've covered that. You've covered it and gone over it and over it. I can't think of any more of it. There's nothing more to it. I knew the guy. So what? I – so what? I knew the guy. I told you several times I – I knew him! Isn't that *enough*? Of course I omitted to tell you that also I lived with him for five years without marrying him. You know, I never realized that?"

You watch – you watch this, and it's – you'll find that it's a fairly patterned curve for the pc. If it didn't happen at all I'd become worried about the pc. You know? Say, well, we're getting no place with this pc. Couldn't possibly be getting anyplace with the pc. Why aren't we getting anyplace with the pc? Well, we couldn't possibly be getting anyplace with the pc because the pc has never gotten mad at us once during the entire session, so we have never gotten anywhere near anything the pc never found out before.

We must be mining a mine that was mined out several hundred auditing sessions ago. And that mine must have been completely mined out to the bottom. The pc will sit there; they give you all the withholds, they would let you publish them in the newspaper – they're perfectly all right. Withholds, who cares about withholds? What's this? All right. They give them

to you. They tell them all to you again. Pc never gets mad at you, pc is perfectly happy with you, pc doesn't change, tone arm doesn't shift. [laughs]

You could go on like that, you see, for hundreds of hours probably. That means you must be mining a mine which has been dug up. There couldn't possibly be another speck of nothing in the bottom of it.

But that is not the state of a pc that does have something at the bottom of the mine, you know? That pc is "Rrrrrrrr." He feels "Uuuuhhhh." And the pc is starting to get gray; the pc is starting to get hollows under their eyes; they're starting to waste away in the auditing chair. They look it over, they finally come near it, they finally look at you, decide you must be the withhold or something or other. And finally say, "Well, I was the usual self and... That's right, I don't think there's nothing when I was there. I – I – I – I no, nothing right. Huuuhhhh. Zt-zt. Damn. And of course, had five children by him. Never mentioned to anybody. And by God, I never thought of that either!" [laughs] Well, that would be a pretty obscured withhold, but... [laughs] All of a sudden they brighten up and, "Heh-heh! What do you know," you know? "Heh-heh. Heh-heh-heh. Well, you know, I never thought of that. You know, that's the most amazing thing. Known it all the time, you know? But I was sure I knew it, but I – I didn't know it. Well, that's pretty clever of you. Ha-ha, ha-ha. That's pretty clever of you. You're an awful clever auditor. My God, that was real smart of you to find that. How did you find that? Ah – pretty darn smart. Ha-ha."

You look at him: the hollows are gone, the circles are missing, their skin texture changes, their eye color shifts, the gauntness which they inherited all of a sudden pads out very mysteriously. You watch it. And they suddenly get a cognition.

"You know, say I wonder – I wonder if losing all of my teeth, which I had forgotten – ha-ha! – I wonder if knocking all of his teeth down his throat had anything to do with my dental trouble. Say, do you know, I think it does. You know?"

And they just start cogniting all over the place. And of course you can milk these cognitions down just by running more Withhold System on them. You just run some more on the same thing and all of a sudden they'll blow some more off, because the – their intense interest means that there's just a little speck or two.

That will bleed off usually, if they come up to that state, in the next twenty-four hours. They'll think of it as they go to bed that night or something of this sort, but you can actually take it all off with this Withhold System. It's quite amusing to watch. But if you don't see that kind of a cycle going on, you know the Withhold System isn't working or something's going on.

Pc is sitting there: pc is bright, colored, everything is fine, there isn't anything wrong; you as the auditor are wonderful, they're answering the questions, they're very happy to do anything, there's no change of the tone arm. They get to the end of the thing – in the right-hand column they write "Goals: No, no goals. Didn't make any of them. Heh-heh, heh-huh." And their ARC break comes after the session. After you've said "End of session," they go out in the hall and they say, "Well, that was a wasted mess."

It must be that the auditor never directed their attention during the entire session, see?

You can actually have a very happy pc who, four hours after the session, is liable to go get a shotgun and shoot you. You know? Pc was not disturbed by the session at all. It's just something about the mechanics of what you're doing, you see?

Now, you should not expect in doing the Withhold System – you should not expect for a moment – that your pc goes on a gradient scale of getting better. Your pc does *not* go on a gradient scale of getting better. Your pc goes on a gradient scale of getting worse. They look worse. They look grayer. They are more worried. Things are grimmer. Life has suddenly started to loom as a serious proposition, not to be trifled with by amateurs. Life is grim.

And they may go into that curve and come out of it with a fast cognition, or they may go into it for three or four consecutive sessions. They may go into it and out of it in twenty minutes. They may go into it and out of it over this cycle of four sessions. It all depends on what you're shooting for.

And if you do the Withhold System using your Zero question – your Zero question is well chosen – and if that is a very beefy question, very ornery sort of question on the subject of – you've all of a sudden connected with something there that is a very hot button of some kind or another, and it fell off the pin, and your Zero question at – as a whole question has been very much avoided by the pc – then it's some one of these four session propositions.

In other words, the hotter the question, the longer the cycle of action of the run, see? The hotter the question, the longer the cycle of action of the run. That's, of course, there's that much more charge to be bled off the thing before they come to grips with it. Now, the milder the charge, the shorter the cycle of action.

Now, the cycle of action is not our cycle of action. It's a different cycle of action for the Withhold System. And that is: is alerted, slowly perishes, goes to the bottom for the third time, and then on no graph curve but total vertical. See, it comes down like this and down and down, and then just total vertical, and goes way up above it. Goes way higher than the beginning of the cycle. It's a funny looking curve, but that is the response of a pc who is having his withholds properly pulled.

They don't get cheerfuller and cheerfuller and cheerfuller and better and better and better. And if the pc is sitting there looking cheerfuller and cheerfuller and you're not getting any tone arm action or anything, you know that at the end of the session it'll be, "Gains: No. Goals: No. Nothing. Ha-ha. That's it. What a lousy auditor you are." And be the truth, too, once you got that low. Because the pc's attention has not been directed into anything the pc's attention should have been directed to.

Now, the entire force of an aberration is devoted to pulling the attention in while buffering it off. You actually haven't got to pull the pc's attention in to the middle of any aberration because it's *fixed* there. But every aberration has a buffer. And that is to say, while the pc has his attention fixed on A, the last thing in the world he'll admit to is having his attention on A.

In other words, he's looking both ways at once. To look is to bounce, you see? The reason the tennis ball is on the ground is because it's in the tree. You know, that sort of thing. The reason the bomb is falling down is because it is rising. See? It's a fixed thing.

In other words, he hasn't got an inflow or an outflow on this point. It's not a clean outflow; it's not a clean inflow. But he'll bounce off of this thing. And you get into those things – you get into the zone areas, and the pc will go bouncy, bouncy, bouncy. And if you don't keep him pushed on in to that, you're not doing what the mind is doing, which is concentrating on that a hundred percent.

Actually, the mind is totally a hundred percent concentrated on it. The closer he gets to it, the paler he's liable to look. That's one of your maxims. The more ARC breaky he's liable to look.

I don't want your expectancy to measure up to: You pull withholds, and the person has a little withhold pulled and they feel a little better. And they have another little withhold pulled and they feel a little better. And then they have a big withhold pulled and they feel a lot better. And they have another withhold pulled and they feel a lot better. And it is not that cycle at all.

But you get a hot question, they instantly start to get sick. And it just gets worse and worse and worse. And then they really – I've seen a pc sit there in the most baffled stage on something I knew all about the pc.

You know? "But could *this* have been me, you know? I mean, but there couldn't have been *anything* about it. See, we lived at Fordham and we..."

"All right. When was it?" and so on.

"It was at Fordham," and so on. "No. No. No, *nothing* happened at Fordham. Just *nothing* I could have – nothing could have happened at Fordham. I didn't know anybody at Fordham. In fact, I don't remember anybody at Fordham. There wasn't anybody at Fordham."

And this is all out of something – the fellow says, "Well, I stole a cricket bat once, you know?"

And, "Well, when was it?"

"Well, it was when we lived at Fordham."

"Well, is that all there is to it?"

And you're liable to get some fantastic – "Well, look – who could I – I stole a cricket bat, but from whom? Fordham, Fordham, Fordham. Who? No, it couldn't have been at Fordham. Couldn't have been. Oh well, it just doesn't amount to anything."

And you run into the not-is, you know? "It doesn't amount to any – cricket bat is very cheap, and so forth. And it's very ridiculous of me to do so, and I undoubtedly gave it back the next day." Dub-in, dub-in, dub-in, dub-in. "No, no. That's not right either. Fordham. It must have happened at Fordham. But nothing could have happened at Fordham. Look, I only lived at Fordham between the ages of seven and eight. And I couldn't possibly have. See?"

Get an answer. You got to get an answer to your auditing question. That's one of your basic maxims of the auditor. But your pc starts to go into these things... Oh, no! Well, help him out all you can. Don't suggest things to him – don't be that helpful. But ask him pertinent questions about it.

"Well, was it a big bat or a little bat?" you know? "What kind of a cricket bat? A cricket cricket bat?"

"Well – well, it was a – just a little cricket bat. I mean, it was just... It was just a toy cricket bat, you know?"

And you'd say, "All right. Good."

Well, that's enough. See, don't beat him to death at that stage. Keep the Withhold System rolling

"All right. Well, who didn't find out about that?"

"Well, I – I didn't. I completely forgot it was a little cricket bat. It wasn't a big cricket bat at all."

"All right. That's fine. Good enough. Good enough." Don't bother to do anything about it. "Well, how about stealing this – what about stealing this cricket bat," and so on, you know?

"I really can't tell you. It's – it's very funny. It's very hazy because it must have been at... Fordham? Fordham? It couldn't have been at Fordham. It must have been at South Chichester, but at South Chichester... It couldn't have been at Fordham," and so forth.

Well, help him out. And you say, "Well, when was it? When was it? When was it?"

"Well, it was in 1957. But it couldn't have been in 1957 because it must have been in 1932. No, I wasn't alive in 1932. It must have been 1941. Well, that would have been during the war and they limited the cricket bats," and so forth.

And you'd say, "Well, just give me an approximation of when it was."

"I – really can't tell."

"All right. Well, you just sit there for a moment and we'll date this thing on the meter, see if we can zero it in a little closer." And you get the idea? Help him out. Help him out. Help him out. Lead that withhold to its doom. Help it out of existence. And then, "All right. Now, is that all of it?"

"All of it? I don't know anything about it at all. We've now dated the thing as having happened in 1945 and I was in the armed services in 1945... Oh, my God! Oh, yes! Heh-heh." And you hit something – "Oh, no! No. Well, no. No." And then you're liable to get a resurgence.

Well, when you start down that steep trail toward those last few fragments, you really got to help the pc out, because he's stoned! He just can't force his own attention into it.

So letting the pc's attention ride all over the place, you see, is actually letting the pc be the effect of this withhold and this charge. And he never forgives you. See? You've got to get the pc's attention and you got to hold it in there, and you got to hold it in there harder. But he says, "Well, can't we take up something else? There are a lot of nice juicy withholds. I've got some on sexy – I've got a couple of sexy withholds here that are very good." [laughter] "Let's get over onto those. I was a mermaid once. I could give you a withhold from that." You know, anything. You know, "Anything. Oh, this cricket bat." you know? "Oh, me."

He gets to the "Oh, my God!" stage. The closer he gets to the "Oh, my God! Oh, not that!" or "That'd be terrible!" or "What do you know, you know? I never remembered that." Any time that this – the cognition stage is approached, attention is harder to get in. And he finally finds out that it was a cricket bat that he carved personally for a little Italian boy in an Italian village and then that was all that was left of the village was the cricket bat. Because he failed to order his platoon out of there, and the Germans shelled it to bits and killed every inhabitant in it. And he'd hold himself responsible for this, and all, ever since, he's had this all figured out that it must have happened to him in his youth. And the only tag he's got is a cricket bat, see?

You know, there's this – but a cricket bat, of course, fits with "when one was young." So he's logicalized this. He hasn't remembered any part of it. He's got a – he's got a beautiful script here. It has nothing to do with reality.

And of course, he just can't face that because he couldn't face it at the time, so he just occluded it, just like that. And he said, "Well, that's it! Now he can live."

See? He's been figuring ever since down someplace in his mind, though, "If I'd just ordered the platoon out of the village that morning; the Germans came in the next morning, they would never have bombarded and they would have left them alive. As a matter of fact, I should have left the old area there earlier. I shouldn't have dragged anybody into it because there was no sense in it. There was no point in it. The Germans retreated the next day anyhow. It was all in a day. And I couldn't possibly have pulled an overt like that. It must have been due to the high command and it must have been due – and it must have been a cricket bat in childhood." See?

He just backs out of all responsibility for it and of course there isn't anything left there. He can't face having caused the death of 150 noncombatants, and *fzzz*. Something he doesn't look into.

You see how it is? So as his attention comes in, his attention comes off. And he – a part of that coming off is getting mad at the auditor, looking ARC breaky, being upset and that sort of thing.

But you must differentiate between a pc who is really ARC broken because you've gone into a games condition with him and a pc who is simply introvertedly ARC broke and is snapping at everything. They look different, by the way. They look quite different, one from the other.

Direction of the pc's attention. If you use this Withhold System, you direct his atten – you help him to direct his attention; if you're on a hot subject, why you'll get yourself some fantastic resurgences. Nobody has ever put their fingers on buttons like this in this fellow's mind. Nobody has ever freed up attention, okay, the way you have.

But reversely, reversely, if you don't direct his attention, he's being put into misery because his whole bank is kicking him in the head because there's nobody there helping him hold it down, don't you see?

Well, you've got to work hard on this particular basis and you actually don't have to slave over it or sweat over it. What you have to keep your eye out for is the tendency of the pc

to go general on the whole thing – generalize things and never come up with anything specific and never give you any kind of data, and just keep glossing over the top of everything and so forth.

After a while, why, wake up and say, "Well, see here. There's apparently something here. We keep going over this ground. Let's look, shall we? Heh-heh. Let's look. Let's look."

Now, I said, "Is that all of it? Now, that's what I mean. I mean – I mean, is there any more to this at all? Just look at it and see if there isn't."

No, the only thing we've missed here is a Bedford truck – you know, something of that size. Because as sure as he gets in toward one of these things he starts to go: generalize, sweep on the thing, and you start crowding him to it, he gets kind of "*Hrrrrr*. Well, I don't know if I'd like the look of this Bedford truck. *Arhrhrrrrr*." That works out with any withhold. "Well, you needn't be so cross about it. You needn't be so insistent about it. I'll look. I'm a perfectly cooperative pc. Hm. No. No. *Hr-psss-sst-ssst* – there's nothing there. But there's nothing there. There's no – there's nothing more. That is all there is to it. That is all there is to it" – the needle falling off the pin. "That is all there is to it."

And you say, "Good. Good. What more is there to the 'All'?" "

"Nothing here but the Second Army Corps."

Some little detail like this just slipped his mind, you know? You got to get him to look.

And the job of the auditor is *not* to get the pc to tell. Yes, the pc will talk to you and the pc better be talking to you. And don't misinterpret that to this effect: that the auditor doesn't have to be told the withhold by the pc. Don't misinterpret that. But just frankly and overtly and directly, if the pc knows about it, the pc will tell you. And that is what you must realize and make up your mind to.

The reluctance of the pc to tell you, all stems from his not knowing about it. And your pc will have a very easy time of it if you grasp this one point of the Withhold System, because after that you will assist him to find out and you will help him find out things.

If he says, "Well, I just don't know," you say, "Well, let's find out."

See, he says, "Well, I just don't know."

Don't say, "Well, tell me." See, that's the wrong response. Get your responses different. He says, "I just don't know." you say – wrong response, "Well, tell me about it," see?

The right response is: He says, "Well, I just don't know and there doesn't seem to be any more," and so forth.

And you say, "Well, look. Let's look at it. Come on, let's dig it up a little bit more. There must be some pieces showing someplace. Aren't there an old pair of winged-foot heels showing out of this rubble here someplace? Where – where is this? Let's dig it up. Come on, here – dig it up."

And he says, "Oh, yeah, there's a couple of very nice people there. I didn't realize that. Yeah, well, there's something." Well, all right. Take that as an answer. Buy the pc's data and keep the system going. See?

Now, the mistakes that you can make is thinking the pc isn't going to tell you. The pc is going to tell you and the pc knows he will tell you.

And the other mistake you can make is thinking that the pc is really upset with you when he starts getting upset with the bank, and start chopping the pc.

Another mistake that you can make is failure to handle the pc's attention – to cut off the pc. The pc is going on and on and on and saying, "I had this dog, and his na – his name was Rover. And the dog used to run up and down the street all the time and he used to jump on and off the hedge and so forth. And I used to teach him to jump on and off the hedge and he had a big collar. And he had a wonderful collar and so forth. Then one day one of the boys stole the collar and I beat him up, and I got the collar back and we put it back on this dog Rover. Well, as I was telling you, this dog Rover, we used to keep him in the garage because he's such a big dog. We had a big garage there, so we'd keep him in the big ga – big dog in the big garage, you see? And we had this thing."

Oh, man! If you want a pc to get upset with you, let him do that – let him go on and on and on. How do you shut a pc off? Well, if you can't think of anything else, say, "Shut up." I mean, that will upset him less. See? That will upset him less.

You learn that. If you learn those little points and you put those points into practice, your Security Checking will become a song. I guarantee it.

There's nothing much to this. Now, we're calling it Security Checking loosely. It's actually Prepchecking now. You're going to get the rest of your materials for this – the little checks and so forth that you run for your Zero questions. Right now, as I've said before, the most fruitful source is to find – if you got any old form, any old form anyplace, the pc has been sec checked on, you'd find one of it's items is loaded (there's one question on there was loaded), use that for your Zero and just go over that and over it and over it.

And if you're – if you haven't got the form from the pc, because you're auditing a field pc and so forth, and you haven't got the records, you can say, "What withhold did you keep telling an auditor? What withhold have you continued to tell an auditor for a long time?" And then try to find out what question got this withhold and try to rephrase that question. And then you've got your Zero and you can take off from there. And, of course, you'll just mine the mine, because it'll go from there on out. And that's one when you're operating on HGC pcs that have been audited by a field auditor and you don't know quite where to start on something like this, you could start there very fruitfully if you didn't have a standard check form. But this person had received a lot of auditing and was – appeared to be very ARC breaky and so forth. Well, somebody has headed him into one of these things and they haven't gotten him off of it.

So the most profit that you could make on the whole transaction would be to say, "Well, what withhold have you told several auditors?" or "What withhold have you told auditors several times?" "That's a good one. All right. That's fine. Now, what question would elicit

this withhold? What question had been asked that did it?" And try to put some kind of a question together that would have gotten that withhold and then mine this question.

And boy, oh boy, you'll see the bank roar. Because people have sec checked this person straight into the middle of a – of a dead stop. They got him right there. They've restimulated something and they haven't pulled it. And that's what's known as your recurrent withholds. Your recurring withhold.

And a recurring withhold is very, very, very well plowed because it's already as though somebody has just set up a radar screen and a couple of compasses and some geophysical markers and the American flag with the eagle on top of it ten feet tall, see, and saying "Under this is an item the pc does not know anything about." And that's your recurring withhold as a sign or symptom.

The other one is a recurring complaint. You know, "Who have you complained about most? What have you complained about most?" And you finally zero that in and you'll find out they've complained consistently and continually about their family. Well, you could use it as a withhold question.

But there is one little word of warning on that. Knowing 3D Criss Cross, you will be very cautious about sailing in toward targets. And you don't sail in toward targets that you don't know whether they are terminals, oppterminals or whether they are on the 3D package at all, because you know that you can beef up the whole Prehav Scale by running a wrong terminal.

So the – one of the poor ways to go about it: This girl has always had trouble with her husband, so we immediately say, "Well, without any questioning at all, she must have withholds from her husband. So therefore, *bang!* – let's just sail in on this and let's use the Zero question 'What have you done to your husband?'" or something stupid like this, you see?

Let's use this – husband, see? Husband. Oh, oh, oh, wait a minute. She's always had trouble with the husband. The husband is either in the bank or not in the bank or should be in the bank, but there's something 3D Criss Cross wrong with this terminal "husband." So you of course don't follow that up at all.

Your generalized questions – your Zero questions – should be very general on the subject of doingness or knowingness, but they shouldn't have too much to do with beingness. They could have something to do with havingness. But you leave beingness alone in those Zero questions and you'll be all right, because this stuff is all being run – usually being run – prior to 3D Criss Cross and you wouldn't know anything about it.

By the way, any 3D Criss Cross item – this is not advised – but any 3D Criss Cross item that proved out as the pc's terminal could probably be moved in as a Zero question of the Withhold System. Now, whether it would blow up part of the universe or part of the pc's head or not, I don't guarantee because it's not been tested.

It's probably too much and it's probably too unreal. But just give you an idea that if you were going to do beingnesses, those are the beingnesses that you would do on the Withhold System, and you leave other beingnesses alone.

You can take up the whole subject – you could take up any subject, you know? But be careful with the beingness aspect of it, see? You could take up a subject of "marriage." But God help us, let's not take up the subject of husbands and wives, you got the idea? Or families. You see, that's beingness. We can take up the subject of being broke, but we can't take up any other. Okay?

Male voice: Yeah.

Thank you.

Male voice: Thank you.

PREPCHECKING

A lecture given on 15 February 1962

I thought you might be interested at first glance here – I thought you might be interested in the Auditor's Report notations on that. You saw Prepchecking, I didn't show you the Withhold System. You were looking at Prepchecking and the numbers are different on Prepchecking.

You've got here Zero, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" which is just a good, solid Prepcheck question, which is a rudiments question. This is mostly what you'll be doing with rudiments anyway. I mean, pardon me, Prepchecking is just getting in rudiments so they are zeroed in a hundred percent, hence the number zero. It's an artillery term. I might as well just give you a lecture on this.

Okay. This is 15 Feb. AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And we're concerned here mainly with Prepchecking. We've got some people that are going; they'll be having a wrestle-around with this, and I'm sorry for that, but you can make it all right.

Did you learn anything from the demonstration?

Audience: Yes, yes.

Yeah. Did you notice that the questions were being given actually that appear on the Withhold System fairly repetitively? Pardon me, one after the other in sequence and not repetitively, but occasionally repetitive? Why was that? Why did I repeat one of the When, All, Who's? Why did I repeat When, All, Who's? At what moment did I repeat those?

Yes?

Female voice: You ran an extra incident that keyed in.

Yeah... The basic reason is the pc still looked puzzled. It's as elementary as that. You get how elementary it is?

You say, "Who should have known about this?"

And the pc says, "Well, Joe, you know. Joe should have known about this and..." See?

"All right. Well, anybody else should have known about it?" or, "Who didn't find out about it?" or "Anybody fail to find out about it?" any variation of the question.

But you're just looking at the pc for a little surge. Well, that will only go so far. Sometimes the pc doesn't surge. Sometimes the pc doesn't say, "Oh well, yeah. Well I shouldn't have known about it, you know," or something like that. He doesn't have a little cognition.

Just leave it. It comes under the heading of "fishing for a cognition." You want him to find out something, see?

So remember that pulling withholds is totally and a hundred percent...

You don't mind my talking about your session, do you Fred?

Male voice: No.

You remember that fishing a cognition?

Audience: Yes.

Remember the old TR, Fishing a Cognition? Well, that's actually what you are doing there. And I'll tell you something: your pc can go out of session if you were not auditing the pc, but auditing a system, you see? Pc'd tend to go out of session because they – interest, of course, wouldn't be on the pc.

Now, the system merely exists to get withholds. That's the first thing you should recognize in Prepchecking. The system exists in order to clarify difficulties. And Prepchecking in general – although it has a whole ramification of stuff – is compared to the rudiments and is plotted immediately and exactly against the rudiments. And you'll get a whole bunch of little questions which are Prepcheck questions, which are Zero₁, Zero₂, Zero₃, Zero₄, Zero₅. Do you see the numbering on this?

The rudiment that you're writing down here... I'm not going to say anything about your withholds, you can start breathing. [laughs] Just talking about the system. The Zero, of course, is the rudiment question. That is the Zero which you're trying to clear up. But to clean up this Zero you have to have a Zero₁, Zero₂, Zero₃. They're a little Zero-Sub-One, Zero-Sub-2, Zero-Sub-3. Do you see those? Huh? And this little – will simply be for this rudiment. They're different for every rudiment. You have a different panoply of and parade of questions, you see?

This rudiment happens to be the dynamics. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Now, if you want to put that together – if you want to put that together – you just take all the parts of the dynamics. You see, you take self, sex, children – all of this sort of thing. Well, what was very peculiar here, is all I was trying to clear of the first of these, the pc's withhold came up on the second dynamic, not the self, see? And we had a second dynamic withhold occurring here, but remember I started out to clear self because I had no other choice. At the beginning of this session, we didn't know anything except the pc knew it was a withhold session and was very happy about it, and said to get "the biggest present life withhold I have and run it out," see? All right. He said that so naturally he's going to give it to me.

But what I want to have done in the thing, is let's clear the auditor. And I wanted to show you the most fruitful rudiment in action – let's clear the auditor. That we almost skimp in auditing, and yet it is the most important one. Yes, it's important to get people's havingness together. Yes, it's important to do this, but there's nothing else in auditing clears the auditor but the rudiment!

See, other rudiments clear other things, but there are no processes we have today that clears the auditor. See? "Are you withholding anything from *me*?" you could say in the session. Yes, that tends to clear the auditor a bit. "Is there something you – I should have found out about you?" Yes, this tends to clear the auditor a bit.

But, actually there's this whole huge area that we've got to raise up to the highest possible pitch. We've got to get the highest possible relaxation on the part of the pc for the auditor. There is the weakest part of your auditing. You see? And it's not the weakest part of your auditing personally, see? But in auditing pcs, that shows up as the weakest point, is the pc hasn't much confidence in the auditor and you've got to build that confidence up.

Now, if that confidence is built up, the pc will stay in session come hell or high water. The pc will actually get mad as hell at you and still be in-session – do you see the difference – instead of being mad as hell at you and out of session, you know? The pc you've just – because why? This particular prepchecking activity is peculiarly liable to the pc going out of session. Why? Well, you're asking him for very intimate activities. It drives him out very easily.

But there's a more important one than that. It's just before he stubs his toe on one of these kingpin withholds; it's a missed withhold! It's been a missed withhold for several seconds, at the least, see? Even while it's a missed withhold for just the period he said, "Hmm, well – uh-hmm, well – uh-hmm." Just at that moment it's a missed withhold. You haven't got it yet, have you? And if he doesn't articulate it right at that second, he starts getting angry with you. He gets a little upset with you, and so on.

Well, it's worse than that. He starts running into it about five minutes before. And he doesn't know about it yet. And the only person he can locate that's badgering him – you see he's being badgered. He's something like a bull with banderilleros being shoved into him, see? And he doesn't quite know what's – what's kicking him. So he looks around to find the most likely target and, of course, it's the auditor. So he tends to be a little bit nervy on the subject of the auditor at that moment. And you will see this time and time again and please, please in sec – in all this Prepchecking, please recognize what it is. It's the pc is just coming up right on the edge of it.

Now, if a pc isn't tremendously well in-session, *zzhhhh*. See? So therefore it becomes very important to get the auditor clean as a wolf's tooth just as early as you can in Prepchecking.

Now, your rudiments aren't run 2, 3, 4 in order. There are some rudiments that it's more important to run than others. And this first one – the first one, the most important one – is, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" That's your first rudiment and that's the most important one. So therefore you take that up. If you were doing an HGC pc, what you would do, would be to clear up, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" as your kingpin Zero question, and then move over on to the last one: present time problem. And you do a Problems Intensive. And that's what fits under there – just your standard Problems Intensive complete with form, just as you've been taught to do it. You see?

That's the old 22 December, Problems Intensive, HCOB. Don't look at me blankly; you know of it. And you just do that whole thing from beginning to end. I don't care how much data you get on the pc before you get up to that – I think it's the O section. But when

you get to that O section, you get those self-determined changes in life and you go down there and you find out then what those self-determined changes are. You assess the self-determined changes. You get the one that is the hottest one and then you ask him, "What problem immediately preceded that change?" and it'll spit out if you've assessed it well. The pc it – it'll just sort of appear magically.

He doesn't have to grope for it. If he gropes for it, you've goofed. You haven't got the self-determined change. You assessed wrong; the pc didn't give you all – something crazy went on here that was just simply lousy auditing. It has to be that crazy. It has to be that bad for this phenomenon not to occur.

You find the self-determined change, "When you decided to go rowing as a profession on the Thames." Oh yeah, that's good. And that falls like mad. And you say, "What problem immediately preceded that in your life?"

And, he's hardly ever thought of it before, but it should just appear in front of him like a magic lantern is turned on, you know? And he suddenly looks at it and he says, "How to drown my wife."

And it surprises him almost as much as the surprising things that come out of it. I mean, that's the way it ought to pop. But if he's at all in-session, that is the way it will pop. If he's worried about session and he's – not any confidence in the auditor, it won't pop that way, see?

All right. Now, you just handle it just the way you handle it, that's all. You just go down the line and list all of the people of the immediate prior confusion. Actually you locate the immediate prior confusion to it. (Let me put this straight way to.) Get the prior confusion to that problem. And listen, it wasn't five years before; it was anything from five minutes to five days or something like that. It's closer. It's much closer. He'll give you an earlier one before he gives you the actual confusion. Don't just take the first confusion he gives you.

Well, he'll give you a confusion, "Well, immediately prior, how to drown my wife. Well, it was my childhood. My mother beating me and so forth every day, and my mother and my wife must have looked like my mother or something I read in a textbook, and so therefore, my – this – this must have been it. And the immediate prior confusion to wanting to drown my wife? Well that, that's it. We've got the immediate prior confusion – when I was three." Only he's forty when this problem came up. And you'd be surprised, that's your main – your main error in spotting prior confusions, see?

Well, you just walk that up and let's just spot – let's just spot the minutes, hours, and days and weeks immediately before that self-determined change for that problem. You just spot that. You can take it on the meter and you'll find it. God almighty! He found her in bed with another man and he completely occluded it. You know, it'd be something wild in here, see. Much more likely, however, this turns out to be a complete dub or something of the sort. And it's an entirely different situation as we turn out in Prepchecking.

All right. You take that zone – that prior confusion – and list the people who were present in that. You get a list of the dramatis personae in that area and then it was – you assess that list and you'll get the hot one. And you take that hot one and your – it get – it – you get a

Zero₁ that runs something like this. And the Zero₁ would be, well let's see... "What – well, what difficulty – What about your difficulties with Fred?" That's a perfectly good valid question. "What about your difficulties with Fred?" See?

And he says, "Well what about them? Nothing about them," and so forth.

Now you have at this point, you've got your – your Zero, of course, is the rudiment – present time problem. Well, that is narrowed down to getting this fellow's problems straightened up. So that's still your Zero.

Then you get a Zero₁, which is your Problems Intensive result. And that becomes, "What about those difficulties with Fred?" You got the idea? Hmmm? That's your Zero₁. And then you get, of course, you get 1₁, because he's going to give you a withhold and now you're going to run the Withhold System.

So your whole Withhold System runs off of 1₁ until you can finally clear about – "What about those difficulties with Fred?" You see, that is really your master question, is: "What about those difficulties with Fred?" That is your real 1 that you're trying to clear. But in order to try – in Prepchecking in trying to clear, "What about those difficulties with Fred?" he gives you a withhold – you even chitter-chatter, "What about those difficulties with Fred?" and you see that it's reading.

And he says, "Well, I don't know."

"Well, are you withholding something about Fred?" Give him a prompt, see?

And, "I was withholding, I guess that I've hated him for years, I've withheld it," and so forth, you see?

And you say, "Okay. What about hating Fred?" See?

Now, that is your 1₁. And you just clean up this, "What about hating Fred?" And you just clean it up with the Withhold System, see? Sounds very sloppy, but it isn't sloppy at all because your next line, of course, is, "When did you first start hating Fred?" or "When was that?" if he starts giving you hotter withholds, don't you see? And so on.

Now, frankly, that can go to a 1₂. See, you're sinking one stage at a time here off of this thing. What this is, is a German *schema*.

"What about hating Fred?" is awfully broad. Maybe too broad, you see? Well, certainly, "What about those difficulties with Fred?" is broad enough. God, that's – that's the Thames estuary-wide, you see? And then you get into this little tributary, "What about hating Fred?" and that's your 1₁, see?

But we find, now, he has innumerable withholds from Fred and, "What about hating Fred?" well, so forth, well you kind of have to steer him now. That's what I mean about steering the pc's attention.

And, "What about hating Fred?"

"Well I hated him for this – motivator, moti – "

"Well, what did you done to him?" you see? "What did you do to him at that particular time?" or something like this. Anything you can steer him into. You don't put that down, because that's just a spat. *Nah*, it's something or other. He's just going to give you tons of these things, see? And you will eventually get out of it. And finally you'll clean up, "What about hating Fred?"

But I said you didn't put it down. If it's "What about hating Fred?" and then he gives you one that is worth calling a new What, see, as soon as you've got a new What, is "Well, actually, all my life I have tried to undermine his reputation." And that is the withhold. That is a real withhold, see. Now, you've got your 1₂ and you carry on from there. And you clean 1₂ which is about his attacks on Fred's reputation, see? That all cleans up.

Each one of these, you see, is done by the Withhold System. But as – if you run down to the second 1 and the third 1, you see, you have to clean it up before you clean up the second 1, before you clean up the first 1. You've got the idea? So, I don't care how deep you go into the well.

Now, you could keep this far too accurately. That's one of the things you should know. You can keep it far, far, far too accurately. God, you could fill notebooks for one session, see? These things are simply indicators. We've got to know where we go back to. That's all we've got to know here. We've got to know where we go back to. If we've cleaned up "ruining Fred's reputation" and that Fred didn't know it and nobody knew it and we went over the 2-3-4 – we're going to get incident after incident, "What about ruining Fred's reputation?" you see, if that's your 1₂, that's – well, you've written that down – "What about ruining Fred's reputation?"

And he says, "Oh, uh – well, uh – I uh – actually planted a letter in the mails; it was a forged letter." Something like this, you know. This is very hot, see? Well, you don't go on with, "What about that forged letter?" you see, and get a 1₃, because this is just a whole cluster. This is going to – this is a big mess – across the boards, you see?

You must remember that a withhold is a mess, see? Now, you are applying a very neat, precise system to something that is totally gummy. See? You're putting on a nice pair of boots to weed and wade through the darkest of mud.

So, you start to get too neat and try to follow down every trend and everything the pc says and everything the utter – the pc utters, and make a sub-numbered What out of it and so on – you'll just run out of auditor report paper in the first ten minutes of the session, and you also will have gotten lost – lost your whole orientation on the case, which is simply: get this withhold good and slicked up. You see? And well knowing you could be mining very arid ground at any time. You see, it doesn't amount to anything. Nothing much is happening.

So the thing for you to do is to keep your orientation – to keep your orientation on what are you really trying to clean up, and any time you hit a central thing that you really want to clean up, you make a sub-numbered 1. But if you've got that cleaned up, now there's no more kick at all on having put this in the mails, you see, and this forged letter and so on. You've gone the 2-3-4, 2-3-4, 2-3-4 on this, you see? Well, let's come back up to ruining

Fred's reputation. And now we go at 2-3-4, 2-3-4, or something on this, and we get off a bunch of other stuff.

Now, just as likely as not, we're all of a sudden liable to run into his planting evidence in Fred's desk at school. Oh well, we've got a brand-new incident, haven't we? So we've got a new sub-2, a 1₂. All right. "What about planting things in the desk at school?" See? Let's clean this up 2-3-4, 2-3-4, 2-3-4. All right. We've got that all clean. Nothing more about planting the desk, but there's plenty on ruining Fred's reputation, see?

All right. So let's fish around and the pc gives you a lot of *boz-woz* and a lot of non-sense that doesn't have anything to do with the price of fish. He says, "Well," he says, "Well I – I, I – I nattered to him. I nattered to him – to the principal and I – I told his girlfriend actually that he sneezed, and I did this and I did that and all of..."

It, just – you're pulling withholds, you see – anything that's coming up. What you've got to meet here is the fact that every time you get off a hot one, you sort of take the lid off the boiling pot. And it boils over for a while and you clean up the mess and then you get back to this other thing, "Well, what about ruining Fred's reputation?" And all of a sudden, well – that's dead. That's a dead one. So you knock out that 1₁. You'd just knock that flat. That's gone now – ruining Fred's reputation.

But remember, we graduate upstairs again, "What about hating Fred?"

And he says, "Oh yes, my God! I certainly do!" and so forth, and "Not so bad as I did. He's not a bad man. He simply should be electrocuted and hanged, and so forth, and well..."

"Now, have you done anything else to him you haven't told anybody about?" You see, that's your incidental question. That's a leader, see, "What about this?"

And he says, "Oh, you know, mmmm-mmmmm. Well, I actually made an attempt on his life. *Ha-ha*. Three days before this problem. *Ha-heh-heh-heh-he-heh*." And it has been totally missing from view that Fred was included in the plans of killing his wife. He had never remembered doing that. It was just somehow out of view, kind of – but he, of course, has a sensation that he knew about it all the time, because he did. But he hasn't thought about this and it doesn't blow, you see, immediately.

"Well, what about threatening Fred's or – what about trying to take Fred's life?" You see, that's your new sub-1.

"All right. Well, it goes clear back to when we were boys and I just remembered this incident, and we were down at the old swimming hole and so forth and he was floundering in the middle and I stood on the bank and I didn't save him and now that's all cleaned up isn't it?"

And you say, "Well, that's fine, that's fine. What about the old swimming hole?" And it goes *clank*. It didn't clean. Well, that's your test. See? It didn't clean. So you've got to clean it up.

Now, what rocks – let's get a little rule together here – is after you've put down a What – whether it's the main 1 or the sub-1 or the sub-2 or the sub-3 – if you go back and ask

about it and it rocks, you actually have a subquestion that you've now got to write down. You get the idea? But remember not to ask it with a restimulative word in it.

You say, "What about the old swimming pool, or the old swimming hole?" You say that, see?

And the pc says, "Well, yeah. That's right. I stood on the bank and didn't save him."

You say, "What about the old swimming hole?" There's nothing on that. That's not a sub – a 1₂, see? We've cleaned it. See, because make allowances here, you see. You're really blowing things. And your incidental test – and not too precisely either, you know – your incidental test is when you repeat it, or when you ask him a What question and you don't get any rock on the thing, well he blew it! So let's get something else to ask a What question about. Let's not clutter up the auditor's report.

But every time you get a big bang after he's given you a withhold, he has not told all. So it's – really, should be a What question. That is your basic fundamental on which you're dealing.

All right. So anytime we put – anytime we write anything down, if we've written it down, then we go 2-3-4, 2-3-4, 2-3-4, on that question until it cleans. And we finally say, "What about the old swimming hole?" And there it is.

Now, by the way, you probably don't realize in this demonstration which you have just watched... And I want to thank Fred for that, that took a brave man, didn't it? What hasn't emerged from view is, is because it was only an hour session, I didn't run end rudiments as an interim action, I ran – didn't have time – I ran a skimped – they were adequate – but end rudiments in which I was hitting "half-truth" and "untruth" and "damage" harder than the devil, because those are the things that are going to give you trouble in Prepchecking.

Now, frankly, every now and then, if the going is getting very gummy and too rough, run that end rudiment. Or run as many end rudiments as you care to. And run his Havingness or anything else you care to, you see? But for heaven's sakes don't go more than an hour before you do your end rudiments because this question, "What about this incident in Rome?", cleaned. I didn't put it back on the meter because I didn't want to throw the pc back into session; we were already running out of time. But it cleaned on the end rudiments.

How do I know it cleaned? Well, I watched carefully the needle pattern that was still residual. And when I did the end rudiments, that needle pattern cleaned on the half-truth, the untruth and damaging himself. I won't ask you to do that kind of E-Metering because you don't have to do that kind of E-Metering, but there we went. And that was why we were still getting a knock on it. Which is why I closed it off with the speed with which I did. I said, "Well, there's nothing much left on this. This goes back someplace else." I would have left the pc with the feeling like it couldn't possibly be clean and he'd be hunting all over the place on a bare street, you see?

Of course, the thing knocks. Now, naturally I will go back and test it when I audit the pc again, see? I'll check it. But the odds are very much in favor of it being clean.

Now, do you see how an incident can be held in? A What question can be held in because your end rudiments went out. But the beginning rudiments go out in 3D Criss Cross and the end rudiments go out in Prepchecking. Isn't that fascinating?

To get rudiments in, you do end rudiments in Prepchecking. Do you want to do a bang-up job of getting rudiments in, why just do the end rudiments. And in 3D Criss Cross if you want to get the rudiments in, why, do the beginning rudiments. I think it's quite amusing – an entirely different aspect of it.

Anyway, you saw those exact needle patterns tend to fall on-off on the subject of half-truth, untruth and try to damage anyone in the session. Well, now listen, when you're doing – when you're doing a bunch of withhold pulling, let me call your attention to something: "Self" is the fellow he feels he is damaging because sometimes giving up a withhold threatens personal survival. That makes sense doesn't it? So he feels he might be damaging self. And sometimes pcs run themselves down and make themselves appear worse than they are, just as this pc did in a desperate effort to make it blow. See? We found out it wasn't quite that discreditable. And there it is. It all of a sudden came back into focus again.

You saw those falls that you – had been left on 1₁, "What about this incident in Rome?" See? There's that one. We consider that thing pretty washed. If there's anything on that it's going to be somewhere else, but will come up as another What on 1 here.

Now, what are we cleaning on 1? Let's take a look at this. We're cleaning "Are you" – Zero – "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Zero₁, of course, we're starting out with the dynamics aren't we? All right. And Zero₁ is where we got to, and on Zero₁ we were cleaning 1, "What about these physical difficulties?" That was the kind of the withhold the pc had, see? You got the idea?

So we're cleaning up here Zero, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" and go on cleaning that up for a long while. That's one of these broad, Atlantic-wide, questions, see? And then Zero₁, self: well, that's the mouth of the Mississippi or something like that. That's as wide as that thing is. And now each time he gives us some kind of a withhold on physical difficulties, we get out of this a 1₁ as a What. Now, out of that 1₁ – if we can't clear this 1₁ with the 2-3-4, 2-3-4, 2-3-4, and it doesn't clear up right away and all of a sudden some hotter subject shows up while we're doing this – we get 1₂, new What, because that will be a brand-new withhold, don't you see?

And he says, "Fred," he said, "Well, Fred, Fred doesn't know it but he was in the sporting goods store with me the day that *ohmmmmm*... He was in there the day I bought this shotgun I was going to shoot him with."

Probably won't become a What. Why? It blows, see? That blows right there.

But all of a sudden you press him a little bit further and he gives you another withhold, "Well, I haven't told anybody that I've always been looking for the perfect weapon with which to kill Fred, and still am."

You say, "What about the perfect weapon to kill Fred?" and you've got a new 1 sub-something. Now, we'll run this off, see? And we're still working on this thing about extinguishing Fred. See?

Now, we've got the subject of killing Fred and maiming Fred and ruining Fred in various ways. We've got – that's all out of the road. We've cleaned that back up. Remember we've still got, "hating Fred," you see? And now we go to town on the thing, because "hating Fred," at this point, he doesn't think of any other withholds right away and it's all – the needle seems kind of quiet and everything seems kind of quiet. Well, let's run the end rudiments, see? And the end rudiments will probably sweep out of the way what's left on it.

Now, as far as repeating the When or the precision of the When, you adapt your When, All and Who to the needs of the instant – just the need of the moment. Of course the more difficulty you're having with it, the less precise the pc has the When, see? So the more When's you use – the more often you come around the little squirrel cage – the more often you have to ask him When, the more precisely you ask him When. The more often – the more precisely. That is the rule. Until you get right down there to a point of where you're dating it, "Well, was it ten minutes of ten or five minutes of ten? Six minutes of ten?" You see, you could get down into it that precisely if this thing wasn't blowing. And every time you do this – you come by – you'll date it a little more precisely and get right on the *bouton*. And finally – that is all assisting in the blowing, you see?

All right. So you would date it, but at first, "Well, when was that?"

He says, "Well, that was when I was a child."

You say, "Fine."

If you're going by it again, "Well, about how old were you?" you see? You're asking him a When but it's with another phraseology. "You – about how old were you?"

You've already kept it in mind that he said with great generality, "When I was a child," you know. Let's get how old he was.

And he said, "Well, I guess I must have been about ten."

And you say, "That's fine. That's good enough."

And now you're coming by – you've done the others – and now you're coming by it again and you say, "What year were you ten?"

"Oh, what year was I ten? Let's see, that must have been 1941. No that must have been 1940. It must have been 1939. It must be no, no, no, no, no, no – that year I was twenty. Ah, let me see..."

And as long as he's willing to figure it out and he's making some progress, don't interfere with him, see? Don't let him run on – don't let him run on and on either, but don't interfere with him.

He says, he's figuring it out. "I was thirty-nine. No that's a, that's a – let's see, I was thirty-nine when I was well, ten and ten... Let's see, what year was I born? Well, that'll give it to me. What year was I born? I was born in 1921. All right, that's good, that was the year I was born. So, ten, this must have been 1930. Couldn't have been 1931. Why, I must have been twenty when this thing happened! Yeah, why, I was twenty! That's terrible, but I was twenty when this thing happened."

And you say, "All right. Well, what date does that make it?"

He says, "It must have been 1941. I was, well, I was twenty years old when it happened."

You say, "Good."

Now, you say – if he's gone into this much of a comm lag, kind of prime the pump a little bit. You know, you know what you're working on here. He just got through telling you that he threw a rock and you say, "Well, is that all about throwing a rock? Is that all? Is that all there is to that? About that? Isn't any more to it? Is that all there is to it?"

And he says something and answers your question. And then you want to find who didn't, and who did and "Was there any determination that never in the future would anybody ever find out about it?" You know, your not-knows can go that far. They can go past, present and future not-knows, you know? You can run the whole gamut.

The most fruitful ones is "Who tried to find out about it and failed?" or "Who should have known about it and failed to?" "Who didn't find out about it who had an opportunity to?" That kind of question is your hottest button, remember that. So don't fail to stress that. But at the same time you can say, "Well, who didn't know about it?" "Who decided never to remember it?" What – you can run a whole lot of postulates out of this, on the subject of memory if you want to, you see? Actually the stress with which you can do this far exceeds the need of it. You have far more tools than you need to pull the simple fact of somebody stayed in ignorance of this misdemeanor.

All right. You could get very fancy with this and very complicated you know. But it's kind of fun sometimes just to throw it around. You just play this off the cuff. It isn't the way it looks to you. You're not reading any crystal ball.

You just say, well, we've talked about – we've talked about his wife never found out about it for a long time, how about Fred, you know? Let's us just interject this thing, "Well, did Fred ever find out about any part of this?"

"Well, no as a matter of fact he occasionally – and so forth."

"Well, should he have found out about it?" You know? Press it a little bit. "Well, did he ever *almost* find out about it?"

"Oh well, yes." And you'll get some little peak on this thing. "Yes he, as a matter of fact, he turned around just as I was standing there, and I put the rock in my pocket. Yeah, the dumb fool. He could have seen me do that."

You know the way they blame somebody for not having discovered something is what is marvelous about the thing. You see what I'm saying?

Anyway, you run it down the line and you're back to your question, "Well, what about throwing a rock at Fred?" something like that. Deader than a doornail. Nothing to this thing. You graduate upstairs again, ask this upper one. Maybe you can clear that now, maybe not. And if you can't clear it, of course, you can run a 2-3-4 on it, if he gives you a new withhold. And you find yourself stuck with a new What. Well that What had better be written down with the 1₂, don't you see?

So you clean the lower ones and go back to the upper ones. You got the idea?

So you can keep this scale going on and on and you keep moving it upstairs. It takes an awful lot of withholds to make a single Zero₁. That takes a lot – there's an awful lot of Whats to make a whole clearance of self. See, that's pretty terrific. But eventually you graduate it upstairs and you've got that, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" requires a sub-self.

Now, what is the exact question that you would ask to find out if you should move on to sex or something else? There'll be something else here. Yeah, well you've got a sub-question at Zero₁ and that question would be, "All right. Are you willing to talk to me about yourself?" you see?

And the guy is all set now. Yeah, you've cleaned these other things up so he says, "Yes."

Now, you've got your new one which is Zero₂, which is sex, children; Zero₃, family; Zero₄. Here we go, you see? And whenever you see these prepcheck questions you'll see Zero₁ and all that sort of thing, you'll know what that is, see? And you just move it out of that category Zero₁, into your 1. And that's the first big, broad, general, cracking withhold the pc gives you. And they usually are very broad. And this one is a perfect example: 1 is, "What about these physical difficulties?" For God's sakes, how much broader, see, do you want? Naturally you're going to run a lot.

You'll find it comes out pretty textbook, actually. It's not a difficult subject; just don't make a difficult one out of it. If the every – oh, some twenty percent of the withholds that you run across or something like that, are going to stick. The other eighty are going to blow the first time they're ever mentioned, because they're little tiny things, you know?

Now, there's another aspect of this I should mention, and that is that the pc gums the system up. Now, don't get impatient with the pc because he insists on giving you information that doesn't fit into your form. That is the way a government operates, not the way an auditor operates, you see? The government gets into a savage, roaring fury, you see, if what should be on line four appears on line two. The quartermaster will never issue it. The Treasury Department will never pay it. Well, don't get that bureaucratic on this because the pc insists on giving you the When, What and All in the same sentence. Just consider it an added bonus. But don't omit asking your routine, but not in such a way that it invalidates him.

He's just told you, "Well, I had a – I had a whole operation and I never told anybody about it, and – nothing about it. I had this whole operation when I was twenty-one and nobody at all knew about it. Secret from everyone."

Boy, has he fixed your clock apparently on first glance, you see? He's given you the When and he's given you – and he tells you, maybe very *in extremis*, you know – he tells you all the details and what he withheld from the doctors, too, you see? And it all comes out *brrrrrrrr*, see? And there is the situation, all laid out on a silver platter for you. So, what are you supposed to do? Well, don't let your system get in the road of the pc's withholds. That's why, when I was auditing, you saw an irregularity in the system. The pc's already given me the data. What was I expected to do? Invalidate the pc?

The pc says, "It was at three o'clock in the morning, the night of December the twenty-third, 3:01."

And you immediately say, "Well, when?" [laughter] You see the invalidative use of the thing. I wouldn't put that in practice. If he gave me that much detail, why I'd just let the system skid its wheels for that particular one and go on to the next one.

Now, it's interesting to use a system with fluidity and flexibility, because after all, all it's trying to do is keep your number on what page of the book you're reading, see? That's the only thing the system is trying to do. And let me tell you that bookmarkers never get in the road, or shouldn't ever be permitted to get in the road of the adventures of Don Quixote, you see? You don't ordinarily let a bookmarker stop the paragraph, do you? Well, that's all a Prep-check system is, is a series of bookmarkers. That's all you're recording here.

But the odd part of it is, if you omit it entirely, you find yourself reading the last chapter when you ought to be reading the first chapter and you get a lot of restimulated withholds.

Now, that's the only danger that you run – is not getting all of it and missing it. So you use, every now and then, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" or you certainly use it before you start end rudiments or something like that. Just throw it in gratuitously, not very often, because it's rather self-invalidative. Don't throw it in very often, but before you start running end rudiments or something like that – you know, you're just going to run a little bit of a punch end rudiment just to find out that we've cleaned up the half-truths and that sort of thing, kind of precede it with, "Well, have I missed a withhold here?" and watch your meter very carefully, and it'll flick.

But when you ask that question, "Have I missed a withhold here?" for heaven's sakes, don't put any restimulative reference into it, because of course it'll fall. And remember the pc is still working on withholds. You still have half-truths and that sort of thing. And if you can't clean that, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" go ahead and run the half-truths and so forth. Realize you haven't cleaned, "Have I missed a withhold?" and after you've got the half-truths, whole truths, so help me God, get the damage and then, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" Because, of course, that he was telling half-truths and untruths and damage, will also be a missed withhold. So don't beat that to death. Just keep your finger on it. Because after all you're pulling withholds all the time. I'm sure you – at the end of the session you won't have missed any withholds on him. But it's a good one to throw in occasionally, you know, just as a checker.

Now, you'll find that the system itself has a high degree of flexibility and it prevents you from sounding like a wound-up doll, providing you don't exactly codify the wording of every line.

I think you think that – I think you – the demonstration – I'm sure the pc was not even aware of really much of a system going on, and yet I was asking him the very salient points of exactly these things. And he didn't notice any system going on because these are the questions you ought to be asking, see? However, I'm sure that if somebody worked on this real hard, they could get that well obtruded into the situation.

"What - about – stealing - your - brother's - marbles?"

"Thank - you."

"When – was - that?"

"Is – that – all - of - it?"

"Who - should - not - have - found - out - about - that?"

"Thank - you."

And you know I think the pc would get a vague notion there that he wasn't really being listened to. I think that would be a little bit poor.

You've got a flexibility. So you have to keep the sense. What I'm asking you to do is keep the sense of what you are doing in your 'ead – the sense of it. *Whiz-whiz-bang*, you know?

And won't – it's just basically this. Well, right now it's When, you know? He's told me and he's given me some other remarks and it's When. "What's the date of that?" See? Anything that fits. It's what is appropriate to it. "When was that?" is fairly early. "What's the date of that?" "Now precisely when did this occur? Precisely. Look, I'll help you out here. All right."

And we go ahead and we just date it down. We take maybe three or four minutes dating the thing, you know. Ah, we found out it was December the 10th and 1941, 2:03 o'clock in the morning – 2:03 and 15 seconds. You can do that. "If it was, it couldn't have been. It couldn't have been. That's when I said I was – oh, oh, I get that now. Yeah, yeah." And you get another one falling out of the hamper.

So anyway, that is a preview of what Prepchecking looks like and sounds like and acts like. And I wanted you to have this so that it wouldn't look strange and peculiar to you. I think you'll find it very easy to use, because it sure do pull those withholds.

Now, I want to point something else out to you. At any time did the pc even look like he wasn't going to tell me?

Audience: No.

The pc protested the embarrassment of telling me a couple of times, but didn't ever say he wasn't going to tell me. It never entered his head. There's no reason why it should have. The difficulties of the session were very minor, very minor difficulties. The pc to some degree was braced in that session as an auditor and so forth. And he was watching the Model Session steps and he was checking it off very, very carefully, very. See? Challenging my right to omit a rudiment, things like that, and so forth. Well, all of that comes in – I'll tell you why that comes in. The pc's riding up on hot stuff, do you see. The pc's fine, and remember we're clearing, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" so the withholds we're pulling are restimulative of having difficulties with the auditor, you see? But you can expect that sort of thing. Fine, three cheers.

Another point: In withhold sessions you can waste a lot of time by asking for withholds when you're not working with – when you're working withholds in the body of the session. Man, can you waste time, because you've started your session out without inquiring

about a present time problem. It's more important that you get the rudiments covered than you try to do the body of the session in the rudiments. So did you notice we omitted the question we were going to work on, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" as far as cleaning it up was concerned. I asked it and saw it fall, and then I said, "Well, that's all right," I says to the pc. "This is what we're going to take up in the session," and we went on to the next one.

All right. We omit withholding. Why otherwise? See? Why waste time, you see, on that? And it was for your sakes that I tried to omit Havingness at the end and you saw my – you know auditing is what you can get away with. And you saw me miss, you know. But I – pc looked okay. His face looked bright and everything and so on. He said his havingness was down. I took a closer look at him and sure it was down. So I ran Havingness just before I ended the session.

But in lieu of finding his Havingness Process, and throwing your timing way out, I ran the surest one I know, see? And we didn't run any distance, see? We didn't have anything very far away. And I call your attention to that process if you're ever caught short on the – without a pc's Havingness Process and have to do something, I just call that demonstration to your attention; because it nearly always works perfectly. You see it's – the reason why it's "reach," see, with the hands, it's "feel." It doesn't tell him to do anything with it. And he becomes aware of the presence of something, you see? And of course, he's been aware of this desk straight away and then his chair. And of course he's been aware of the chair straight away, and just a table and a chair, and a table and a chair, and your feet on the floor. That is the – oldest form of that was, "Feel the floor beneath your feet." And you'll find out that'll bump up havingness. And that was an interesting thing. I had him clear down at 0 there on the sensitivity or close to, and we got a third-of-a-dial drop gain on the thing before we left that thing and we had how many commands on it? Twelve? Fifteen? Something like that.

So anyway, that is a – that is a good one. By the way, on some pcs that is only adventurous because it doesn't flatten in a hurry and it turns on exquisite agony. It just hurts like the blue blazes on some pcs. Some small proportion of pcs are so far out on their havingness, that this is such a positive enforcer – touching things – that when they touch things, they haven't touched anything. They've been carefully not touching things while they were touching things, and it turns on pain in their finger tips. And the pcs that are having the most trouble with havingness are most likely to turn on tactile pain with that particular thing. But if the pc does, my God, that was what needed to be run.

All right. Well, that's just comments, broad comments on the session. We're talking mainly here about Prepcchecking.

Blowing withholds, blowing overts – before they are finally cleaned up on the whole subject matter you are working on – will reduce havingness. You get your biggest resurgence in havingness when you blow a whole package. You've got a whole chain, and you've blown all these overts and that sort of thing, and the guy has got this all taped and straightened out and you'll find his havingness is in pretty darn good shape when he's done that. But before he gets to that point, his havingness will go up and go down and it's very irregular. And if he's been under considerable strain in the session, and you've gotten charge off of it – we only got,

I think a slightly less than a half a division of charge off that particular session, but did you notice he was walking back up toward 2.0?

And remember how hard we had to work on that down in Australia trying to get him up from the 0.0 out there? Well, Prepchecking brings them up and you just saw an example of it. I don't know if you noticed it. We watched something we've been trying to solve for years in that particular session. Prepchecking was bringing up the pc who was running at 1.4 on the meter and brought the pc up to 1.9 at the finish. I thought that was fascinating, huh? Since it's impossible – was impossible for a long time with old, earlier processes to bring the pc higher on the meter, when they were registering below – between 1.0 and 2.0. Remember? Well, did you notice that we did it in that particular session?

All right. This is Prepchecking and although you will see a lot of publications on this one way or the other, the complications of it are not very great. It's a sort of auditor shorthand on, "Where are we going?" And the system itself simply gives you the questions in the exact rotation they are to be asked.

Now, that is the basics of the system. Everything else that's added to the system is simply let the auditor keep track of what he is doing. And you'd hate to have to stop a session in the middle of the big withhold that has just tumbled out at one hour and forty-five minutes of a two-hour session. And the pc says, "Well, of course there was the time when I murdered my grandmother."

And you say, "Good. Thank you. What about murdering your grandmother?"

And you get a four-tone-drop movement of the tone arm. I think at that time you want to have, "What about murdering your grandmother?" on your auditor's report, numbered with its proper sub-numeral in the proper sequence of things to be cleaned up. I think it'd be very beneficial at that time.

And it would also be very beneficial to have the pc's confidence, both from having done a good job of auditing and because the pc was cleaned up on the auditor. And I think that would also be very beneficial because it means your pc will survive till the next session. And do you know there are those who might not believe this, but I myself am a person who favors the survival of the pc till the next session. I belong to that small, small band of die-hard auditors who believe the pc ought to live through it.

Anyway, so there it is. I hope you understand it. I hope it looks good to you and more basically than that, I hope it works for you like a mad thing.

Okay?

WHAT IS A WITHHOLD?

A lecture given on 20 February 1962

Okay. You have, by the way, seen an example of Sec Checking on rudiments as opposed to Prepchecking. And you had three or four rudiments live on the other session, the first session you saw, do you remember that? The earlier session, same pc. And the auditor just swept these by grandly. Do you remember?

Audience: Yes. Hm-mm.

Hm-hm. And you gasped with horror? You remember gasping slightly with horror? And you didn't use any sound. And today you saw me handling them with Sec Checking and going in and straightening up every rudiment, or trying to, and bypassing Prepchecking. We never got to Prepchecking, did we? Never got to our business at all.

If it's all right with you, Fred, we will now ask the pc. You understand this is not pre-ordained particularly. This isn't taped as to – so as to give you an example of which is which. It just turns out that you now have an example of which is which.

All right. Which session gave you the most gain, Fred?

Male voice: First one.

The first one? Mm. We handled the whole ruddy lot with Prepchecking, didn't we? Hm? And on the other one we never got any auditing done to amount to anything, and go ahead and tell them what you told me at the end of the session about having the areas confused.

Male voice: Well, he was asking me about a withhold on something. Had to do with money. And I had three different areas, if you noticed: the Center Theater, the American Theater Association, a big area there, and this area here. And I wasn't sure about which area the withhold was in. And on Thursday, in Prepchecking, coming around to "What about such and such," the number one question – you see, every time he came around to the number one question, I knew where I was. I could locate myself, kind of, on the track or what are we working on together here? You see, how you're working? I knew where I was every time the number one question came around. And we got a new number one question, we kind of narrowed down to one area and cleaned that up before it went on to something else. This time I wasn't sure, and so I kept saying, "Well, gee – where, you know? What?" or something like this.

Okay. All right.

Male voice: I'll keep prepchecking.

Good enough. Okay. You see this? You see this? Well, we learn what we learn. That was not scheduled, to teach you these two things. But you get out – you understand, these are live sessions, they are not demonstrations. And you learn what you learn out of something like that. Of course, I feel silly when I don't get a pc pressed on forward. I didn't intend, actually, to run onto this much crash on this. And frankly, an hour, an hour-and-fifteen-minute session is a very short session for me. I normally will audit three to five hours in a session. And I'm having to scale my sessioning down, see, to match the demonstration.

But frankly, it is my opinion after this session – it's my opinion after this session – that the more you monkey around with rudiments, except for Havingness, why, the less auditing you're going to get done. That's just what we sort of mean.

That does not apply to 3D Criss Cross. But, we've got Prepchecking now and it is a highly precise activity. And I don't think that Sec Checking even vaguely compares to it. That's my opinion.

I couldn't get it off the launching pad, see? If we'd gone on auditing, I would have given him a break. And I'd have said, "Well, none of this is clear, none of these things are null." I would have given him a break, and we'd had a cigarette and I would have brought him back into it and started a new session. See, I would have ended that session and started a new session instantly and I would have swung right into the rudiments. "All right. This one's live and this one's live." I would have told him, see?

And then I would have come down on Prepchecking, and I would have said, "Well, what about money?" See? Or "What about taking money?" or "What about this subject?" because this seemed to be the subject we were on. And then I would have gone ahead and cleaned it up by area and type of withhold, and so forth, and I would have cleaned it up properly. But I was trying to clean that up with the who and the when, if you will notice – just the who and the when – and, man, it didn't spring, did it? So scrub it. It didn't spring. If I can't do it, I can't expect you to. Okay?

There's no substitute, apparently, for just full dress parade, clean zone, troop the colors, Prepchecking. Get a 0, proceed from the 0, go to your 1, proceed from your 1 to your 1₁,³ you know? Whatever it is. There is no substitute for it. I've run a couple of sessions since I was – that, well, I ran another session particularly, I was just standing on my head. I could have been sitting there knitting like the children's tutor does. She teaches them school while knitting.

It requires no strain on the auditor. This was quite a strain on the auditor; wondering where the hell you were going, see? And this other, I ran a three-and-a-half hour Prepcheck

³ Editor's note: Spoken "One sub-one", term for a What question evolved from the first What question; One sub-two is the next one evolved from that and so on. Explained in the preceding lecture of 15 Feb 62, SHSBC-118, "Prepchecking". From the following lecture on changed to "One-A", "One-B" etc., see also in Tech Dic under "Zero-A".

session; terrific numbers of withholds falling off the line. And it was just dead easy. There was nothing to it. Sunday night. I woke up, you know, "Well, let's go to a dance," you know? There wasn't anything to this on the auditor.

Okay? All right. This is Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. What's the date?

Audience: Twentieth.

Thank you. What's the month?

Audience: February.

Oh, thank you. What's the year?

Audience: AD 12.

AD 12. All right. All right. We will let you away with that. Thank you very much. Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

Now, I'm going to talk to you about withholds. And this is all about withholds, so a rather – relatively brief lecture. But I have now found the common denominator of withholds. You didn't get an opportunity to see it in today's demonstration but that doesn't make any difference to that.

What is a withhold? A withhold is something that a person believes that if – if it is revealed, it will endanger their self-preservation. In other words, a withhold is something that endangers the self-preservation of the pc. Now, that is a very important definition. It's taken me a very long time to get that definition. It gives us a new line for 3D Criss Cross, although this is not about 3D Criss Cross.

And it, worked back and forth, is an absolute killer because this is the reason whole track is occluded. This is where your whole track memory went. And this is the button on which it is sitting.

So this is a very important discovery. Therefore, we would consider that that person who had very little whole track recall would consider themselves in a very dangerous position.

In other words, you've got a gradient here. The less whole track recall, the more the person considers they are in danger, and the less likely you are to get a withhold off of them. The more fantastic the whole track recall, the same thing we are dodging here, somehow or another, with that.

Now, that's quite important to you, because it gives you and gives me – ha-ha-ha-ha-ha – the exact reason – this is why you get off such as I am now going to say, and call them withholds. These are actual student withholds.

"I went outside and looked at the sky and felt strange." And an auditor bought it as a withhold and worked it over.

"I had a picture of my mother's bedroom and I don't know why." That is a withhold.

"I spoke crossly to an Instructor."

"George and Bill told me that they had heard that Agnes..." And that is a withhold. Why is that a withhold?

All right. Let's start with the first one first. Of course it's safest to get off other people's withholds. These are all safe withholds. They are so safe. And that is all students tend to get off on each other, is safe withholds. I'm sorry to send that arrow so deeply. They get off safe withholds. If they reveal these things, they – it'd be perfectly all right to reveal them, because it's perfectly safe to reveal.

Now, why do we get into a tacit consent of this particular kind? Very interesting why we do: overts on other people's withholds. We take somebody's withhold and we yap-yap at them and we trip them up with it and we make them guilty with it and we sort of punish them a little bit for having gotten off a withhold. We yip-yap on the subject. And after that, we are a little bit afraid to get off a withhold of ourself because we have an overt against the other person's withhold, so therefore, we don't consider it safe to get off a withhold. Do you see what the – what the rationale of the overt is? We have an overt on other people getting off withholds, so we don't get off withholds, you see? Because it isn't safe to get off a withhold.

Now, of course, the more unsafe you make it to get off a withhold, the battier it all becomes until you get a civilization like this one.

Now, the one thing by which the communist profits in [in very broad Australian accent:] Australia and Suid-Afrika⁴ are the laws against perversion. The state, of all means, is regulating how you are going to perform the sexual act. I think that's very interesting. I've seldom seen any police officers in my bedroom. And I'm afraid if I did they'd have short shrift. [laughter]

Of course, I have – I have had the people the police officers are supposed to restrain trying to crawl into my bedroom windows and a few things like that, you know, but that, of course, they wouldn't be interested in.

Now, what are they doing? They're just trying to invent some new withholds, aren't they? I think that's fascinating, because the communist uses blackmail of this particular kind as a means of controlling heads of state.

In other words, if the state itself lends its weight to punishment of withholds, see, it has just laid itself out to be crazy. Because now, anybody in the state can be blackmailed so as to overthrow the state, because the state will punish the overthrow of the withhold. Do you understand this, or any part of this?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Now, there it is on the third dynamic. The state makes it unsafe for anybody to confess to anything. So everybody is withholding from the state. What happens if you withhold from the state or the state misses withholds on you? Of course, you begin to hate the state, and that is the downfall of nationalism.

⁴ Suid-Africa: the name for South Africa, as it is said in Afrikaans, an official language of South Africa which developed from seventeenth-century Dutch.

Of course, this may be very fortunate. But nevertheless, they have sown the seeds of their own destruction by the number of great laws which they – arise on how a person shouldn't get off withholds.

Let's apply that to an auditing session. The auditor upsets the pc or tries to make the pc guilty every time the pc gets off a withhold. Therefore, the auditor is making it unsafe for the pc to get off a withhold. All right. Then therefore the auditor trains the pc not to get off unsafe withholds. The auditor then trains the pc to get off only safe withholds. And we read on an auditor's report, "I went out at night and looked at the sky and felt strange." And that is a withhold. Great day in the morning! That's a safe withhold, isn't it?

Well, of course, the funny part of it is, there it is. It's not a withhold. It's not a withhold at all.

So you can actually get into a games condition with your pc by punishing the pc for his withholds. You can actually get into a games condition where the pc will only try to get off safe withholds. And there you go.

Now, if a pc isn't giving me withholds, I'm afraid that I would become persuasive. A withhold is something that, if revealed, would be prejudicial to his survival.

Now, naturally, his individuation comes from his withholds. This hyper-individuation of the pc, this only-oneness, this withdrawal into only self – all of that – and withdrawal out of groups and withdrawal here and there and so forth, all of these things stem exclusively and only and entirely from, of course, withholds which, if gotten off, the person *believes* would injure their survival.

Now, the funny part of it is, is these – is this is not true. The person gets an aberrated idea of what would injure his survival if he got it off, don't you see? And it's this aberrated idea of what they dare get off that brings about the condition of aberration. I think that possibly you've got one, two, or three apiece – some kind of an average like that – that if you revealed it in the wrong quarter, your – it's factual that somebody would be likely to take action. See, if the state of New South Guinea, or something of this sort, found out about this, well, huh, might be a poor show.

You've all got some that were factual. There are some factual ones, see? Some real ones. And you get those real buried and they get very encysted. And the other aberrated idea builds up on those and we get a build-up of that.

Now, the punishment of our parents, of course, we feel offhand that – this comes from past life; 3D Criss Cross gets these areas cleaned up – but when we started this life, we already had the idea that if we disclosed certain things to our parents or we did certain things or we were – didn't withhold mean words and so forth from our father, or something like that, we'd find ourselves suddenly without food, clothing and shelter. In other words, we get this exaggerated idea. Well, it's built on our past life structure. But that's a bad enough basis.

Now, we take off from there and we move into areas and then do commit something which, if revealed, would be very upsetting, or would have been very upsetting. And then other little things start piling up on the top of that, and so on. And we get up to a point where

we become quite aberrated, quite individuated, and we get so we can't even communicate with parts of our body.

And the result of all this, naturally, is a feeling of high antisocialness.

And somebody comes close to these withholds and we believe implicitly, you see, that if we got off this withhold, naturally we could just see the police running in, my God, the sirens going in all directions, you see, and police by the squad coming bursting in the front door, probably with battering rams, you know? And they got handcuffs and they're all ready to put them on you, you know, and drag you off. And naturally the cell they're going to drag you to is not any of the modern jails, you know, which just dramatize withholds; it's probably one of the old-time dungeons, you know, where they bury you up to the neck in water and leave you there for forty years or something like this, you see? You get an aberrated idea of the punishment in a jail. And this all of a sudden rekindles, you know? The auditor gets close to one of these things, and this idea, *oooooh!* you know. *Oooo-oooooo-ooooo-ooo*, you know? At any minute this horrible series of circumstances are going to occur, and naturally we consider the auditor dangerous.

No, listen, the auditor is only dangerous if he doesn't pull the withhold. And that is a recurring phrase that is starting to happen here in this school. There are certain auditors that we designate as dangerous auditors.

Why are they dangerous? Because they will only tick and not pull a withhold. And we call those people dangerous auditors. Why? Their pcs are all going to be mad at them, they are themselves going to goof up and get lots of loses one way or the other and they're going to always be involved in ARC breaks of some kind or another and they're going to have people going around gossiping about how bad Central Organizations are and how bad they are and how bad everything else is and so forth. And they are dangerous.

But from the pc's viewpoint, the person becomes dangerous the moment they might find out whatever this thing is, you see? And the auditor appears for a moment dangerous. The auditor might find out. And the pc gets ARC breaky, however, only when the auditor fails to find out. The auditor has to go the whole way. And an auditor who won't go the whole way, an auditor who will only get off safe withholds off of a pc is dangerous. And that is today's adjudication on whether a person can audit or not: Are they a safe auditor or a dangerous auditor?

Oddly enough, it's a complete reversal. The auditor who gets off safe withholds is dangerous. And the auditor who will get off unsafe withholds is safe. You understand that?

Now, you've got to – you've got to bust through any feeling you have on this and look at this square in the teeth and follow it through, because your – actually – all of your activities as an auditor are totally, 100 percent, based on this *one little fact*. It all cones down to this: An auditor who will not pull dangerous withholds from the pc is a dangerous auditor.

You're going to have an ARC breaky pc, your pc is going to be upset with you. There are only two or three ways you could possibly mess it up, but how could you fail to do this?

One, you could fail to use an E-Meter. You could fail to make an E-Meter play any tune that was ever written by Bach, Beethoven and Brahms, you see? You could just fail to

make an E-Meter talk. In other words, you look at the thing and the needle falls off the pin, and so forth, and there it is, and the parts are all collapsing and so forth, and we say, "Well, that needle, that's null. Ha-ha. That's a null needle. Ha-ha."

Hm. God, man. Well, you don't have to clean it up in one session, but you have to make sure that you've got another session. You notice I had about two or three rudiments banging there in that demonstration today, and even missed a withhold as banging. And the pc didn't spit at me because the pc knows I know that they're missed. See, and the pc knows I know where we're going on this sort of thing. Pc has confidence in this.

All right. But you go a whole intensive and you never pull any of these things and you never ask for missed withholds and you never try to inquire any deeper into any of these things and that pc blows up in your face.

Every ARC break you *ever* got off of a pc *was* due to missed withholds. Although missed withholds is brand-new as a principle, it's been functioning this whole time. And every time you failed to get off a withhold – you missed a withhold on the pc, you ticked it – you had an ARC break. That accounts for every ARC break you have ever had with a pc. That accounts for every pc who never wanted to be audited again by you. That accounts for all of your own difficulties with pcs; right there in one fell swoop.

Now, you could accomplish it by not operating with an E-Meter. You could accomplish it by a very unreal or nasty auditing approach. Every time the pc said something, you say, "*Nyaaaaa*." You know, something like this. You could accomplish it by just having your technology all backwards and shuffled into another deck. You could accomplish it by just poor auditing. But in the final analysis, poor auditing only exists if a person is determined that they're never going to hurt a pc by getting off any *nasty* withholds. They're going to be *nice* to pcs and they're only going to get off *safe* withholds. *Uuuhhrrr!*

You almost have to use sjamboks⁵ and clubs on some auditors. I'm not kidding you. My method on the thing is just to stampede the auditor on the subject and there's more than one here who's already been stampeded by me straight at the subject. You know?

What – the only thing you want to worry about, the only thing you should really worry about, is when I give up on you. I've done that, too; just quit, you know? And then you get very nice auditor reports. You get an initial or something like that. I just won't do anything more about it. Why? I know you won't. But that doesn't include very many, and the other ones is you start missing withholds...

Pc goals and gains: "Well, I didn't make any goals and I didn't make any gains," and so forth. Well, it might as well have been printed in letters of fire! "Auditor has missed withholds on this pc. Auditor did not clean up things on this pc. Auditor read the E-Meter upside down." Something wild went on here. That's all. I mean, because frankly I have to tell you this. But I've got you in a box right now with Prepchecking. You're taped and targeted.

⁵ Sjambok: A strong, heavy whip made from thick, tough hide, such as that of the rhinoceros or hippopotamus, used in South Africa for driving cattle. (World Book Dictionary)

The auditor who cannot get a result with Prepchecking will not audit. *Uuuuhrrrr!* It's been weaving closer and closer to this point, see? We've been converging on this point. Technology has been getting better and better and better and better, and here we sit looking at Prepchecking. Well, Prepchecking gets a little better. There was a little change the other day in 3D Criss Cross.

As soon as I found out that this applied to 3D Criss Cross, I realized that you can't let a pc cross out anything on a list. Because – that's you, not me – because the pc says, "That's pretty dangerous. Let's see, that's pretty dangerous. Let's see, that's pretty dangerous. And I think this – this item, I think that's awfully dangerous. I think we ought to have that off the list and that off the list and that off the list," and we just cross the whole list off. It's all too dangerous. And then you have missed an item which actually amounts to a missed withhold and so the person gets upset with 3D Criss Cross.

So we can't allow the pc, once he has put it on the list, after we've blackjacked him, tricked and hoodwinked him into getting it onto the list, we can't let the pc take it off, even though that makes more work on differentiations. I found this is the case. I find pcs will take live items off the list if you don't watch them. So, there it is.

So some of your lists are disappearing into smoke, and some of your items are being crossed off because your pc has misgivings upon the safety with which they can be revealed since *all* of these items went out of sight to some degree or another because it was very unsafe at some time or another to reveal them.

I'm looking at somebody right now that was going around with a very, very hot terminal tucked under her arm in a family who believed *implicitly* that the exact *reverse* of this terminal was a way of life and how to be closer to God.

And this pc just had to withhold this one like mad. And of course the whole – more the pc withheld it and so forth, why, the hotter it got. See, the whole family – this would have been heresy. It's like the son of a priest, you know; he wouldn't believe in God. (Nobody gets that joke. Boy, you're slow today. You're very slow today. Wake up.) The son of a priest and he has a terminal called "atheist." See? That would be very upsetting, very upsetting. He'd have withholds. So would the priest.

But anyway, as you get this straight across the boards, we find that a hundred trillion years ago, why, well, let's take an example. We had one mentioned in the session today, something like, well, let's just call it out of thin air "embezzler," or something like that, you see? And this fellow was born in a banking family where *integrity* is all, you see? And he hears from his father and he hears from his mother and he hears from his brothers and sisters in the business and he – and so forth, and he's got a hot terminal. He's been one of the best embezzlers that the country has ever had, don't you see? Something like that.

And here he has to live in this atmosphere with this terminal. *Hot*, you know! So all the time he's pulling this terminal back. (I'm not saying that's the terminal but...) You get the idea? That's a withhold! Man, would it be unsafe to be that embezzler. Right? And he might dramatize it at any moment. And so he fights it and he fights it and he fights it and then one night he goes into the bank vault and he cleans out the whole thing and goes over the hill. [laughter] See, the wrong time, wrong place, wrong terminal, see, for his environment.

And when these things get badly restimulated and so forth, why, they've had it.

All right. Now some auditor is auditing him, see, and we get down to this terminal. And, "Who or what would enforce an outflow from others?" See?

And he puts down "An embezzler."

And he goes down the line, and the auditor goes down, and they – he had a little ARC break with the auditor, something of this sort. The auditor looked at him crosswise or didn't acknowledge him just right – and it's not really an ARC break; it was just that. And he clicks on that other one, you see? "You know this – I don't," auditor has already missed a withhold on him, and so forth, and he's a – he says, "I – I don't know."

We're differentiating the list, and we get down to "embezzler," and we – he thinks we better cross that off so he says, "Well, it – it really wouldn't enforce an outflow. Cross – cross that off the list."

Gives him a second thought, and we mustn't let the pc have that second thought. So there's that little change in 3D Criss Cross. You see why it is?

All right. Now you see that the pc – now let's take up Prepchecking. These two things, you see, suddenly go hand in glove. In other words, we have one straight line. We have Prepchecking as a basic for this lifetime that keeps the pc in-session and then we have its extension, 3D Criss Cross, and both of them are devoted to the same thing of letting the guy stand in the sun. They're both devoted to the same thing, you see? Getting him over all of his odd-ball notions about how dangerous it would be to reveal the fact that he had a crooked left ear. Nothing to it. I mean, he looks at this after a while and laughs. But he isn't laughing at the time you start auditing him.

You say, "All right, now. Okay. Now, what about that activity there that was going on in Tacoma?"

And, [sighs] "Now, let's see. If I think of something else or if I can get the auditor thinking or talking about something else..." you know, this is all reactive, you know? "So let's – let's – let's move it all over onto some other perimeter." Then he says, "Well, it has to do actually with Mexico City." In other words, he's trying to throw red herrings. He can get into a point of reactively regretting having mentioned it. And you'll see him pass through that little band of regretting he brought it up in the first place.

Now, if the auditing is bad, he does this often. If the auditing is good, he only does it once in a while. It is always present, no matter how good the auditing is.

"I'm kind of sorry I brought this up. Now what is going to happen to me?" Of course, all the time he's being sorry he brought it up, you're just crossing into the actual zone and area. You actually have tremendous unknowns left on the whole subject. And the pc does not know much and a great deal about this. That's what the difficulty is. In other words, he still has tremendous unknowns.

Now, in Prepchecking – in Prepchecking, also, there's been a little discovery here about when the pc – Prepchecking – when the pc equivocates, you know you're looking at the package; when he starts to explain. Watch when the pc starts to explain. At that moment add a

What 1₃, or whatever it's coming up this time. And let's find out what this little hot subject is he's going over right this minute. He's explaining.

Now, there's a rule. There's a rule about this, about asking What questions. And this isn't really about What questions but I'll just show you what this is.

The first rule is: When the pc gives you a motivator, you *know* you're on hot ground and so you always ask a What question that's rather overt. Says, "Well, my mother beat me every day."

My What question, I'm afraid, at the moment is "What have you done to your mother?" I would not even monkey with this motivator, see? I wouldn't fool with it at all.

The next gradient up – that would be – that'd be the most certain ground to mine. Motivator, motivator, motivator – man, that just takes the What question and practically writes it in legible script in front of your face, you see?

Your next one up the line from that is the person is critical. The person is being critical of somebody. Well, the criticalness – you can go on and pull criticism forever without getting anyplace. You want to know what he did, did, did, did, did, done, done, done, done, action, action, action. There must be action back of that criticism. Otherwise, we wouldn't have it, see? So, criticism is a sure indicator of an overt.

Now let's take the milder form of it which is explaining why it happened. The pc starts explaining – I don't let the pc explain very long without giving him a new 1 sub-something or other on the What question. I give him a new What question to clean up.

Pc starts explaining and says, "Well, actually, the truth of the matter was that I was on the ferryboat. I hadn't – I hadn't actually meant to be on the ferryboat, you understand, but I was coming down from the taxi rank, and I just saw the ferryboat there."

I'm liable to cut him off at that moment, on whatever we were talking about, and ask a little more pinched-in-close What. "What were you doing?" you know? Something like this.

And he says, "Well, oh-oh. Oh, that!" And it alerts him.

So you have these various indicators. They make a gradient. Pc gives you a motivator; oh well, that's an absolute certain indicator and you must pull the overt straightaway, just convert the thing into an overt without any slightest...

Person says, "Well, my – just my mother beat me every day, just on and on and on. And beat me every day and so forth."

It's just a lead-pipe cinch. "What have you done to your mother?" I mean, it just might as well appear – be printed on the auditor form, you know? I mean, it'd be that inevitable.

Your next one is criticism, criticism, criticism. Well, there's a real overt back of this, and so forth.

Now, we're not going to dignify getting off other people's withholds by even classifying it. An auditor who would do that, oh, man. That's very safe, but it's so safe that they're not withholds. They're not his withholds. What are you doing – what are you doing monkeying

with somebody else's withholds? They're not this pc's actions. Perfectly safe to reveal other people's withholds, isn't it? Or it might be, unless they find out about it.

But – then your area of explanation. And then there is the actual withhold. Now, of course, the actual withhold: the person says, "Well, I – I used to stand down on the Battery and bung paving stones through the windshields of cars," see? And you've got your tailor-made What question standing right in front of your face, because it's not "What about binging paving stones through windshields of car on the Battery on July 1st, 1962?" or something like this, you see? That's not the question. The question is, "What about damaging cars?" or something. But there's your What question. It's tailor-made because it's the withhold.

Now let's drop downstairs a little bit and we find the pc is explaining something so we get the What question out of the bulk of his explanation.

He's saying, "Well, I actually – I actually would never – never really liked – liked – liked my wife, and I really never liked her, and so forth. And this was easy to understand. I, of course, was – came home late and all that sort of thing, but she never kept herself up and she never really did anything for me around the house. And she never really paid much atten – ."

That's – actually, he hasn't given a motivator, you know, he hasn't given an overt. It's just an explanation of how it was all messy. And you could just cut him short on his explanation, get your new What.

Now, I'll give you an example out of your session today: we had two or three periods of explanation, when I wasn't doing Prepchecking. In view of the fact that I wasn't doing Prepchecking, I of course could never get to the bottom of it. It was just crippled, you see, because I couldn't slide in the What. See? Because in clearing rudiments, I was avoiding Whats, and I certainly wasn't Prepchecking, you see, I was sec checking. Doesn't work.

All right. So next indicator is the pc is being very critical about something or other. He's being very critical of you, the auditor. That's a very special case. If he's being critical of you, the auditor, you have missed a withhold and you better find out what it is. "What should you have found out about?" "When did you think I was a fool?" Anything that you could possibly mention that would throw a missed withhold into view – that would be the stage at which you pulled this particular one. But it's the criticism. You want to find out what has been *done*. The missed withhold, underlies all of these things, by the way. But you can find an actual *doingness* at the point of criticism. He's saying, "Well, I," natter, natter, natter, "and actually I always thought, always thought that he wore the wrong color ties. And that was why I didn't like him," or something of the sort, and so on. Well, he's done something to that person or done something to a person like that. So your What question is tailormade out of that.

And then there is your fundamental fundamental – is motivator. Man, red flag! Let's just find out what he's done to the source of that motivator or the type of beingness of that motivator. Just overtly find out what he's done. In other words, you're getting off overts and so on.

Now, if you look at this as a scale, you will find out that the withhold is measured by the degree of danger – the only reason I'm giving you this scale; I'm not talking about how

you ask What questions – the degree of danger the pc conceives to be present on the subject of getting off the withhold.

All right. If the pc doesn't think it's very dangerous, they give it to you directly and straight. If the pc thinks it's a little bit dangerous, they explain around the fringes of where it might lie. If the pc thinks it's rather confoundedly dangerous, it's getting just a little bit grim, maybe on the jail borderline on that chain, the pc will criticize. See, criticism enters.

And if it is so dangerous that the pc believes – you understand I'm saying pc "believes"; I'm not saying it's factual – the pc is right up to the point where, with a jingle jangle the patrol wagon arrives, the officers pick up the battering ram, they knock down the front door, they come crashing in with the handcuffs and leg irons, you see, and drag him screaming off, towed back of the Black Maria, you see? Something like this. And they can see *this* is going to happen if that withhold is missing; they give you the motivator. They always give you a motivator. Flat, flat, total motivator – a hundred percent.

Now, what – how do you use this? Well, it gives you the gradient scale and indexes of all cases. A case is *not* as bad off as he is crazy. A case is *not* as bad off as he is aberrated. A case is *not* as bad off as anything, except how dangerous he considers it would be if he revealed himself.

And so you have from the top to the bottom, all cases on that gradient. Just like you have the What questions and the degree of the withhold and the safety on those – that gradient, so you have all cases on that gradient. And the person who will die before he will reveal himself is also on that scale.

So you have them from the case that you could audit to Clear in twenty-five hours. See, bang! You sneeze, the person is Clear. Well, this person has not had any great idea that it'd be dangerous to tell people things. That's the index of that case.

All right. Now, the person who went 150 hours to a Routine 3 kind of Clear. Well, that person doesn't have very much he considers his – be all right. Pretty easy.

Now we have the case that we went 200 hours on without finding – only finding a goal and terminal. Well, ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha, that case has got quite a little hatful. There is a nice little hatful of stuff that if the individual revealed any part of that, he thinks, he believes, that *hmmm*, it would be, well, it'd be rough. It would be pretty rough. He'd probably lose his family and he'd lose this and that, you see?

And now you take the person who went 500 hours with no goal and no terminal and no gain, and that sort of thing. Now, we know darn well this person has moving up into the perimeter of the police breaking in the front door, if it were learned about this person, see?

And now we take the case – the case that actually goes to the spinbin rather than reveal things. Well, man, that's *in extremis*. Because insanity is the last protest against punishment. See, "I cannot feel your punishment. I do not even know about it. I'm not even a rational being. You've driven me out of my mind." You see, that's a total motivator on the subject of punishment.

So, where we go. Then you've got your whole – your whole thing. It's just length of time in auditing. Your length of time in auditing is indexed by the danger the individual believes would be present if he revealed certain things. And danger to reveal is the direct index of length of time in auditing. There it is. Want to know how long it takes to clear somebody? Well, how dangerous does this person consider it would be to reveal certain things.

Now, how could you cut down this length of time in auditing? Well, I've given you the answer. Don't pull safe withholds. Just move in and pull actual withholds. Don't fool around with it. And use Prepchecking. And you've got that, all right. Now, that gets this lifetime's danger out of the way.

And I've even given you a new type of line and a slight change in 3D Criss Cross that does not permit the person to escape once you've got the item on the list. And the type of line is – the line for 3D Criss Cross, of course – is "What identity would it be unsafe for you to reveal?" or some such wording. See? And they will blow into view. And, "What identity would it be safe for you to reveal?" of course, could be a relief line, which would just be nonsense. But it would sort of balance the thing off and throw the other one into view; in other words, just be a trick line.

In other words, you could drag these things out, and you could – you know now what the pc is doing, so it becomes relatively simple. That is what the pc is doing. While he is there sitting in front of you, he would like to reveal himself. He would like to reveal this and he would like to get out of it, but he does not know how to get out of it. And the person is always hoping that somebody will come along and give him a shot in the gluteus maximus with some magic fluid by which he will not have to reveal a thing and become totally Clear.

And anytime anybody has *ever* proposed that to me, why, I've had an instinct on the subject. [laughter] Now I know why! I should go back through the files and find out who's proposed it because we would have an index of some of our roughest cases. It'd be the person who wants to be cleared without revealing anything.

Now, the people who get spinny in processing, you must be tripping right over – you must be falling right over something.

Well now, Prepchecking will get it for you. There is no contest about it. This is a very easy, easy activity, because a person moves right up into it. But the basic Prepcheck question that would get them all would of course be one of these "unsafe to reveal" questions.

Your Zero: "Have you ever – have you ever done anything that might have been unsafe to mention?" See, that would be your Zero. "Is there anything you've ever done that would be unsafe to you if you told about it?" "If you reveal certain things about yourself, would it be unsafe to you?" Some such Zero, don't you see? Doesn't matter how it expresses to the pc. Then you get your What off of what the pc said. Then you'd mine that down; you'd strip the whole bank. Interesting

"Safe to reveal." This is the index on it.

Now, you must figure it's awful safe to show up with a mest body, a meat body, you see; and then you get the idea that it's unsafe so you begin to take it down. That must be what old age is. That must be the only thing old age is. So take heart, girls. [laughter]

Now, you just look at this as the idea of apparence – apparence, appearances, disappearances, being there, not being there, well, it all passes over into the field of fact. Offering the fact is dangerous. Withholding the fact is apparently not dangerous. All it does is pull the person to pieces. That's the trick of the Body Builder. That is the basic trick of this universe. And the basic trick of this universe is, if you withhold it, it won't hurt you any. And of course, that is a stinking lie.

So they get everybody to withhold things. They invent codes of law and that sort of thing, and these things are all supposed to get everybody to withhold the thing, and then the thing – thetan gets to packing up mass and occupying less space. And he occupies less space and less space, and he can permeate less and less things, and here he goes. He's got it made. Yeah. But who's got it made?

Of course, that is a game nobody wins. Scientology is the only game where everybody wins.

Now, there's your – there is your index of withholds. There is your – what they're about. That is why your pc won't talk to you. That is why your pc reveals what he reveals. That's why you sometimes look very silly writing down, "Well, the pc has a withhold that the pc has a bent toe," and why, after you've prepchecked a bent toe for five or six sessions, there has been no gain on the part of the pc.

You see? You see how this might work? Does this straighten out anything for you?

Audience: Hm-mm.

Now, you could use this principle, but if I give it to you, you'll work it to death, instead of using it as a Zero, you can flip over, and you mustn't work this to death.

"Who would have been dangerous to have revealed that to?" could be a version of the Who question. But you get on some hot line and the person is talking about having robbed every restaurant in the entirety of New York – and he's robbed every restaurant in New York practically, and so forth, and he just keeps going on and on; you don't seem to clean this up. The Who that will clean it up is "Who wouldn't it have been safe to have told about that," and "Who didn't find out about it?"

And of course, he'd say, "Well, the restaurateurs." And he's been saying "The restaurateurs" all this time, and all of a sudden he looks at you and he says, "Well, all right. The police."

"All right. When did they fail to find out about it?" And we get the rest of the chain and it blows. Do you see that?

Now, there is – there is your gradient of the value of the withhold to the pc. I call very strictly to your attention that I have said the pc *believes* it would be unsafe. And that is what is most interesting: "believes" it would be unsafe.

And of course, these things – I think, I think the crime you committed – I think they probably run out of witnesses. I think the – I don't think the government would spend a cent trying to dig up enough witnesses, or even find the records, in order to prosecute you and so

forth, particularly if it was a real crime. The government is much more interested in minor crimes than real crimes.

And the essence of the situation, however, is one little thing like that gets stacked up on other little things and something else gets stacked up on that and the next thing you know a person believes it's very dangerous to put his nose out of doors. Can't! Can't go outside. And there's your "can't go outside" thing. God-awful things are liable to happen to this person if they go outside; liable to be recognized as the person who committed the murder, only they kind of vaguely think maybe they have committed a murder, which is quite interesting.

You have very few backtrack things on this that are hot, but every case must have a few on it. You suddenly say, "Oh man, I bet they're still waiting for me. I bet they're still looking for me someplace or another," and the pc is liable to have his hair almost stand on end for a moment when he hits one of these things. And then he suddenly, "Well, that's nonsense. Been a long time ago. Long, long ti... I wonder if they are."

But this equally applies to 3D Criss Cross and to Prepchecking but is most salient in your use of Prepchecking. And there is where you should use it. And I won't get nasty or mean with you, or anything. I will just forbid anybody to get off your withholds if I hear any more session being spent on "I went out in the evening and looked at the sky and felt strange." I wouldn't even try to make anything out of it except that some pc had a hot area someplace and had just thrown me a great big floppy, squishy red herring. And I don't like red herring, so I would let that one drop.

There are certain withholds you let go by. You just let them go by. You don't do a thing with them. And there are certain withholds that you hang to till grim death, until they are all revealed, and you'll just have to learn which ones. And the index of it is what is it – the pc consider it safe to reveal; what does the pc consider it unsafe to reveal. And that unravels the whole problem for you.

Thank you.

USE OF PREPCHECKING

A lecture given on 21 February 1962

Thank you. Thank you.

All right. Now, you've seen an example of Prepchecking and that is an example of Prepchecking. And that example should serve as *the* example for how you put these things down.

Now, if you had more than this on your auditor's report, you're nuts. [laughter] If you had more than this on your – the auditor's report which you wrote... The Zero from which we're proceeding is "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulty?" – your Zero_A. We started using A because 1 is the number of a question and you could very easily get tangled on it.

So your Zero_A, self, and the 1 is "What about these physical difficulties?" We already had those from an earlier session. We're trying to clean those things up and our 1A is "What physical difficulty would it be unsafe for you to reveal?" which is a question in desperation, see. The pc has not given me a withhold, so you have to take off from some point.

All right. That's a very fine point to take off from, I assure you. And we immediately got a list. And, as the pc gave the list, if you were listening and watching the meter at the same time, you saw that the middle one was the one that fell, and we got 1_B – "What about this rectum trouble?" 1_C – "What about not keeping Jim clean?" Because we got that straight from a withhold.

And then 1_D, because that wasn't cleaning, we have to have a 1_D. And "What about doing something to Jim?" which is, of course, a direct auditor question. Let's get the overt. Let's find out what the overt is, see.

Boy, you look like you're all adrift. Well, after you've done this a few times, you won't any longer be adrift. You only write down what the auditor says on a Prepcheck report. As far as your auditor Zeros, 1, 2, 1_A, 1_B – that's only what the auditor says. You only write down what the auditor says. You never write down what the pc says. What the pc says, of course, reflected in what the auditor says.

But you don't do a stenographic job of auditing of simply sitting there, writing down everything the pc says and think you're prepchecking because you're not – on any relationship to Prepchecking.

Now, if you want to make a few little old comments, you come over here. Results and comments, you have in this column. And you have over here some – the goals, and you have some notes by the auditor, and of course, they're totally incidental to the auditor's report. And

I notice that 46 or 47 has something to do with the rectum trouble, but then heavy reaction on the word *damage* was something I noted, so I just put that down for future reference, see? So that has nothing to do with the auditor's report as such. Okay?

But there is that. This session served as no fantastic revelation. The pc, however, I think, felt better. Right?

Male voice: Mm, yeah, much better.

All right. And of course, I didn't want to hold you up, so I didn't take his goals or gains at the end, but that was purely by reason of demonstration and no other reason.

Now, in a Prepcheck you write down what the auditor says. And if you're going to write down anything about what the pc says, it's going to be some kind of a little notation of something you considered interesting, and you're going to put it over, way over on the right hand side that has nothing whatsoever to do with your Prepcheck Zeros, 1s, and so forth. You see?

In other words, the report is for you and for referral to keep you from passing up a question which you then don't clear.

Now, we've got to clear all these questions up the line. Now, because I audited this pc before and got some tone arm action on an incident in Rome – I got some tone arm action on that particular line – I got considerable amount of half-truth and untruth off the end of that but that was running relatively well. That whole series, I must comment to you, is in question whether or not that is clear or not. You understand? But we were only going back such a short and shallow distance in the pc's life that I thought, "Well, now, let's see if we can't get a little earlier and get a little more germane to our original question – 'What about these physical difficulties?' So what I'm going to do is run down physical difficulties some more and find out if there wasn't something else in the way of physical difficulties, find a chain ripping up here someplace, and now go back and clean up this other chain."

I figured I'd be faster to do that than to slug as we went on that. Do you see this?

All right. Now, there's another rule on Prepchecking and that is that you are only trying to pull withholds, and a withhold is held in position because of a prior overt.

If you can find a withhold, your Who, When, What – pardon me, your When, All, Who, to be precise, round and round and round, applies mainly to the overt, of course. It does not apply to the withhold. It applies to the overt.

Now, the steering of the pc merely consists of steering the pc into giving you a withhold and then steering the pc into giving you the overt. And that is the whole of the steering action. There is nothing esoteric about it. You are pulling chains. You are not looking for withholds. That's the next thing which you've got in crosswise. You are not pulling individual withholds. You are pulling chains of overts. And that is your target in Prepchecking: chains of overts. That's all you're interested in is a chain. You are not interested in a single incident. You want chains.

The anatomy of the mind tells us that we have incidents forming in chains which go down to a basic. And this basic, when pulled, pulls the rest of the chain. That is purely the

mechanics. That's Book One. That's been with us for ages. It's hardly worth going over again except to remind you of its existence. You have chains, which is a whole series of incidents plotted on the time track, and those incidents derive their force from the under, lower, earlier incident.

You are not looking for the hidden part of a single overt or withhold. You are looking for the hidden incidents earlier on the chain. That is what you are looking for in Prepchecking, period. You are looking for nothing else. I find you going *thud-thud-thud* on something of the sort – why, you're just going nowhere. Trying to take an engram which occurred yesterday and trying to find the unknown or hidden part of the engram which occurred yesterday in order to release the engram which occurred yesterday and after you have worked on that for forty, fifty or a hundred hours, I would love to be able to show you on the meter that it was dependent utterly upon a whole series of engrams, and any one of those engrams ticked would have done more than your hundred hours of work on that single engram. Do you follow that? You're pulling the underpinning out.

And if you could consider a chain as a whole series of steps on a ladder – looking at the ladder from the top, you only see the top step, right? The top step obscures all the remaining steps of the ladder clear to the bottom – you see that – if you were looking at a ladder from the top step down. So that is what the pc can see. He can see the top step of the ladder. And that's all he can see. And that's what he gives you as his withhold.

Now, your When, your All and your Who are directed toward finding the rest of the steps of the ladder. And this is a very peculiarly built ladder in that the top step of the ladder will remain inexorably in place until you pull the bottom step of the ladder.

And of course, you find the bottom step of the ladder by finding earlier steps than the top step. And you finally will get to the bottom step of the ladder. And when you get that, you suddenly have a stepless ladder. It is very mysterious. It just suddenly goes *zzz-dddh-zzzzz*. And there's no reaction on it.

The unknowns that you were looking for are the earlier incidents on the chain in this lifetime. Prepchecking has only to do with this lifetime. That is what Prepchecking has to do with.

Now, I have advisedly not used the word *basic-basic* with regard to Prepchecking. And I have not used this word *basic-basic* with regard to Prepchecking because the basic-basic of any chain of incidents is anchored in a valence, a beingness that you will find in 3D Criss Cross.

But you can find this lifetime's basic, and it'll rip up. It'll rip up. You do not have to find, in doing Prepchecking, the past life upset. And you'd better not.

You can, then, clear a whole chain of overts resulting in withholds in one lifetime by going back and finding the basic on the thing and by asking pertinent questions.

Now, therefore, your What questions do not apply to one incident ever. And your Who, All and When – your When, All and Who, to get it in the proper order – your When, All, Who, When, All, Who, When, All, Who, When, All, Who, on and on and on, round and round and round does not apply in any way shape or form to one incident. So therefore, you

have the greatest fluidity and flexibility in the asking of questions. You have enormous fluidity and flexibility in the asking of questions. You can ask about anything as long as it's on that chain.

Now, the stunt which you ordinarily employ is you try to clear the What you've got. And if you can't clear the What you've got, then there's a subsidiary chain. So you try and look for that chain, and if you can't clear that, why, let's find another subsidiary chain, and let's clear that. And if we can't find that, why, we clear the other subsidiary chain.

In other words, when your reaction is not dimming out by reason of asking When, All, Who, When, All, Who, When, All, Who, and our reaction doesn't go off the test What question, why, then we must have – this chain must be dependent on an earlier chain, or a different chain, slightly different chain, more or less on the same subject. So we finally get the pc to give us another withhold, so we mine that. But it's all on the same subject.

And we finally get this lower one, and we finally get the – I don't care how many I_C s and I_{DS} and I_{ES} and I_{FS} that you go to, you'll eventually get one of those that, when by asking, When, All, Who, When, All, Who, When, All, Who, When, All, Who – all of a sudden when you ask it again, you haven't any reaction on it at all. And that moment you've got a null What question. So that last What question that you were working on goes null. So you mark it null, and now you've got to work the one above it. If that was I_D , and it went null, you've got to get I_C . Now, you work over I_C a little bit more with When and All and Who, and When, All and Who, and all of a sudden it goes null. And then you go back and you get your I_B , and you got When, All and Who, When, All and Who, When, All and Who, and it isn't nulling, you've got to find you another subsidiary of the chain, get a new What question. You've got to now get a new I_C .

In other words, you clear these things by finding new withholds and new chains. It is not at all difficult to do this. It sounds actually much more difficult than it is. And once you get the hang of this thing, it goes like *zz-zoop-zoop*. There's hardly anything to it.

Then finally you'll clear this new one that you got. You'll come back and now you'll try I_B again with your When, All and Who, and you just test it. And you're liable to find out it has evaporated. Maybe you didn't ask the When, All, Who for it at all. You just test it. You ask it. No reaction on it. All of a sudden, you ask I_A – *bang*. That thing is no longer there, and then *boom*, you're liable to have your I gone by this time. And that is clean. It's a progress into depth of chain.

Now, let me show you the association amongst these questions. Our Zero is, of course, a rudiment question. That is all that is. That's just a rudiment question. So we got to have a $Zero_A$, and this particular rudiments question, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" gets a starting point for you.

And you've got your starting point. And I'll go into that more in just a moment, but your starting point in this particular one is the dynamics. You have the dynamic, the dynamic breakdown. And we are working at the moment on $Zero_A$, self. Therefore, you don't find me taking up much sex because we are working $Zero_A$, see. We're working self. And what could he talk to me about himself? Well, he got a bad meter reaction. That is to say he got a nice fall

there the second that I asked him – he talked about physical difficulties and he got a pretty steep reaction on physical difficulties, so we are actually entering this case from the rougher side because we're going directly up against physical difficulties. And the physical difficulties, of course, depend utterly upon a tremendous number of withholds of one kind or another, so this is a heavy slug.

But you should be aware of the fact that the beginning of the case is when the case should be Clear; then the auditor would have a perfectly good time of it.

The hardest end of the case is always the beginning end of the case. This is when everything is wrong with the pc. See, that's always the rougher end.

All right. The optimum, of course, you can't have, so you have to take what you got.

Now, we have "What about these physical difficulties?" and we didn't have the pc volunteering any new withholds in this particular session. Pc volunteered no new withholds about his physical difficulties, so I had to prod him.

Well, that doesn't become a What question. So I had to talk to him. So I had to coax him, persuade him, accuse him, crisscross him, and he finally breaks down, and he tells me that he has some physical difficulties, and one was a rash on the ankle, the other's rectum trouble and the other one was sexual urges.

And just by keeping my eye on the meter at the time he announced these things, then I didn't have to make a further assessment because rectum trouble went *bang*, so obviously it was the most available subject, so I just take one out of thin air on the thing because this might go anyplace, you see.

And I took one out of thin air – "What physical difficulty would it be unsafe for you to reveal?" – he gave me this list. I got my list here a little bit crossed up a moment just talking to you about it.

Now, we got "What about this rectum trouble?"

Oh, he did tell us, didn't he? All right. This was actually our point of departure in the session. We didn't have a point of departure up to then. The auditor was simply working the whole way.

All right. And at that moment, why, we had it rolling and we find out all of a sudden that the pc has some kind of a reaction here on the subject of taking care of his little brother, keeping him clean. Well, let's see if we can't get away from this. Let's get out from under on this particular one, see. Let's see if we can't get that one, see.

Furthermore, it follows up the purpose very much better. Because we had an incident in Rome in an earlier session and it was very late. It's only two years ago, and we were having an awful time mining any earlier. Well, when somebody has a little brother who has been with him an enormous number of years, that is awfully good mining area.

But more, more importantly, you should realize that it is risky. You're asking about a valence. This might be an oppterm. This might be almost anything, see. So we – when we introduce an identity into a Prepccheck, we introduce it with a little catch in the breath, you know. We might or might not get away with this very easily, see?

We try not to use identities, but we've certainly got to start someplace here, and this was minor enough to try to plow up one way or the other.

Now, that didn't clean up, so the auditor simply got overt, and the auditor said, "Well, what about doing something to Jim?" Just out of thin air because we didn't clean up "What about not keeping Jim clean?" after we'd gone over it a few times with a When, All, Who, see? We didn't get it clean. It was diminishing, but we didn't get it clean, so what have we done to Jim? That's the inevitable question that we ask.

If we're not being able to clean some subject up, well, let's see if we can't find out what the pc did to him, see? What did the pc do to this person? There must be something there. Otherwise, the pc wouldn't have any antipathy on the subject.

You're using the basic rule of the overt-motivator sequence, which is what has been done to you has very little bearing on your psyche. But what you have up and went and did, brother, that's it. And they only clean up on what you've done.

Somebody here, by the way, ran an engram the other day which is a motivator engram because they couldn't find anything. All that person had to do was just ask for an overt to the subject matter and it probably would have cleaned right there. *Bang!*

So you always have this dodge which you work continuously, "Well, what have you done?" see. Natter, the person natters. The person says there's an upset, the person says this, the person says that. You always got "Well, what have you done?" you see, as a leading question.

Now, we notice that the auditor in this particular case didn't write down anything whatsoever that the pc was saying. It was just that the pc was saying these things, influenced the auditor's report because we were keeping a record of the Whats, don't you see? That was all you were keeping a record of, and we're all on the main line.

Let's see if this is on the main line.

"What about doing something to Jim?" and "What about not keeping Jim clean?" All right. This is starting from the bottom. Your 1_D; "What about doing something to Jim?" 1_C, "What about not keeping Jim clean?" 1_B; "What about this rectum trouble?" Is that all – this all pertinent as we go? 1_A; "What physical difficulty would it be unsafe for you to reveal?" Isn't this on the same line out of which, of course, we got a list? And isn't that germane to "What about these physical difficulties?" And your Zero_A – isn't that germane – at self it's certainly germane to this chain. And then our Zero, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Is that all of a piece? Well, you just make sure that any Prepcheck chain that you set down of What questions is all of a piece.

Now, if you write a new What question every time the pc gave you a new withhold, you'd go stark staring mad. There isn't enough paper manufactured. You would just go mad, that's all. You don't care about individual withholds; you care about the subjects of withholds. Therefore, the drill of the What question – What drills – Pc says, "(Specific withhold)." Auditor says, "What about this chain of withholds?" Interesting, isn't it?

Pc says, "Well, once upon a time in my life, the only time in my life I was up on the top of the Empire State Building, looked over the Empire State Building's edge, and I was terribly, terribly stricken about the whole thing because I had an impulse to pick up the companion who was with me and throw him over the side of the Empire State Building down to the ground." And the pc gives you some long, involved withhold like this. Well, you've got to condense it. What's the most likely chain that requires an auditor insight? What's he habitually do in life? This is – regulates the What question. What's he habitually do?

Is he always going up on the top of high places and trying to damage people? Is he always being afraid of height? Oh, that's motivator, isn't it? So we leave that one alone. We don't have anything to do with that one. Just skip that one. Any mention of the fact that he's afraid of something only would lead us astray, one way or the other. We've got to have something there that's overt, so we choose something out of this. And the widest thing that you could say, "What about damaging people?" That would take in the whole reactive mind and would be a no What question at all, and you see.

But this is a neat little one: "Well, what about wanting to throw people off things?"

See, that's a nice neat What question. There's probably a chain of these things here. And you understand, you mustn't let your desire to get it all done now, at this instant, interfere with your sensible What question – the sensibility of the What question – because everybody to some slight degree suffers from "It's all gotta be done this instant, now. And we haven't any time to repair it, because it's all an emergency anyway." Well, this all comes out of problems, don't you see?

He says, "Well, I wanted to throw this person off the cliff."

And you say, "Well, what about being aberrated?" [laughter]

Now, that's a good What question and would include all of his overts, and you would get nowhere with the Prepcheck.

No, your What question must uncover, if possible, a chain. And if that chain doesn't clear, you've got to narrow the chain. And if that doesn't clear, you've got to narrow that, all done by his withholds. And you'll finally get a What question, a subsidiary What question way down the column – it will clear. When that one's cleared, why, the next one above it will clear, and when the next one above it clears, why, the next one above that will clear. And if you're kind of having a rough time of it, you've got a question now that isn't clearing, so you've got to get a new subsidiary What, and a new subsidiary What to that one, and clear those two. And now that one that you hung up on, that will clear, don't you see? It's going back and forth, up and down.

Actually, it's a very neat relatively simple action. Nothing very pertinent to it. But if every time he gave you a withhold, you got a new What question, you would just be *blaaa*. You'd be nowhere, you know?

I expect a fellow to give me – if he's working well, he'll give me two or three withholds for every What question, see? So what? You say, When, and he says, "Well, which one?"

Well, tell him. Pick one at random. "Well, the earliest one or what about that one about – that you just told me about Keokuk?"

And "Oh, well," he says, "that was in 1960."

"All right." You say, "Good. Well, is that all there is to that one?" and so forth.

And maybe you've got three, four, five dates you're working under the same What question, don't you see? You just go on and on and on and on, and I don't care how long you roll one of these things around. Or how many overts come out under the heading of it as long as they're pertinent to that.

Now, where do you get your next one? Well, the pc jumps. You've mined the thing out, and all of a sudden, you're not clearing this easily, and he gives you another brand of withhold. It's on the same subject. You've been talking about shotguns very, very nicely, and he starts talking about rifles. Well, you're talking about breaking up shotguns, and he starts talking about stealing rifles.

Well, you've got a new subsidiary What question, haven't you. He changed the subject on you. So obviously he tells you that your shotgun chain went over here to a stealing-rifle chain, and then the stealing-rifle chain went down here to an insulting-quartermaster chain, see? And the insulting-quartermaster chain went down here to trying-to-please-his-wife-by-getting-her-money chain. That's all under the same series of Whats.

And all of a sudden that clears up. That was the reason he was trying to needle quartermasters into giving him more goods – because he could sell them illegally. And when that cleaned up, because that was a basic withhold, and the next one is – cleans up, and the next one cleans up, and all of a sudden shotguns all blow up, and there you've got it. You've got the lot.

But this is all dependent on the fact that a piece of hidden information, one or more pieces of hidden information, exist on a chain.

It isn't that one or more pieces of hidden information exist in a withhold. You see, we are dealing, not with my arbitraries or what I'm trying to make you do or what would be optimum. We're actually dealing with what we find in the mind. That is quite important, Scientologically, to understand that. And the datum which we have is a very ordinary datum. That datum is simply that on one chain, why, you have, usually, one long, involved, confused chain of stuff that has little hanger chains and that sort of thing

Somewhere down around this thing someplace, there's going to be something that's totally out of view.

The person didn't ever know that before. He didn't ever think of that before. Where did that come from? What is that all about? And you'll see these things start to dawn on the pc. In two, three, four or five hours of auditing, you'll, you'll see some one of these things start to dawn gradually on the pc and they – sometimes they dawn slowly, sometimes they dawn fast.

But, the pc all of sudden – I'll give you a typical one: "Well, I never remembered that, you know. I was in the doctor's office and I reached around at the cabinet, and I pulled a vial of morphine out and put it in my pocket, and that's where I got the morphine."

He's been telling you always before this, there was something else going on with this morphine, and so on, and he hadn't even remembered that he had stolen it, see?

That one comes to view; the whole chain pulls up. It's some little oddball scrap of information, usually an overt, usually discreditable, and it'll have this whole chain mired. It'll have the whole thing pinned down. The chain won't come loose till a piece of hidden information discloses. So you can tell about when a whole series of chains are going to pull. You can just about tell. Because the pc says he didn't remember that.

Now, early in a case you can mine for a long time before finding one of these. You can – you might go several sessions before all of a sudden, the person, you're doing Prepchecking, the person says, "What, do you know I didn't know about that. I didn't know about that. But do you know that I – I – I actually went and got the boiling water and poured it on him. He didn't have an accident at the stove. Yes, well, what do you know? Yes. Oh, well."

You see this preclear start to spark up. Well, cover that for your needle reaction and you'll find the whole chain. All of a sudden, you'll be able to run back that chain, *brrrrrrp-brrrrp. Brrrrrrp-brrrrp-brrrrp*. All of a sudden, the chain cleans up.

It may not clean up all the way on that one hidden piece of information. It'll clean some distance. And if you've been unlucky enough to string yourself out to eight What questions, you'll find the piece of hidden information and suddenly you go up the line, you'll lose maybe – at least four or five of those What questions will drop right out, see.

It's almost as though there is a hidden tent stake and you're trying to strike camp. The pc has been setting up camp here at the old water hole, and this has to do... And he's just been setting up his camp setup for a long time. Tells everybody about it, you see. Whatever it is. And there's a stake that is driven in the ground. And it is not visible to him, and it's not visible to you, and it's not visible to anything. And you keep trying to get this tent down, you know.

And you can pull on the tent. You can yank on the tent, and you can try to bind it up. You could try to burn it up. You – anything you did, it won't matter. I mean, because this tent is just *there*. And you could kick in its sides, and you can pull up some of its stakes, and you can drag its ridgepole down – you can make it look messy – but for some reason or other, the thing insists, utterly insists on remaining on the ground. And then all of a sudden, this mysterious tent stake – that, by the way everybody's been falling over – and you take a sledgehammer to it, and you knock it a couple of times, and all of a sudden it comes into view, see.

And there it is, *bang!* And the pc looks at it, and he says, "Well, I never knew that stake was in there."

Of course, you're in good company because neither did you. But you were at least looking for it and he was avoiding it. So we take the tent stake and all of a sudden the tent wraps up real neatly and we strike camp and that's the end of that chain.

And we – the pc can move on the track from there on. But every time he went back past that particular camp, man, there was the kettle still sitting on the coals, you know. And it was still erected. And it always takes one of these hidden tent stakes of one kind or another.

She was always kind of upset with the local library and didn't like to go into the local library until we all of a sudden find out that she made a practice of going into the local library. And anything – any poem or anything that she found that was real good, or something, she'd tear it out of the book on the shelf, you see, and put it in her pocket. And she's totally forgotten this.

This just seems to never come up. Only it might be something – it's not the, it's not much of an overt ordinarily. It's you – sometimes quite mild, quite idiotic. You can't look always for the big punch. It may be something like she forgot to take this child a birthday present, you know. Just didn't ever take the child a birthday present. Never wrote a thank you letter, and for some peculiar reason, wouldn't have anything to do with this particular zone or action, this whole series of overts. And she has never looked at this series of overts. This is ordinary in Prepchecking.

Well, that's why you're running down these chains is you're – you're actually mining whatever the pc gives you. And it's all valuable, and there's a little more being disclosed about all this, and the pc knows a little bit more about it. It's freer. It's less reactive. But you can sometimes go on for hours and hours and hours without falling over this tent stake. And of course, you're looking for a needle in a haystack, so the trick is don't look for it.

That's actually the trick in Prepchecking. You don't go looking for this tent stake because you'll just try the big effect. All you do is run the system; the tent stake will all of a sudden show up. You see, actually, the tent stake can't be found until you get those coils of rope off of it. Everybody knows the coils of rope are sitting there, but it's necessary to move them. You see?

Prepchecking has the facility of bringing to view incidental items that apparently had no bearing on anything but which in reality were holding down a whole chain of incident and were making it reactive and making the individual have a jolt on it.

Now, in laying out a pattern of this sort of thing, you of course can go in on all manner of wild questions. You can go in with any kind of a wild question you ever heard of. But the best way to establish a question is what you call Prepchecking. Now, the reason this is called Prepchecking and the reason it isn't called withholds system and it isn't called anything else but Prepchecking is it's preparatory to clearing. And that is not just a loose advertising phrase. That is a neat fact. You can't do 3D Criss Cross while Prepchecking.

Well, well, it's idiotic. You spend a lot of your time on your rudiments and that sort of thing. All I mean by that is not that it's impossible. But I merely mean that when you're doing 3D Criss Cross, you should be doing 3D Criss Cross. You shouldn't be Prepchecking, and so forth. You shouldn't be monkeying with rudiments. Let me put it much more strongly than that.

When we start a pc into 3D Criss Cross, we expect the rudiments will stay in for a little while maybe. We expect this pc can be settled into auditing. We expect this is a possibility that we will get some 3D Criss Cross done.

Well, the best way to guarantee that is to prepare the pc for clearing. We get, then, "preparation for clearing," "Prepclearing," "Prepchecking" – synonymous at the present mo-

ment. And you get the rudiments in with an ax. And that's what you use this for. You just get them in with an ax – with a mallet, with a maul. You knock them in and cement them down with concrete. These rudiments are not going to come out and the only reason you should do anything is just to get the rudiments in. So of course, your basic Prepcheck questions are the rudiment questions. There they are. They're just the rudiment questions.

Well, under Havingness, we have the 36 Havingness Processes and others. We can straighten out the pc's havingness, and so forth. So that could stand outside of these, but at the same time there could still be some Prepchecking done in this particular zone.

"Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Well, the pc who is sitting back there unwilling to talk to an auditor about his difficulties certainly is having a hell of a time when he's getting 3D Criss Cross thrown at him.

So that's a very good one to straighten out. Now, "Are you withholding anything" – you get your Form 3 and Form 6A. "Are you withholding anything" – you just don't sit there and say "Are you withholding anything?" You try to – you guide it. And when you get down to that rudiment, you put that in by running a Form 3 and a Form 6A.

Now, you've got present time problem, you've got a Problems Intensive. But you prepcheck the withholds that the pc comes up with in the prior confusion areas. You just use those as Prepcheck runs. That's all right. They're your Zero_{AS}.

Now, end rudiments, same way. You can go ahead and talk to him about – you can break that – Half-truth, Untruth, Impressing people and Damaging people – you can break that up into a four-segment question, each one with a Zero Question, and you'll get anything on this lifetime out that makes him impulsive along these certain lines.

You could go – the E-Meter influence, and you can take meters, electronic gear, influence, mind reading, allied subjects of this character. You could whip those things out and get that thing in so that you haven't got somebody trying to sell you an item all the time and doing a sell, being upset about the meter, get that thing squared around. Pc can sit there and look at the meter without having to do something to it.

Anyway, the difficulties of handling a preclear under 3D Criss Cross are sufficiently great that why do you want to buck into the lot of this, don't you see? Why do you want to have to handle the rudiments at the same time you're doing that. So just go ahead and get your rudiments in and you've got Prepclearing, and the activity – the broad activity of setting him up to be cleared would be to get his rudiments in hard.

And you've got his rudiments in hard with a *thud* all the way along the line, they're not likely to come out very hard. And a pc can then be gotten into session right at the beginning of the session for a 3D Criss Cross activity, and you can get him out of session at the end, and you've done a bang-up job of that. And you get a lot of 3D Criss Cross done on him, which is high validity processing. And that is very valuable processing. But what gets in the road of 3D Criss Cross? Out-rudiments. That's the only thing that gets in the road of 3D Criss Cross. Just out-rudiments. That's all.

So Prepchecking is totally devoted to straightening the pc out so the rudiments reasonably stay in.

Now, you've got your next problem with regard to rudiments, which is when you change valences by reason of 3D Criss Cross, you will bring areas into view by reason of having changed the valence of the pc. But it isn't true that just because you are finding new valences on the pc, the pc is going into a new valence every time.

They are still in all the old valences and they are also now in the new valences, but they have been in the new valences, and they have been in the old valences.

In other words, if you find a new valence on the pc by 3D Criss Cross, that does not mean that he abandons all of his old valences, throws away the old shoes out of the attic and moves into the new valence. As a matter of fact, the 3D problems mass pulls apart a little bit. It just pulls apart a little bit. It has less influence on him than before. But just before you find this, the pc will dramatize the new valence coming up.

So that dramatization, of course, influences the case and tends to some degree to throw your rudiments out. But if your pc is already capable of being kept in-session, then influence of this is minimal. You get less influence on this.

Now, actually you shouldn't have to pay much attention to this particular phenomena because the pc while he's running this and doing that will get a lot of cognitions, will give you a bunch of withholds and so forth. Remember that isn't rudiments. That's all incidental to 3D Criss Cross.

So if you could just get the rudiments in so he vaguely could be audited without thinking the auditor was going to shoot him down in flames, and he was – all of a sudden wakes up at nine o'clock in the morning and suddenly says, "Oh, no," and realizes all of a sudden that he, all of his life has done nothing but rob banks and this was totally occluded to him before this moment. He doesn't come into a 3D Criss Cross session with the session burgeoned with all this.

You've already more or less got this cleaned up in, in your Prepclearing. So your case tends to maintain a greater stability if the case is well prepchecked before 3D Criss Cross is run.

Now, it isn't absolutely necessary to do a Prepcheck before you do 3D Criss Cross. But you will find out that it takes you about four times as long to do the 3D Criss Cross as it would have if you'd also done a good Prepcheck. So it's in the interests of saving a tremendous amount of time. 3D Criss Cross can upset the person most gorgeously, and if you're upsetting the person with present time problem, out-rudiments and everything else going this way and that, you haven't much chance of putting the case back to battery.

Now, the way to put a case back to battery is put it in some kind of shape to move forward before you move it. That's the time to put a case in shape, not after you *have* to put it into condition. See, it's too late now to do the effective, so we have to do the urgent. And you'll find yourself in all kinds of heroic activities. Middle of 3D Criss Cross all of a sudden the person has a screaming present time problem, you're halfway through a list, and so forth.

Well, if your – the person isn't rather accustomed to handling present time problems, and so forth, the pc's liable to be far more worried about this than they ordinarily would have. So just by the fact the pc knows he can talk to the auditor and knows he has been able to talk

to the auditor, and knows that things aren't going to bite, why, he can get these things – you can get the rudiments in more easily. That is the least benefit from it.

Incidentally, Prepchecking looks to somebody in off the street as a fantastic activity. It's about a psychoanalysis – the complete psychoanalysis – every three or four hours. [laughter] And Papa Freud would just be in love with it if he ever saw it, man.

A well done Prepcheck and, man, fantastic. Wouldn't Freud have had a ball with that session I had today? Wouldn't he have? Wouldn't that have been marvelous. Psychoanalyst would be talking to the patient yet. [laughter] Explaining all this beautiful data.

Of course, I don't know why he'd explain it. There's a little pin worth of it – there's a penny's worth of data he – around there someplace we haven't collided with. And we'll collide with it and that will spring the chain and that's that.

Now, here's – this factor is confidence. When you're doing 3D Criss Cross, a person can get awful low. And a person can become very morose. And a person can become very upset. And the person can wake up at two A.M. and suddenly say, "What was that item they found on me today? Oh, no. Not 'a terrified louse'. [laughter] I wonder if that could be why I'm lying here shaking and sweating. *Mmm*. Is that why I – every time I get caught in a rush hour, I'm afraid of being squashed? Do you suppose that?"

And he goes over this. "Yes, by George, that's true. That's true." Cognition, cognition, cognition, you see.

And after he self-audits himself, incidentally and accidentally because he had no other choice, half the night, he gets up, stumbling off, while walking on both sides of the street the next morning – and he's so concerned about all this he doesn't really want to face up to any of his friends or meet anybody like this. That would be the wrong thing to do.

Well, he neglects to eat breakfast, you see, and comes in to get audited. And now if you're ever going to have any trouble with this person's rudiments, you're going to have it now. So it's a good thing to have the pc in a condition where you can put the rudiments in rather easily. Right? Good safeguard.

But if we just had that, we didn't have anything else, Prepchecking is actually more valuable than the – most any other process we have ever had. It is more valuable as a single activity. It is well worth doing very well.

I don't see any signs of it changing around. You'll goof up here and there, and I will have to make a few little minor changes because of whatever you're doing with it or something of the sort or make it a little more simple someplace or more explicable, but I don't look for anything to happen on it. Because actually I worked on this for months.

I worked on 3D Criss Cross for ages, and we've only had one change in 3D Criss Cross, I think, in about two months almost – a month and a half. And that's just to find out that – oh, oh, the one little change in a month; that's not much of a change – don't cross them out obligingly for the pc because he's going to all of a sudden realize that it's unsafe to reveal. So he's of course liable to take out the item. He's of course rather – abandoned.

He sees – he sees these tremendous lists, and he sees by their very length that a 'terrified louse' is being beautifully swallowed up and is meaningless on this long list, so he goes ahead and gives it to you, you see.

And then if you're asking him what these things mean, he can have a change of heart. And he isn't operating with that interesting feeling of confidence and abandonment he is operating with when he's just giving you the items one after the other. He – it lets him have an afterthought. And apparently, pcs are not entirely proof against striking their own list off. They really don't know it's theirs, you see, and they don't know it is, and they don't know that it's not. "But oh, well, no, a terrified louse, that wouldn't oppose an insecticide factory. Take it off." You're bound by the rule there. Off it goes. Your list will go null.

There's a phenomena of bouncing out of the 3D problem mass. People go into it and move out of it, and bounce off of it, and sit on top of it, and try to approach it, and the auditor pulls them down to it with winches and heavy oxen and so forth, and the pc's heels have made a furrow, you see, that can be traced back down the concrete highway, you see, two furrows clear back to Los Angeles, you see.

And you gradually got him, you see, to confront this point. And he's giving you some answers at this point, and of course you let him go at the end of the session, and he goes back to Los Angeles. And he says, "What uh, why ah, that list – put a new one on it. All right. Now, differentiation and so forth – well, I wouldn't have anything to do with it, and that wouldn't have anything to do with it, and the next one wouldn't have anything to do. .. And a terrified louse wouldn't have anything to do with an insecticide factory. Take it out, and so forth. None of those things would be," and so on. He's bounced.

You haven't had many changes and this thing is well worth learning. You had a variability. The – this came out of this interesting inability of the auditor to vary the Sec Check question. The auditors could never vary the Sec Check question sufficiently to get all of the data. Well, this is the system by which you do that.

And this is how you vary the Sec Check question. Now, I've had that – you've had that difficulty for many, many months, and I worked hard on this to get this thing shaken out so that we could get around that difficulty. And it does rather easily.

It looks tougher to you than it is. But by the time you've kept a few auditor's reports on a few demonstrations, it'll all of a sudden start looking awful simple to you.

By the way, if anybody gets an improper report, one mistake on the report, you know, gets four infraction sheets. I don't think you knew that. We tell you after the fact today, you see. And failure to turn one in, why, you spend the night in the dungeon. [laughs] Well, not that crude.

But anyway, you're working chains, and you're looking for the little scraps of data that evaded people's memories. And you recognize that if this little scrap of data could make this much change in a whole chain on a pc, why, then actually a fully, completely recognized valence from the past track, the whole package occluded, would make an enormous change in the pc. So you're actually getting those gains which are in vignette.

But don't be too hopeful that after you've got the person Prepcleared – by definition all rudiments in – and gotten the whole 3D Criss Cross and gotten all of the items of the Goals Problem Mass beautifully stretched out, beautifully opptermed, everything laid out on a line plot marvelously, don't be too sure that you have heard the last of Prepchecking. You haven't. Because it's very probable that a similar technique will be used to take these items to pieces. So it's what you start with, and it's probably what you will end with. Okay?

Therefore, you are not at all concerned, before you've got the Goals Problem Mass isolated, in establishing – in any past life activity. You don't want anything to do with a past life activity with Prepchecking until your Goals Problem Mass – because you've got the method of reaching those withholds. Those are the biggest withholds of a pc's life – a whole life.

Yeah, for instance, some of you come to England and you go *zzzz*, and you go *huuuuuuu*, and you say, "I don't know what's the matter with me," you see. And of course, you've probably been hung for a poacher or something like that. I think we had somebody who was killed down the road here just a few miles south. [laughs] But it's not very serious. It's just a restimulation of that sort of thing.

And some of you, of course, come to England and feel very relaxed. You think this is wonderful. England is very relaxed, very nice, and so forth. Haven't done anything to it for centuries. All of your overts are against France or Los Angeles. [laughter]

Well, anyway, the use of what you're doing is very broad, and all I'm asking you to do is to become very expert at it and watch your meter rather closely. Now, those things which are falling, of course, get some representation here on your Sec Check plot. And you'll find out they will all stop falling if you get the chain out of the road. That's all you do is if you get the chain's unknowns out of it, why, the whole chain will wrap up, and then anything that you've been hitting on in the chain will wrap up, and you'll finish that off. But of course the chain won't wrap up till you get the bottom of a chain.

So therefore I wouldn't work too long, just as a tip, on any What question if it seemed to be resistive – if the question seemed to be resistive. And in Prepchecking we've answered one of the big problems, is: "What is this continuously banging withhold?" The withhold bangs and bangs and bangs, always with the same intensity, always with the same intensity. You won't find that in Prepchecking because if you found it, you would go on and get the next What question.

In other words, when, you get a constancy of reaction on the meter and you're not cleaning it with your When, All and Who, it's time for you to find a subsidiary What. And don't just take it out on the pc; you just haven't asked the right What question yet.

Well, it doesn't matter how many What questions you have down. But remember these What questions must all be of a kind and they must all apply to the case. And they are in an effort to clean up a chain which starts in with concern, in this particular chain. You've got it there in your 1; is – that names the chain. You've got a chain here called "physical difficulties." It could say "What about these physical difficulties in this lifetime?" And that would be more pertinent to what you're doing but the pc isn't showing much proclivity to drift elsewhere, so there it is.

Okay? Do you understand this a little better?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yeah.

Well, I hope you have good use of it.

Thank you.

PREPCLEARING AND RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on 22 February 1962

Thank you. Thank you. Well, we made that one. All right. This is the what? Twenty-two.

Audience: Feb.

February, AD 12. All right. And Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

We just had a demonstration of Prepchecking. Actually, we're not Prepchecking. We're Prepclearing. There's probably a vast difference. Nomenclature settling down a little bit. Give me that sheet. I'll show them a sheet. There's your auditor's report. Yeah. It's the same heading Zero, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties." Zero 1, which is now changed to Zero A as "self," and 1, the 1 question is, "What about these physical difficulties?" And then your 1_A is, "What about this incident in Rome?" And your 1_B is "What about proposing marriage?" And 1_C is "What about this 17-year-old girl?" And 1_D is "What about this first girl?" And 1_E is "What about these earlier girls?" And then there's 1_F, not articulated. But I didn't ask him about this. It's "what about raft incident, 1935." We're running it down to the basic. And we must be awfully close to basic right there, you see? That's what this chain is stuck on. Now, do you see what a chain is?

Audience: Hmm-hmm.

Hmm?

And that's what I'm running down. Now, you notice there's still a – there's a tick-tick. Well, we got the tick two or three times, little tiny tick. Can you see that on the screen all right? Well, that little tick is what I'm looking for. And we're in the vicinity of that tick right now because the tick changed characteristic slightly. I didn't really see that it changed characteristic. I just know it was doing something else. And we're running it down at the bottom on the thing and then we will turn around and go back up this chain merely as a check. And we'll go up this chain and you'll find out they will all go null. They'll go over and take what I was working, on the other one, and you'll find out that that one and this one are tied in together.

Now, why I started working the other one hasn't anything much to do with it. You shouldn't consider it a model, but you shouldn't feel too abashed if you find yourself working a nonworkable chain to abandon the chain temporarily and come back on it later.

And you notice that this chain was working well and the index that this chain was working well is the fact the pc's havingness did not go down as far today as it ordinarily did. You see?

That is an index. The tone arm motion was there and the tone arm motion was doing all right because at that particular point tone arm motion is mostly read on the needle position on the dial rather than on the tone arm because at sensitivity 16, at that needle position on the dial with the tone arm, you can't even see it on one of these screens when you move it so microscopically.

But it was moving. We were playing it over on the right side of the dial and the left side of the dial and it was doing all right, but the index was the pc's havingness did not drop as far today.

And you saw a session that was run almost totally without rudiments. If you're good, you can do it. If you hold the pc in line with interest and auditor presence and you don't fool with anything much else. Of course, you realize this pc is working under – Fred's getting off the withholds like he said yesterday, you know. He's getting it off to whole Saint Hill, you know, whole world. *Crash!* Really getting a withhold off, you know. *Boom!* I hope he hasn't lost the ... At the same time, why, that's a rough one.

Now, let me ask you a few little basic questions about preclearing. One, did you see the pc unwilling to talk to me at any time?

Audience: No.

You didn't, did you? Well, I don't think that ever enters into it. Now, I don't know what trouble you have, but I never have any trouble having pcs talk to me.

Now, you understand this pc is talking to me over a TV network. Well, that's an awful hurdle. And if he can talk to me over the TV network, he sure should be able to talk to you as a pc in a nice, quiet room with everybody's ears stopped. Wouldn't you say that would be the point?

You go getting the idea that the pc isn't going to talk to you, you're in a games condition with the pc. I'm not in any games condition with this pc. This pc only faintly goes into a games condition with me. He has once or twice, just a tiny little bit when I wasn't mining anything that the pc was interested in. I got over into an area and I was plugging him and chugging at him, and pushing him just a little bit and then he all of a sudden said, "Gee, I'm being pushed." And he's recognized this, just a – just a shadow of it once or twice. And as far as you've seen, it's caused him to comment on other things that didn't have too much to do with the session. And that's as far as that goes. Otherwise, he's been running like a well-oiled dream, right?

All right. Now, you start – you start Prepclearing on the assumption that the pc isn't going to talk to you, you've assumed that you're not auditing a pc. Pc will always talk to you. But of course, that we are clearing up, "Are you willing to talk to me?" is actually, "Are you willing to talk to me about certain subjects?" you see, because he's perfectly willing to talk to me.

But I want him to have complete breadth and width before we start going into 3D Criss Cross. He shouldn't have the idea halfway through 3D Criss Cross that he'd better not tell me about a seventeen-year-old girl in Reno. Now don't you think that'd be the wrong time to have him suddenly get this idea? *Huh?* I think this would be the wrong time. And let me invite this to your attention that the time to put in rudiments is before 3D Criss Cross, not after you start 3D Criss Cross.

And the whole basis of Prepclearing is just to get your rudiments in. You're getting them in with a maul. I mean those rudiments are going to stay there. You see? That's the whole purpose on it.

Now, I should comment to you that on using havingness as an index and I'm not using havingness – a havingness Prepcheck, but I could very, very fortuitously and very fruitfully clear up the havingness environment rudiment with Prepclearing, see? Let me call it the Prepcheck is the operation and the whole operation is Prepclearing. Now, I could prepcheck the room. How could I prepcheck the room? Just by prepchecking rooms.

Let's locate withholds about games conditions. What has he denied people? What spaces has he denied people? What spaces has he pushed people out of? You got the idea? And we could – we could actually prepcheck that thing straight on down to the ground. And we'd all of a sudden find his havingness would stay in without any Havingness Process, providing while we were doing this, he was willing to talk to the auditor all the time. So you'll find the best way to handle this, however, is to use Havingness Processes while you're getting him – getting the pc to talk to the auditor.

All right. And then clear up things like the Joburg and 6A on an old-time Scientologist. Just clear these things up and run them down as chains. That's on the withhold section.

And then as far as problems is concerned, well, let's find out what problems he's caused people in this lifetime. That's all. It's just a Prepcheck totally devoted to the problem he's caused people to have, see, using problem as an overt. And we could prepcheck that out of existence and you'd find your pc wouldn't have any present time problems. And that – we could do that, you see? Your – your routine form is the Problems Intensive, see. You can do that with a Problems Intensive. And that directs you on to the problems, do you see? And that pulls you over on to the problem he's really sitting in and you could just take off from that point, clean up the prior areas of confusion, you see?

Now, that is the more stylized way to go about that, but I'm telling you a shorthanded way to go about it is, "What problems has he caused in this life?" Just use that as an overt. Instead of, "Do you have a present time problem?" you use as a Zero question at that particular rudiment, "Have you ever caused anyone a problem in this lifetime?" or "Have you ever been a problem to anyone in this lifetime?" Such a Prepcheck question cleared for this lifetime totally would leave you with that one in.

Now, we could take up telling people half-truths, we could take up telling people whole-truths – always a Prepcheck action. We could take up "impressing people" as a Prepcheck action. And we could take up "damage" as a Prepcheck action. And then we could swing on down into, "the meter," and we could take up the meter. And about this time we'd

probably be wanting to clean up missed withholds and that would be about it. I don't think you could go much further than this. The pc would be blowing things left and right.

There's a possibility that you could make a MEST Clear with Prepclearing. But of course, it'd be a preparatory sort of Clear, wouldn't it? It would just be a this lifetime Clear. And that's what we've been making and that was the target and goal of Book One.

So don't look on Prepclearing as being an incidental technique. Who did we run into today but a psychoanalyst, you see, a psychiatrist down the line. And this must have looked very restimulative to the pc because what you're doing is what they wish they could do, see? You're actually plowing right on down the line. If you could get ahold of a psychoanalyst who wasn't any dumb bunny, straighten him up himself and teach him Prepclearing, you'd find out he could learn it, you find out he could learn it.

You'd have to beat him over the head to make him keep the Auditor's Code and so forth, but he would find this is "Oh, my God. What have these Scientologists done now," you see? "They've gone and wrapped up psychoanalysis," which we have. And of course, it's so much more fundamental than psychoanalysis, there's hardly anything to it. And the psychoanalyst had no such goal for people. He just didn't want them to be neurotic. You want them to fly. Slightly different target.

And then you're just opening it up so that we can take this case over the jumps with minimal auditing upset. And it'll be a colossal joke on one of – one of the old boys to explain them all this, teach them all this. Show them what you could do, run it on him, get him a good reality on the thing. Give him wins and goals that he's been reading about for ages, you see and has never attained. Put him right through the lot and then when we showed him that we have gone ten thousand feet higher than any goal he had and so forth, we say, "Well, this is just preparatory to the basic skills of Scientology." [laughter, laughs] I thought it'd be rather amusing.

But now, you're liable to get lost watching a demonstration. You're liable to get lost a bit in wondering where the hell I connected things. And I am throwing a little bit of a curve on you because I won't downgrade what I can do just to give you a demonstration because I'm actually just auditing the pc. I'm not trying to demonstrate it.

And I'm using Prepclearing on a very unstrained basis. I don't shut the pc up so that I can ask him the next question, you see. Nor do I let him wander off of it very far, but I add things up. By watching the meter when he says things, I add up what he said. See, I got one eye cocked at the meter and he says, "Well, a proposed marriage" and all of a sudden I see the potential chain, see.

I say, "Well, gee whiz, maybe we've got a lot of proposals of marriage here, see? Maybe. Maybe. Who knows? So there's some kind of a subsidiary chain in the middle of the chain that we're running. Well, let's just ask him this as a What question and strip it down – and sure enough we found one. It wasn't terribly fruitful or very bombastic, but it was – it was, it definitely had to be asked.

Well, you say, well how did I get to this point? Well, I was auditing the pc, I'm afraid is the answer. And how many overts or withholds did you see me take off on one What ques-

tion? I just went on and on and on, didn't I, see? Got him talking and talking about it some more and talking about it some more. And asked him, "Is that all of it?" And sometimes I didn't ask him, "Was this all of it?" because he just got through telling me there was a lot more to it. So I just asked him Who, don't you see. And then you saw me shifting the Who question around a little bit so as to fit the circumstances of what we were talking about.

In other words, the system was being adapted to exactly what the pc was doing so it didn't matter how many What questions we were plowing. We could have a thousand What questions written down and trace them all back, but if we tried to get one per incident, we would quickly get lost. All you want is one per chain. You have this little subsidiary chain, you better have a What question there, see?

And frankly, we ended that session without articulating, as you will see on the auditor's report, the last What question. But there's a "What about" there, that I'm not sure what that question is about. You probably would have jumped at that point and you said, "Well, what about frightening little girls?" And very possibly that is the What question. But I want to hear this pc tell me a little bit more about this before I make up my mind, see? I'm not in any hurry to put down a What question.

What I don't want to have happen – and this is what is important – is for the pc to give me a bunch of different chained withholds that have no relationship to one another. And that I don't want to have happen.

The fellow says, "Well, I stole a car and ah – I, ah – ah – got drunk and ah, I made a pass at my sister and ah – let's see, is anything else I'm withholding from you? Well, ah – oh, yes and ah – I robbed a bank and ah – I always quit my job by parachute."

Now, there – that pc would have gotten the brakes put on him the second – first time he changed the subject. Well, I would have put the brakes on him. I would have guided that right back to the first one he told me or, if he – while he was going over this, I'd had my eye on the meter, I would have seen one fall like mad and I would have picked that one and I would have mined that one and I wouldn't have asked him another thing about the others, on the danger of missing a withhold or something like that, you see? I'd just sort of pretend I didn't hear about them and hope they don't restimulate.

But don't let a pc jump all over like a hot flea on a griddle, see. He's liable to be just impressing you or something like this. No, mine a chain, mine a subject. Well, what is a subject? I don't know. What's a subject? You can certainly define what a subject of withholds is.

Now, you can define it too narrowly or you can define it too broadly and defining the subject of a withhold is something like how do you ask a What question. And asking a What question is an art. That is an art. You can lay down the rules. I can give you a written paper about how to convert what the pc says into the What question that's pretty precise. But it is still a bit of an art. You still got to listen. You got to listen to what the pc said. That's important.

Now, I'll give you some of these rules on how to lay down a What question. As one, it must not be too general. It must not be too wide so as to miss a chain entirely. It must not be so narrow as to pin the pc on a single incident and prevent him from exploring a chain. That's

too narrow. It must be designed over the most, if possible, the most contrasurvival portion of the withhold, if you have a selection like, "What's most dangerous to the pc's self-preservation?" Not what's most dangerous that he has done to life, but what would be the most dangerous thing to him. So that's your too wide, your too narrow and that is the most important item in a What question.

Now, I've given you another definition similar to this and I'll give you another that's written, but there's more to it than this now. You must not take motivators, criticisms, other people's withholds or explanations, period. Now, those you mustn't – those mustn't be part of What questions.

Now, there is something you do to each one of these. Now, let's take the motivator. What do you do to a motivator? Now, this is a broader question. What do you do to a motivator? You always ask for the overt instantly. You don't – you don't monkey with the motivator. You don't do anything with the motivator except have the motivator indicate to you the class of person against whom the overt has been done.

"My mother beat me. My mother beat me daily, daily, daily, forever and ever. I was beaten every day my whole life, sometimes twice a day. And I often only got a delay in being beaten because she couldn't find a fresh place to beat me."

Well, if the pc has managed to say all those things without you asking something, you need your thetan examined because it's got a revving gear in it. See.

As a little point of amusement, I once explored, a long time ago in some of the early, early, early researches I was doing, I once explored, "Momma has beaten me" and I've also explored, "Papa has beaten me" and so forth. I've explored parental motivators. And by George, at the other end of the line we could just find one light spanking on the Momma case and we couldn't find any at all on Papa. That was when we finally got it all mined out. There hadn't been any such incidents at all.

Now, that's not really the reason why you shouldn't buy a motivator but it's a good reason not to ask for one, because you're throwing the rudiments out wildly and brutally, because you're letting the pc tell you an untruth. And of course, that stuff will go out.

Now, every time they start talking about motivators, you've got an untruth, right there, it's very close to. It's worth knowing, isn't it? You can throw your rudiments out taking one. You do anything about one, you've goofed with a capital G. A "G" is for, "Oh, my God."

You convert it at once into the overt. There's no hanky-panky with it at all. You find the pc never ARC breaks. Don't do it accusatively. Just do it overtly. If you're going to Q-and-A with anything, Q-and-A with your own overtness in asking for overts. But never Q-and-A with a motivator.

"My mother beat me." It's instantly, "What have you done to your mother?" or, "What about doing something to your mother?" if you want to be fair and neat and so forth. I don't. I just say, "What have you done to your mother?"

Pc says, "I was just beaten daily and ..." so forth.

And I say, "Well, who beat you?"

"Oh," he says, "Oh, my, my mother. My mother. She used to beat me every day and it was terrible."

"Well, all right. What have you done to your mother? Thank you very much."

And the pc comes right off of it and goes right on to, "Oh, I never did anything to my mother except, well, except pour scalding water over her feet one day and ah, matter of fact, I said I would support her and I don't now. I never sent her any money and ah – ah, I've never written to her. She doesn't even know where I am. Ah, there are no overts though." You mine that one out and you'll have it.

Now, what's the next one?

Female voice: Criticism – criticism.

Well, on the criticism. Yeah. The natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter. That's the same rule that follows the motivator. That's identically the same rule.

Person says, "Well, they gave me seven infraction sheets and stood me on the head in the corner and made me eat *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health* page by page."

And you'll find out if you accept a criticism it'll go into the motivator. Now, a criticism is a hope that they could damage. And that's what a criticism is – with an inability to do so. It's a little higher toned than a motivator. But that's all a criticism is and that applies to life in general.

I'll give you a good example – I criticize governments. That's because at the present moment I'm not in any position whatsoever to completely smash them. [laughs] I – I make no bones about this, see? This is not covert at all. Governments know what they're doing, not cooperating with me, if they're that smart. If they were very, very clever, they never would. And we'll have to cut that off the tape, you see. [laughter] But at the present moment – at the present moment – it's not that I'm in a position to – but it just doesn't fit the cards to make nothing out of all national governments, that's all. It just isn't in the cards at the present moment. I criticize them.

Now, you say, "Well, what have I done to governments?" What do you want? A costume historical? What do you want? Something the size of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*? I guarantee you it would be entertaining. More entertaining than the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. But if you even want to find out some of these, well, just go to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and read some of these sections. Of course, I've never done anything to France. That's different.

You want to know overts, man – man, you got them when you're into an area of this particular type. But criticism is not necessarily a covert action. Criticism is a confession of inability. It's also, on a broader scale, a confession of an overt.

It's higher toned. Criticism is higher toned by far than a motivator. Well, "They took me over in France and they threw me in a tower and they did this and they beat me and they did this and that," and so on.

But that of course, would convert instantly into, "All right. What have you done to France?" You see?

And the fellow says, "And I wish and ah, they – they just ought to have their head examined. Leave it to the ..."

I'll give you a comment I made the other day. "Leave it to the French." While trying to get rid of a piece of their empire, the French settlers of which don't want to get rid of it – France has a revolution from a third party. Leave it to France. If you want to know how to mess up a situation, why, just get some advice from the French government because they're experts.

Of course, in politics, they have gone mad on the subject of politics. Somebody commented "Every time two Frenchmen get together, you have three new political parties." [laughter]

Well, now, that's rather mild criticism and we're not talking in the same line, but you, nevertheless, the question is just exactly the same. "What have you done to France?" See?

It isn't necessarily true that all criticisms, however, are based on unknowingnesses, which is different with a motivator. Motivators are always based on an unknowingness. Criticism being a little higher toned, it's not based on an unknowingness. Person may know all about it.

Now, there's other people's overts. Now, on the basis of safety, this is the safest thing apparently to the pc to do. And actually, now, if you want to draw a scale here, I think you're below motivator. That is the safest thing for the pc to do – to get off other people's overts. "I heard that ..."

I'll give you – you hear this sometimes around the Academy or something like that. We used to hear it here. I hear less and less of it. Some reason or other, propaganda wins at long last. Training is reaching there. It's been a long time since I heard anybody work over, for any number of hours "Well, I heard the other day that such and such a student actually, in their own town, had met a girl and had ..."

And you know and I just don't hear people around here doing very much with those. But out in the field, that is practically all that ever gets mined. That is the whole mine. And do you know? Here's the proof. I could show you this on auditors' report forms over a long period of time here at Saint Hill.

Wherever you have a session like that and the person has listened to other people's overts or criticism or motivators – we have a "goals and gains," section of Zero, no goals made, no gains made. That is the test. After all, Scientology is an heuristic science and it is there because it is workable. And if you let people get off any one of these four that I just gave you, you get a no goals and no gains.

Now, I don't care if you run them as engrams or anything else, you just get no goals and no gains made. That's it. And I can show you just auditor's report after auditor's report. Even the auditor writing the report didn't notice the connection between these two things. Because, you see, maybe the next session they did the same thing again and got no goals and no gains, you see? And then maybe the next session did the same thing again and got no goals and no gains. And then an Instructor caught up with them before they were absolutely obliterated by Mary Sue. Because if anything stands her hair on end is this particular one because

she is very, very aware of this factor. That is the way to get no auditing done and even to retrograde a case.

Now, you get the other people's withholds, it's absolutely beneath contempt. The person has not done it and your proper response on such a thing is – they say, "Well, well, actually, I heard that John Q. Jones, when auditing so-and-so, said..."

"Well, what have you done to John Q. Jones?"

Well, if you let them go a little bit further, you're liable to find a more pertinent target.

"Uh ... said that somebody in Cape Town," blank name, you see, something or other.

"Well, what have you done to somebody in Cape Town?"

I would clear it up on this basis. I would say, "Well, which one of the – which of these people do you know?"

"Well, I – I – I know John Jones."

You say, "Good. What have you done to John Jones?" And you've got your What. That, in other words, converts. These are all convertive. These are – these disobey the rule of taking what the pc said.

Now, as far as explanation is concerned, when the pc gives you an explanation, you know you have an overt. So once more, you ask, "What have you done?"

Now all four of these conditions are answered by the same What. You convert them all to "What have you done?" Now, frankly, an explanation is perfectly innocent. And there's no reason to condemn a pc for explaining. But whenever I hear a long and involved explanation about how – "Well, you see I actually was a younger child in the family and I never really had the advantages that the older children had. And so I never really got to school and – the way I should have. And the reason why I had such a terrific amount of trouble on my first job was just this – just this lack of education and so forth."

I'm liable to say, "Well, all right. Your first job, who was that with? Who was that with?"

And he says, "Well, it was Burchiman Company."

And I say, "All right. What have you done to Burchiman Company?"

And it's another conversion, see. I find out carefully what my target is because in an explanation, the target is never given until some fifteen hundred words are exhausted on the situation. That is, it comes under the heading of extenuating circumstances. And if an explanation records on your consciousness as an auditor as an extenuating circumstance, we could realize then, at once, that it's an extenuating circumstance for an *overt!*

So whenever the pc gets too interested in explaining I will always put a What on – no matter whether that's a sub-A, B, C, D or E. And incidentally these are terribly important. Don't think I'm just forbidding pcs from doing these things. I'll go into that in a moment. But I can always be counted on to use one of those things in a What.

And sometimes, you see, you can't – you really haven't got a pc giving you any overts. He doesn't – isn't giving you any overts and he isn't giving any withholds. He's talking to you. Good. But he isn't telling you that he did anything. And you, why, lightly, without any challenge or anything of the sort, can't really – this is early, before you learn very much about the case. You see, you learn cases and your first few sessions on a case, just as these demonstration sessions, are a bit fumbly, don't you see, because you're learning exactly where we're going. We're learning something about the case. We're knowing where these chains land up. And after you've given two or three sessions, of course, you get these things so that you know about where they're taped. And you know what you can ask about and what you won't ask about. And these *four* things I just gave you are beautiful indicators. And you can play those things on a one string violin, an electric guitar, a chord organ. You can play them with one finger or like Bach. It doesn't matter.

But the pc who is defensive will always give you one of those. He's explaining something. Marvelous. These must be extenuating circumstances he's explaining. Well, what is he explaining about? That's all you have to establish. And that doesn't become a What question because you're trying to find a What question.

You're trying to get your toe in the door, you see. And these four are lovely because there isn't a humanoid alive that won't do them. See? They always do them.

You're trying to clear up the second dynamic on "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties." And by George, you just can't get anything much out of – the pc's going on talking about what a beautiful day it is, you know? Oh, it's not the pc's fault. The pc isn't withholding from you. You just haven't directed the pc's attention. Well, this is how to direct the pc's attention to a thing and so forth.

All right, you can say something as innocent, "Well, have your parents ever been mean to you?" [laughter] It's not very accusative. Doesn't sound accusative to the pc. It would to a Scientologist. [laughter] Even at this stage, see.

And he said, "Well, yes, my father's always very, very mean to me. Always very mean to me."

You got a What question. [laughter] You just instantly convert it and you say, "What have you done to your father?"

And you're sailing. Now, you got your foot in the door, you know you'll get some withholds of some kind or another. You know you'll get the case rolling, you see?

Now, if you want to go milder, you can vary the – vary the thing on the harpsichord. All you've got to do is say to the thing, "How is it that you went to – ." You just know a little scrap of something or other about the pc, you see. "How is it that you went to such an expensive school?"

And the pc says, "Well, I just did."

Well, that just leaves you exactly nowhere. So you say, "How is that you got married when you did?"

"Oh, well, that's – that's another thing. Now, actually – actually, the truth of the matter is that my parents contested this marriage a considerable degree, you see, yet the girl was very desirable and that sort of thing. They wanted me to marry another girl and I – I – I of course, had my reservations about this sort of thing, but, you see, I hadn't actually been educated very well and I wasn't making a tre--- "

Oh, well, what the hell. [laughter] You walked into it, you see? You can sort it out on the meter quite overtly in front of the thing. You can say, "parents," "girl," whatever it is. So, all right, "What have you done to this girl?" And you're off to the races, see? Very revelatory.

Now, the person who talks – who gives you other people's withholds, of course, you could always ask, "Have you heard any gossip lately of any kind like this?" And the gossip that sticks in their mind is always about the people they have overts on. So you can mine that one. And you can – you can also say – these are just – these are just hunting mechanisms at the beginning of a Zero question, you see – and you just can say such a thing as, "Well, what should be done about ... ?" And then just run off the gamut of the dynamics.

If the pc starts answering on any particular point, the pc at least will communicate on that point and let's take that point and mine it down. You could almost do it without an E-Meter. And you'd find yourself in a fruitful area. So, this is how to get into fruitful areas. So they're not really condemnations of the thing.

Now, as we sit there watching the pc going on and on, the pc, of course, is unconscious of these various approaches. And the pc can steer us with these things. Steer us very nicely. And you listen to those – that type of response and when you hear that type of response, convert it. Whatever these things have as a target, convert the response to that target. It's on your subject. It's on your chain, but your chain is getting wobbly. It's getting kind of ragged. You don't quite know where you're going. You're steering a course down a chain of incidents which the person considers relatively discreditable.

Now, because the person considers these incidents discreditable, they are not in communication with the subject matter. Therefore, they feel this subject matter, therefore, has them at the effect-point. And the subject matter is at the cause-point. And it actually is the source of the aberration with which they happen to be boxing, as far as one lifetime or one valence is concerned.

You follow how this is? The individual has certain areas he's chosen for his randomness. Well, of course, he has varying approaches to these things. Give other people's withholds. Well, he isn't even on the receipt-point. Motivator – he gives you motivators. Well, golly, he sure can't flow back against the motivator. He can't flow back against cause there, can he? Because he can just tell you about motivators, right? He's got a victim computation with regard to this subject, so therefore it's quite fruitful.

All right. Let's move up a little bit more. All he can do is criticize it. It shows that he has an impulse to destroy it. He's a little bit better off if he's just criticizing it. If he starts to explain one way or the other, it shows that the lines are in a dispersal. So that you've got your cause with your pc at the receipt-point and what you're doing is walking your pc back to cause again over these points by knocking out any reason he has to attack those particular points or defend himself or retreat from certain materials or subject matters he has on his

track. So therefore, he can communicate on all subjects. It's very, very simple. Do you see why that is?

You can actually draw these four things with the arrows with regard to cause- and receipt-point, then the pc is at effect-point. And you can draw how little he's backing up against the cause-point. Well, naturally, because he can't back up against the cause-point in any one of these cases, he doesn't know.

Now, if you want to find a pc in total ignorance as to what's going on, get the other people's withhold. Man, that pc has – doesn't even know he has a bank, see? That's the wild one. He doesn't even know he's aberrated on this subject.

On the motivator, he knows he's in trouble with regard to this subject, but there he is. Well, how did he get in trouble? Well, he can't tell you and so he doesn't know anything about what's causing him trouble. And he'll have the wildest fantasies with regard to this sort of thing.

And the pc who is criticizing, he may – he may even understand the situation a little bit, but he just wants to knock it out and make nothing out of it.

Well, it's not necessarily true that he – that there is an unknown at all on the channel; and as far as explanation is concerned, similarly, not necessarily true, that the subject matter is terrifically unknown to the pc.

If you want to find unknowns that the pc couldn't even vaguely confront, get other people's withholds and mine it. So you don't mine that one at all.

The pc is suffering from and tells you he's suffering from and therefore has motivators on certain subjects, well, you know that you're in your most profitable area of not-know. But you may be in an area which is so thoroughly unknown that the pc cannot penetrate it at all.

So it's what the pc gets a reality on. Well, a reality with regard to that is solved by your E-Meter. If you get a disturbance of the needle on any given subject, it is real to the pc to some extent. And if you get a disturbance of a needle on an E-Meter, it is the charge generated between the not-know and the know. And if you've got an unbalance between not-know and know, you get a reaction on the E-Meter providing, of course, that you've got the pc on the E-Meter and can read one.

Now, the pc must know something about it to be in a clash with a not-know on the subject, you see? Now, when the pc is at not-know and the subject is at not-know, you get no read on the E-Meter. Now, when the pc is at know and the subject is at know, there is no read on the E-Meter. When there's as much known about it as the pc knows about it and could know about it, you get no charge. If it's totally unknown to the pc and in the bank and everywhere else, you've got a not-know versus a not-know and the pc does not register on the meter.

There's possibly somebody here who burned down a cathedral sometime or another. And they don't even in this lifetime have any religious prejudices of one kind or another. You put that person on the meter and you ask him – you see, it's – the reason why you don't see this is because you can't test it, see, this is totally out of use so it's untestable – and we say to

the pc, "Did you ever burn down a cathedral?" and we get no reaction of any kind whatsoever, you see?

Everybody didn't know and he doesn't know and he's never heard about it and he doesn't remember it and nothing remembers it and it's just all gone and the not-knows are matching the knows, so of course, there's no flow generated. He doesn't know anything about it. You'll get a total null.

And then you're very surprised after a considerable period of time of auditing and so forth, you ask him the same question. You might remember this vividly because it's one of your favorite overts, you see? And you've asked the pc one of your favorite overts and you got no reaction and so on. And you were disappointed so that you remember this – you remember this vividly. And you go on and you audit this pc for two or three weeks and all of a sudden, why, one day you say, "Well, did you ever burn down a cathedral?" and the needle falls off the pin, in running something like 3D Criss Cross, you see? And now the pc knows something about it. He just dimly remembered something about this, you see? And that's enough against the unknow to cause a generation of current or charge. So it's a difference of polarity is what you've got. And postulatewise, it's the not-know versus the know that gives you a polarity difference.

All right. Now, similarly, the more a pc knows about his own life, the more charged up the bank will appear to be. So you're always pulling new withholds off of a pc that he didn't have last week. And that is the increasing phenomena of withholds on the case.

Of course, the no – more the person knows about his own life, why, the more the areas of occlusion can be located. So he knows now that he doesn't know about more areas of life and so you get many more areas of charge, so you get many more withholds after a while than you started out with originally, which is quite fascinating

Now, you can take somebody who is sitting calmly at 3.0, absolutely right on the button. You stamp on his toe, needle doesn't even quiver. You say, "How are you getting along?"

And he says, "Fine."

And you say, "How do you do in life?"

And he says, "Fine."

And you look it up and you find out he was fired that day. And you find a lot of other things were going on in life that he has never seemed to discover.

And this person's getting along well. And you say, "Could you. ..." You run your test on him ... "Well, could you help me?"

"Help you?"

"Well, how could you possibly help?"

"Yes, I guess I could help you. I could loan you a pound. No, no. I – I – that wouldn't be of any help to you. Ah, no, I don't think I could. Is it really true? Can anybody ever help anybody? Now, that – that's a philosophic question. Ah, does anybody ever really help anybody, you know?"

You get this kind of *blaaah*, and you got your dead thetan reaction. And by George, you can't get an overt to register. He doesn't know he's done anything. He doesn't know anything is wrong, he doesn't know that he doesn't know. He's almost a circuit which is a total not-know, you see, talking as a total not-know. And even if he says it, it isn't true that he knows it, you see? Something operated his mouth and some words came out, you know. And you just get no registry. You can be fooled by that case unless you know these tests for Help and other such things.

Ah, old Helen, she used to call some of these very, very statuesque, not even present people that she'd see around, "Operating GEs" an operating genetic entity. It described them wonderfully, you know? Honest to Pete, they could be standing there with a 13-inch bayonet dripping blood that they have just pulled out of the policeman's back and you say, "Have you ever stabbed anybody?" on an E-Meter and so help me Pete, you wouldn't even get a quiver on the needle. They haven't found out. And there's no know versus no not-know because they're just total not-know, don't you see? And you don't get any overts on this character.

Therefore, Security Checking as a means of business prevention could go down to the *reductio ad absurdum* of only selecting out as employable those people who are dead thetans – Operating GEs. Anybody who had any ability couldn't pass one, see? It isn't the operator. It'd be the mechanism of the bank. A guy that's halfway crazy is much better off than one of these birds who hasn't even found out whether he's crazy or sane, see. Operating GEs.

All right. You look this over on Security Checking type of activity for admission of personnel and it's a – gives you a very dangerous view. A person registers on nothing and so therefore he's employable. Ah, that isn't so. You'd only employ your worst-off people.

Anyway, the other side of this picture is much more interesting. As you start running – well, this has always been true of pulling withholds. The more withholds you pull, apparently, the more withholds the person has, so that on the first of Jul- August, you get the last two pages of the Joburg. And you got them slicker than a whistle. And they're just dandy. Everything is fine. You got these things clean, buffed up and shining, you see. Somebody could check them right after you. They'd all be null as null. Isn't that marvelous? And you give the person some more Prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross or give them some more auditing of one character or another and somebody says, "Well, I – you might as well give him a test on the last two pages of the Joburg."

And the person says, "That's fine, they're all null," he says.

And then they ask the first question and the second question and the third question. This person's going, "What the hell, you know? Well, that should be cleaned up, but actually what is this?" You know, he gets into a terrible puzzle. Actually, he's gone up into a higher state of knowingness. He's in a higher state of awareness and knowingness, so of course he bangs against these hidden areas. And you have the phenomenon of more withholds.

You'll think that it's endless and it's not endless because at the same ratio, their ability to find them and blow them increases. See?

Now, the other test of it is, is you'll find one withhold on this person at beginning of processing. And you'll find out that when they left, they forgot to lock the office door yester-

day. And this is a withhold and you get this and you clean it up and it takes you two or three sessions, but you clean it up. See, you get that withhold out of the road. It takes you quite some time, but you do, only to find out, after you've spent that much time on it that now they have more withholds and then more withholds and more withholds.

But they blow slow. Withholds are few and they blow very slowly at first. And as you continue to go on, withholds get more numerous and blow faster. And you can bring the person, just by auditing one lifetime, you can bring the person up to a state very happily. You can bring them straight up to a state of being able to blow when viewed. You find it, they blow it. And you get a pretty fast-acting needle when you do this kind of ...

Now, there's – I just got a report from HASI London, one of your recent fellow students up there now as Tech Director, and I got a report that they have found something new. They have found out that all you have to do – an incident's turned up on doing Prepchecking – and all you had to do was pick up these past life incidents and you included them in your Prepcheck and it all blew beautifully, and it all straightened up and it worked.

Well, I doubt the last part of the line, see. You see, that isn't what we're trying to do. We are not trying to blow incidents. We are not. We're simply setting up a person's alertness up to a point of where they can handle more in this lifetime. And we can show them very nicely that this lifetime can be cleaned up and we're getting them ahead so we keep the rudiments in easily. And you're actually not trying to do a great deal of auditing with pulling withholds. You're trying to fix the person up so the person can go into session.

Now, the time to pull backtrack withholds is after you have done 3D Criss Cross into a totally stable package. So they're trying to do what you do at the end of auditing at the beginning of auditing. And let me assure you that I could take any one of the pcs on which they have miraculously cleared something by finding a past track incident and I can show you that the things would just have cleared just beautifully if they'd gotten "Dropping a candy cane when they were five." See? Didn't have to go in for this kind of nonsense at all.

And if the auditor is going to reach for past track every time he wants to get the rudiments in, to 3D Criss Cross, where are you going to be? Because you're going to be nowhere. I can tell you why. Because the more – the more valences that become available, the more past track identities that become available, the more withholds become available and the pc has never been guided into the unit value of a valence. The unit value of one lifetime.

See, he doesn't think he can do anything about this lifetime. He doesn't think he can do anything about anything. He's never had any big win and you plow him into the bank after he's never had any big win and of course, he gets no big win and he gets no win and he gets no win. He could go all the way through ...

You'd probably audit him for two or three hundred hours without ever giving him a win. Just miring him down and miring him down and miring him down.

For instance, don't think I don't know some processes that'd take a pc's head off. Big effect processes are very easy to have. They'd be very easy to find, they're very... That's the easiest thing to do. I can give you – a – well, you've had one for a number of years – is R2-45. That's a big process. [laughter]

But you're not trying to establish – you're not trying to do anything with Prepclearing except straighten out this lifetime so the rudiments will stay in while you do an effective process on the whole track. That's the only reason you're doing it. See, if you do anything else with it, why, there it is. The pc – gradually a pc will get quite a few wins.

Now, oddly enough – oddly enough, if you're going for gain and you're going 100 percent flat-out and if you were a crackerjack auditor and everything was fine and so on, you could probably produce, probably – probably produce all of the gains that you could get out of Prepclearing, you could probably produce them with 3D Criss Cross. You probably could produce all of them with 3D Criss Cross. The real, real gains – cognitions in this lifetime, blowing incidents into view – you could do all these things providing you could do 3D Criss Cross.

Now, is there anything going to get in your road doing 3D Criss Cross?

Audience: Yes, yeah.

Yeah, yeah. In go the rudiments, out go the rudiments. In – they get them in, you get them out, *da-da-da*.

How about this little mechanism called a missed withhold? You're going to get your 3D Criss Cross one-tenth done and then hit a missed withhold on the pc. And the pc's going to get screamingly angry with you and blow. And you're never going to get a chance to finish your 3D Criss Cross, are you? That's really the end of that argument right there. There's numerous reasons why.

One of the things you'd accomplish with Prepclearing is just show a pc you could get his rudiments in. You know that some of you right now, particularly newer students and so on – there may be a lot of you – have a feeling of utter despair about ever getting your own rudiments in as a case.

I could prove it to you. I could put you on this meter and I could ask you one after the other how you feel about having a present time problem. You wouldn't like that, would you?

You come into a 3D Criss Cross session and you're all set to go there, and you're all set to list, and everybody's got the list and the auditor comes down the line and he says, "You got a present time problem?"

And your heart goes into your boots.

You say, "Well, there goes half the session. There goes half an hour of auditing. There's time up the spout."

So the auditor says – I'm talking about hard experience now, I'm not talking about any theory – the auditor says, "Well, all right, we'll ignore it."

Ohhhhhhhhh! Now you *have* had it. Let's ignore this present time problem. Let's not do anything with the present time problem and let's get on with this nulling so you – "Is it a weasel mouth?" [laughter]

And the pc is sitting there and the pc is looking sort of fixed and they start to look kind of green and you say, "What's the matter?"

diments, two-minute break, beginning rudiments and on back into that session again. And we find out what's wrong, see.

But I use rudiments a little bit differently than I advise you to use rudiments. I use rudiments to salvage a session which isn't going well, not to create a session, because I'm very cocky about this. I can always create a session.

I'm not talking necessarily about my auditing and your auditing or anything like that. Let's hope you can do that, too. But you can – you sometimes – I watch you sometimes destroy a perfectly good session, however, with a rudiments mess-up of one kind or another.

But I don't yet trust, on most auditors' parts, the ability to look at the pc and just listen to the pc two words and know whether the pc's attention is on the session or on something out of session. That's a sensitivity. And when the pc – when you can tell that "*bing*" why, then is your time to use rudiments or not use rudiments. Pc looks like they're out of session, use rudiments. Pc looks like they're in-session, why, don't use them.

As far as end rudiments are concerned, pc's happy, pc's talking to you, havingness is – might be repaired and so forth. They're happy with the session. Well, ask them what goals and gains they've made and get the hell out of there, man, see. But that requires you sufficiently confident unto yourself as an auditor that you're going to get results and so forth, that you don't have to keep patching them up all the time. I'm giving you another look at this sort of thing and that goes along with this.

That means that you've got to get wins. You've got to know what you can do as an auditor and you've got to be able to get wins. And I know nothing under God's green earth fit to make you cocky like two things we're doing – Prepclearing and 3D Criss Cross. And those things can actually make you cocky.

You do those things well, you will see wins, wins, wins, wins, wins, wins. So after you've had a lot of these things and you know where you're going and what you can do and you haven't got any little questions in the back of your mind about this and that, you'll start watching the pc and putting your attention on things that are important. Up to that time, follow the rote. Until I can show you the win, you sure got to use the rote. And then you'll use most of the rote to get the win. You see?

We're very fortunate right at this particular moment. We have Prepclearing and this procedure almost puts your feet on the path one after the other. It is so good a rote procedure that you needn't not use it. [laughter]

And the other great gain in Prepclearing, the other great gain in it is that an Instructor and a person reading your auditor report knows just like that whether you're doing it or not. And there's no doubt in anybody's mind on what you're doing. We know exactly what you're doing.

And you can be steered then until you're doing it right and then you're walking with your feet practically put on the path and the next thing you know, you happen to look up out of the session and notice the pc. And the pc's getting better. [laughter] That's how powerful the process is.

And then you'll all of a sudden come into a dawning someday of, "My God, how easy auditing is." Well, of course, a pc will occasionally nag you, you're just starting out a case and you don't know where you're going, something like that. You feel a little bit nattery about the thing.

And then all of a sudden, why, you realize you just sit down there and you get results. Cocky. You become absolutely overbearing and insufferable. But you won't be here, so I won't have to worry about that part of it.

Thank you very much.

PREPCHECKING AND BASICS

A lecture given on 27 February 1962

Thank you.

Well, this is what?

Audience: 27th.

Twenty-seventh of February ...

Audience: AD 12.

AD 12. Very good. Very good.

All right. We begin herewith, herein, amongst our battered selves, a new type of schedule simply designed on several basics. And one of those is that I'm perfectly willing to give you all the instruction time I possibly can and your schedule was a bit colliding with this particular fact and so I've stepped it up to eight hours of demonstration and lectures a week. And that's a bit better than you were getting. And I've tried to put it in that part of the day that you were least harassed. And I think you find this more satisfactory.

And the demonstration's going to work like this. The regulations on the demonstration is that you can leave at ten. You don't have to leave at ten; you can leave at ten, on a demonstration. But me, I audit for results and after I'd done some of this postage stamp auditing for you ... I audit for results, that's all and these results are scheduled on a – just that. They're scheduled on the pc's reactive bank. They're not scheduled on a clock. And I like to audit to a result and knock it off. Or audit to a point where I don't think I'll reach anything that session and knock it off. It's a different framework.

And trying to audit somebody in an hour, I was setting a bad example to you because I ordinarily *do* do beginning and end rudiments. And now, by the time you've subtracted beginning and end rudiments from an hour's session, you've got damned little auditing left. And I could fully expect – I don't say that it will – but I'd say on seldom occasions, one of these demonstrations is liable to run until two o'clock in the morning. And that's because I audit to an item, audit to a result, don't you see?

And nobody expects you to stay till two o'clock in the morning. You can leave at ten. Or you can stay until two o'clock in the morning. You understand?

Audience: Yes.

But doing it this way, why, then I can put in an extension of time. The only people that have any problems with this, is some of your Instructors have problems with this new schedule. But that's all right. We can – we can solve those one way or the other. We can get those.⁶

Now, one of the old-time students at this late stage of the game is coming up to Clear. And it's almost a shame to let her go. But I just received a letter from her – her true love down in South Africa – or down in Rhodesia, saying it was all right for her to stay this one extension, see, but I shudder to mention another one. But that's awfully tempting to see that there's a floating needle amongst us. The tone arm is too high, but that will come down with a – with a few more items. But it's awfully tempting just to hold this person over and clear her. Or let the auditor, Norman Wold, go right up to the point where the tone arm is unable to maintain its present height, you see. Let him go right up to that point and then take over with the last session, you see. And clip out the few W/Hs and terminals, you know, that are holding the tone arm up there, you see. And then tell everybody well, you see, I can clear somebody in one session. [laughter, laughs] I think this is very funny.

After he's worked, you see, for a couple of hundred hours on the project or something like that – that would – that would be a college professor's trick, wouldn't it? Yeah.

Yeah. They take all the students' inventions, don't you see, and patent them themselves. That's the California Institute of Technocracy. They specialize in that. As a matter of fact, one of the greatest names in American physics does nothing but that. He's never had an idea in his life.

But we don't work that way around here, so we won't do it that way. But it is very, very tempting to hold this person over until we get the tone arm down and then we say, "See? A Clear."

And then we could put her on a frame alongside the door and you could ...

Okay. Well, I forgot my notes and – you haven't heard that gag for some time, have you? It took you by surprise. I forgot my notes, so I don't have very much to go over with you aside from Scientology, Prepchecking, 3D Criss Cross, clearing, chains, engrams, secondaries, valences, circuits, reactive mind, the E-Meter, auditing sessions, Model Session. These things sound familiar to you? Any of you heard of these things before? [laughs]

Now, I will talk to you about – a little bit about Prepchecking. Because this is where you will find your biggest strength and it's sort of a knack.

Once upon a time, you were given a bicycle. Or you saved the money you had been stealing out of the church collection plate or something and managed to buy a bicycle. And you couldn't ride it. Or you had a sister or brother or the fellow next door had a bicycle and you couldn't ride it. Do you remember a time when you couldn't ride a bicycle? Hm?

And you may have some recollection of falling off the bicycle a few times, of steering it onto the grass plots and off the curb and narrowly missing various inanimate objects and

⁶ Editor's note: This paragraph is missing in the audio recording of 1991, but not in the accompanying transcript.

maybe not missing a few animate objects and you had quite a time with this bicycle and it was all in the matter of steering the thing and keeping it balanced.

And then all of a sudden – there was no transition period – all of a sudden, one day, you could ride a bicycle. There was never a period when you could almost ride a bicycle. You remember that? Then one day you all of a sudden could ride a bicycle.

Oddly enough, both Prepchecking and 3D Criss Cross come under this category. And you go on falling on your 'ead and falling on your 'ead and not riding the bicycle and then suddenly one day you'll be riding the bicycle. Then you say, "How is it possible that people can't ride bicycles?" And you will be very, very snide about this, I'm sure.

It's not possible not to ride a bicycle – if you can ride a bicycle. And one day you'll get the feel of this. But there's a certain amount of information and technology that is necessary toward the riding of a bicycle. And one, you must recognize whether by definition or merely fooling with it, that there is such a thing as gyroscopic action.

And gyroscopic action is one of the most complicated mathematical subjects you ever tackled in your life. If you ever wish to make life miserable, if you just feel in one of these masochistic moods, you know, don't go out and get yourself beaten with a club or run over by a taxicab driver, just study the mathematics of gyroscopes. They're fantastic. And that's a bicycle, see. And study the delivery of mechanical force from point A to point B and study mechanical advantages. The operation and construction of coaster brakes. The metallurgy of the frame. That's a nice, complicated one. The synthetic chemistry in the composition of tires. And as long as you're getting into tires, let us go into something worthwhile. Let's go into balloonostatics. Let's get further into the stress analysis of spokes. I never knew that spokes could be complicated till we put a coaster brake on a little 15-inch wheel for Quentin.

We put a 3-speed gear shift on one of these little, tiny bicycles. And of course, they're not made for that, you know. And this little bike, now, will practically – you could peddle it up a vertical wall, you know. But all of the – all of the spokes, since they don't make spokes small enough, you see, to go in that wheel on a coaster brake, they all had to be cut, hand cut and that was a mess because the wheel would thereafter not vibrate straightly. So they had to be cut and recut and bent and rebent and every wheel spoke had to be balanced in so the wheel eventually ran smoothly on its own axis. Very complicated business.

Well, you could go into all of this. And then because you're going to ride a bicycle mainly outside, you could go into and make a complete and exhaustive study of meteorology to know when the weather would be good or bad so that you could ride your bicycle, don't you see?

And then because you're riding your bicycle on ground, you could take up the study of materials of construction. This would give you everything to know about roads. And you could go just a little bit further than that – knowing more about materials and construction because you're going to ride this bicycle on Earth – you could take up geology. And then geology is influenced, of course, by electrical currents and that sort of thing, so you could take geophysical hydrostatics of various kinds.

You could take the influences of Earth's magnetic fields, you see, as it might influence matter, as it might influence the ground, as it might influence the sidewalk, in case you ever hit your head on the sidewalk and couldn't ride the bicycle.

Now, if you approached it from this very, very complicated sphere, you still wouldn't be able to ride a bicycle. You've made all these studies now and you still can't ride a bicycle. So you see, you could go around Robin Hood's barn on a perimeter of about seven miles away from it and wind up at a destination nowhere, even yet, couldn't you? Well, I'm just giving you this as an example.

Now, you could know all of your theory and you could know all these things very well and you could know exactly how to – well, not how to, you could just know the theory of practically everything in Scientology and still not be able to prepcheck. That's the only point I'm making.

You don't have time to steer the handlebars to the left or the right by calculation. The people who do this by calculation have remarkably knobby skulls by this time. [laughs, laughter] And if every time the bicycle had a slight impulse to go out of balance to the right, they did a calculation as to whether or not to move the handlebars to the right or the left, they would be full of dents after a while. You recognize that as a fact?

Well, similarly, the auditor actually never has any time to calculate in doing a Prepcheck. You ride a bicycle by instinct. And you prepcheck by instinct. Now, you can get the rules down pretty well and you can know about where you're going and so forth, but when you totally delete out instantaneous instinct out of the thing, you're in bad shape.

But if you read your withholds into the pc's case and call *that* instinct, you also will not ride the bicycle. You know, people do that. You know, we did that to you and I don't think anybody ever told you about it.

We asked you what withholds does your pc have and then did you realize you had been run on them immediately afterwards? We took the withhold the auditor was sure the pc had and had it run out of the auditor. It worked pretty well, didn't it? You found a few, didn't you? Just a corny gag. See?

It's a truism that auditors will sometimes assign all of their own withholds and misdeeds to the pc and then try to audit them out of the pc like mad. And of course they aren't in the pc. They're in the auditor's own case.

So if you ask an auditor at any time to list the withholds it's most likely the pc has and make a long, arduous list of this thing, particularly if he hasn't much experience with the pc, don't you see? And then you take that list and have it and check it against the auditor, you'll find those withholds.

I don't know that you are aware of that, but it's pretty rank. And if instinct is running your withholds out of the pc, why, then you're not again going to ride the bicycle.

No, you have to be able to sit in front of a human being – a being – and ride it down the line. You sometimes don't even find out what you're after till the session is over. Theory be damned. I mean, I did a session the other night and I found out after five hours and a half

of auditing or something like this, I found out I had been auditing a chain called "women." But I didn't know it for five-and-a-half hours. That was the only common denominator to the chain I was running.

I thought I was running another chain entirely, all stemming out of a channel of withholds and sure enough, I was following down the channel I thought was there and we were winning hands down all the way, but I never got the whole chain summated until the session was over. There was another deeper common denominator to the chain of withholds that I was running. And that was women. See? That was actually the basic common denominator of the chain I was running.

But nevertheless running a very successful Prepcheck. Running a terrifically successful Prepcheck with, actually, hardly the foggiest notion of what I was prepchecking. But I couldn't find out.

Well, it was, to some degree, my fault because I started the session without really starting the session and started away from a present time problem. And the present time problem was dead on the line, but the auditor was actually assigning the channel rather than finding out from the pc what the channel was and assigning it.

In other words I – if I had spent a little more time at the beginning of the session, you see, instead of getting myself hurled into the session with a present time problem... Actually, I had no subject left unflat on this, see. This was a new start on this case. It was a brand-new start.

And this brand-new start – it meant all the 1s and 1A, 1B, and so on it had before, they were all washed, you see? So I had to find a new departure point, so I just took the present time problem as a departure point and the case walked over from this present time problem right down a chain. And then after five and a half hours of auditing I found out what the chain was called. It was called "women." Interesting, huh? I thought it was very fascinating

So your basic orientation on the case of what you're doing and so forth is largely a matter of touch. It's finding out what the pc will give you as a withhold and finding out what runs nicely as a withhold and then going on down that chain of related withholds and carrying on with it without letting the pc's attention jump entirely off that to some other disrelated subject. You know, you have to keep the pc's attention on this and it's sort of interesting. You sort of keep the pc's attention on it without forbidding the pc from talking about other things or stirring up a lot of bank that you're not now going to pull and keeping the pc on a chain and you sometimes will find yourself unable to identify the chain.

But it's obviously all related, you see? You're just running it by instinct. So we could tell you all about meteorology, geology, the magnetic fields, gyroscopy, synthetic chemistry and we could tell you all about those things and you could still sit down and if you have no instinct whatsoever for the pc and no interest in auditing the pc, if your – if your point here is totally missed, if you're just studying and your point is not you're going to audit the pc, you see, why, we'd wind up not riding the bicycle at all. You follow this?

We could lay it all down with beautiful rules and you could memorize these rules and so forth. Well, you've already got a tremendous summation of information as contained in the

withhold system itself. See, a tremendous quantity of data have been summarized and synthesized into that very neat package, just as fantastic quantities of technical information and modern science have gone into the making of a bicycle. See?

And what's left? Well, you haven't got a bicycle unless somebody can ride the bicycle, you got the idea? Bicycles are not display objects. They are riding objects. And so it is with Prepchecking. It's something to be used and you can use it or you can't use it. And there's hardly, apparently, with 3D Criss Cross and Prepchecking – apparently no grays. It's black and it's white. And how it got from black to white is as sudden as can't ride a bicycle and can ride one.

And just how it got through that zone will probably continuously evade your eye. Once you've given an auditor – once an auditor can sit there and run a repetitive process, he can get his rudiments in somewhat – if he can do these things, see, you know – run a repetitive process on the pc and he can keep his rudiments in, then I think you could teach him forever without getting him any closer to prepchecking than just prepchecking.

So the best – the best way is, I think, is kind of make sure he knows all about it, you see, that if you reverse the turn of the pedals, you apply the brakes, don't you see, and make him learn these various things and make him learn all that. And then just let him prepcheck and keep him from going off the roadway completely. And one fine day, why, not too distant future, he'll all of a sudden say, "Hey, what do you know!"

Now, just as you have to be able to walk and move your arms and legs to ride a bicycle, so do you have to be able to use an E-Meter and have a fair command of the basics of auditing. That is to say, sit in a chair, repetitive question, these various things. Well, we *assume* that you're good at these things before you move over into it. But you'll find sometimes, when you're teaching somebody to prepcheck very industriously – you're gorgeously slogging ahead teaching somebody Prepchecking and they just can't prepcheck – you're liable to find out that they're trying to ride a bicycle but have no legs or something. And this is embarrassing.

They don't know how to use an E-Meter, see. Or they actually haven't ever had Op Pro by Dup flattened on them. And they can't repeat a repetitive question. They wouldn't be able to do this or they haven't a clue about Model Session or keeping the rudiments in and they're so busy doing all of these other things that their attention's not on Prepchecking at all, don't you see.

So the stunt is to get somebody into some kind of shape where he or she can audit – knows an E-Meter, able to sit in the chair and do the TRs more or less, do Model Session and so forth. And then be able to handle the E-Meter against rudiments. Be able to handle the E-Meter pretty well against rudiments, before you turn them loose on Prepchecking. That's basically what they have to know.

And of course, they have to know the withhold system and they have to know what that's all about. And they'll get that pretty straight and then next thing you know, why, there they are, running.

But you could learn all the rules and it'd still be to some degree, excusing your presence, ladies, fly by the seat of your pants operation. It is that. Because nobody could lay down what the pc's going to give you for withholds. Nobody could lay this down.

This is a variable just about as wild as – well, there's no telling what a state legislature or a provincial assembly or something like that's going to pass. That's about as wild a variable as you could think of. And it's sure as variable as that, you see? And since I one time was asked to congratulate – [laughs] I was asked to congratulate an assemblyman who informed me with great pride, expecting I would instantly pat him on the back, that he had just read the Ten Commandments into law in the State of Arizona. They were now going to be the law of Arizona – the Ten Commandments. It's marvelous. I don't know how the hell – I don't know what that had to do with the price of fish at all, you see? It's pretty good.

Oh, yes, I've seen some wild ones come through there and you're going to sit there sometimes and just absolutely drop your jaw at what the withhold is. You always tend to run by your own moral code. And the basic mistake that you make, once you can do all the mechanical operations and so forth, is assign your own moral code to the pc.

And if you could think of you being sec checked – not prepchecked – but if you think of you being sec checked, now, by an Ecuadorian headhunter, now what kind of questions would he ask you, see, and then think of this Ecuadorian headhunter becoming frantically furious with you for not having abided by his moral code, you'll get the frame of mind of the pc toward the auditor sometimes. This – this you can make a mistake on.

Now, you can also let yourself be talked out of pulling a withhold on the same grounds in reverse. See, you mustn't do that either. See, either way is a sin. You're caught. So sometimes it's right and sometimes it's wrong.

Now, let me give you an idea. Let us have a 3D Criss Cross. Let's take a look at 3D Criss Cross and we shake out of 3D Criss Cross an item which gives the pc pain, meaning it is his terminal. And it's an unmistakable item. It blew a lot of charge when we got the thing off, but let's prepcheck it. Now, that sounds funny running Prepchecking after 3D Criss Cross, but you're going to be doing just that, you see.

It hasn't got another name. You run it before and you run it after and so on and we're catching up with the aftermath because after you do 3D Criss Cross, you still have to do an operation which looks exactly like Prepchecking and is Prepchecking and possibly be called something else because it's a sort of a mop-up. And it's – you steer the pc's knowingness down these channels and blow them apart.

Well, I know, at the moment, no faster method of reaching the knowingness of the pc than taking a 3D Criss Cross item, which you've got – it's nicely isolated and you got a lot of the charge shaken off the case and so forth – and just enter a Prepcheck along these lines.

The item which we found and gave the pc pain was "a moral man." That's – not – would not be an uncommon or a strange terminal to find on a case. A moral man. That is the item and it is obviously a terminal of the pc's because it has pain on it. If it made the pc dizzy, it would be an opposition terminal to the pc – if he merely had sensation or misemotion or

something like that on it. But if he had pain, if it gave him real good aches and pains, it's his terminal.

All right. Obviously then, we could prepcheck this item and how would we pull the withholds that were holding this thing on the whole track. What would be our Zero Question?

Well, I'm not going to give you the perfect Zero Question from this. And I'm just going to give you some thinkingness on this subject. We know the pc has a terminal, a moral man.

Now, what is the obvious Zero for a Prepcheck? This is running it backwards. This is running it from the bank up to present time. Obviously, he has a whole chain of withholds on this right in present time that you've never spotted.

I don't care how carefully you prepchecked the pc originally. This is going to be a whole new chain. No matter if he almost wrapped Clear on the present lifetime. There's still going to be this buried chain because it's going to go completely in all directions on forward right up until now – a moral man.

See, there's still going to be stuff missing. You couldn't help it. What's the Zero? "Have you ever been moral?" Well, wouldn't that be the Zero? Wouldn't it be something like that? Honest, you'll find withholds on that line if you had that terminal – moral man.

Now, you think of all terminals as representative of some bloody-mindedness of one character or another, you know, like "A *vicious thief*" Ah, that sounds like a good terminal. Well, you could understand that one. Now, let's get that one. Now, we find that "the vicious thief" as a 3D Criss Cross item has pain on it. Every time you try to run "vicious thief" why, the back of his neck comes apart and his skull splits in half, and he has horrible shooting pains going through his stomach. Now, that's dandy, so it obviously is something like a terminal. Obviously. And it's all checked out very nice. Naturally you could run this one. "Have you ever stolen anything? Have you ever stolen anything just to be mean?" See? Nice, nice Zero.

Now, you can understand that one, can't you. That's an easy one to understand. Well now, look, "a moral man" as a 3D Criss Cross item giving the pc pain is the same confounded concatenation of what-not. It has exactly the same value as "a vicious thief" as a subject of withholds. Believe it or not, that is what it does. Now, you look that over and any question that you ask about "a vicious thief," substitute "vicious thief" or "thievery" for "a moral man" and "morality" and you'll get the same value of withhold. These withholds will come off fantastically charged.

Supposing this was a girl we had this terminal, "a moral man" on. "Have you ever been moral?" Oh, man, this thing falls off the pin. Just falls off the pin. "Have you ever been moral?" "Have you ever abided by any of the Ten Commandments?"

Big withhold. "I didn't kill Bill." See? Big withhold.

It's reprehensible in some fashion. Sounds weird, doesn't it? There could be just all that backwards.

Now, let's get a little more involved on the thing and let's get a terminal, "an immoral girl." That would be common enough as a 3D Criss Cross item. And if "the immoral girl" was being prepchecked up the line, you possibly would get the same package of withhold. "Have you ever done anything moral?" you could ask. You follow me now?

So it could fall on either side. This terminal has a different value of withhold. And you'd get into a whole chain of what people call laudable withholds.

Now, supposing we had a terminal – "a lady." Isn't that a nice terminal? We can just see the pc now sighing with relief at the end of the item, for her male auditor was sitting there and she was still trying to impress the auditor a little bit. And at the end of this long and arduous list of 3D items which contain some of the more interesting lines – it doesn't fall on any of those. It doesn't fall on any of those. And she's sitting there, *whew*, you know, because down at the end of the line the last item that was left in on the nulling was "a lady." Isn't that sweet. [laughter] Isn't that sweet.

And she's so happy about this. Gives her an awful pain straight through the ears and straight this way and that way. That's fine, but nevertheless it's a nice, pleasant, acceptable terminal. And now we start prepchecking this. And the Zero Question, "Have you ever been ladylike?" "Have you done ever – ever done anything that was ladylike?" Would oddly enough be quite responsive. Each one of them as a solid withhold. Why withhold? Well, the terminal, a lady, was withheld, wasn't it? So all the acts of a lady would be withheld.

Now, look at the lau – now let's look at the thing in reverse. Look at the laudable withholds of a lady. She withholds herself from drinking. She withholds herself from swearing. She withholds herself from rowdy companions. She withholds herself from dirt, you know and getting dirty. Withholds herself from getting sweaty. See, all the things a lady withholds herself from. Withholds herself from sex, from pleasure, from pleasurable excitement. This starts to look like a very interesting series of withholds. And we finally find out that "a lady's" primary mission was to hold herself from living. Not that that's – things I have mentioned are the total composite of living. [laughter]

Actually, then, you could just translate the terminal in two ways. Why can you translate it in two ways? Because if you were running an old 3D set of commands, it'd be, "What have you done to a lady?" see, "What has a lady done to you?" see and "What have you done to another?" Which of course puts the pc in the valence of the lady for the moment and so on.

So it's what the pc has done as a lady and what the pc has done to a lady. So we have the pc interiorized into this terminal, a lady, only because the pc has tremendous overts on a lady. But the pc not only has overts on a lady but also is being a lady, see?

So we'd ask, "Have you ever done anything ladylike?" would be the response to that 3D Criss Cross item. Or "Have you ever failed to be ladylike?" would give you another channel, all on the same terminal.

In other words, you'd have a string of withholds on the subject of being unladylike and you'd have a string of withholds on the subject of being ladylike, equally, wouldn't you.

In other words, these are two channels which would have moved forward into present time as a series of problems and they would have made all these problems. Every time she

powdered her nose, she knew she was doing wrong. Why? Because ladies don't use powder in most periods and ages. And this could be practically a trained mechanism.

But ladies look nice, don't they. So every time she didn't powder her nose, she was doing something wrong. Isn't that right?

A 3D Criss Cross item is simply an item with which nobody wins or has won. See, nobody's ever won with this item. This item is not a winner. It's only an apparent suppressor of other things and items, see?

So if you dramatize the item, you are obviously wrong and if you don't dramatize the item, you are obviously wrong, so it gives you two different types of withholds on the same case – the withholds of having dramatized it and the withholds of not having dramatized it. And you'll get the same thing.

In other words, you'll get all of the withholds of a moral man and all of the withholds of not being a moral man all at the same time, see, because it's a nobody wins situation.

Now, the easiest time and the easiest point of departure in the clearing of a pc, the easiest time to start the clearing of a pc, of course, is when the pc is Clear. And then you know all about the case. You've got adequate case records, then, with which to process the pc.

Now, you know how to process the pc. You know what all the terminals were, so what all the types of withholds there would be. You know what all the items were and so you know all the types of items to pursue and you know all about it.

Now, one of the things you want me to do is to give you the whole map of the case as cleared in order to clear the case. Well, the funny part of it is I fool you and I almost do. But you've got to apply this data and this know-how to the case you're auditing at a time when you don't know a blasted thing about the case but the mechanics of Scientology. And that's all you know about this case. All else is variable.

You have the stabilities of knowing about locks, chains of locks, secondaries, chains of secondaries, engrams, chains of engrams, the effect of the lock, of the engram holding down secondaries and secondaries holding down locks and you know that this is plotted against time. You know there's such a thing as the time track. You know there's such a thing as the known part of the mind and the unknown part of the mind.

All right. You know there's such a thing as a thetan. You know the various dynamics, and you know the axioms on which this thetan is operating and you know that – about ARC and the fact that the thetan is in bad shape when he is unable to communicate and he's in good shape when he is *able* to communicate. Not necessarily when he is communicating or not communicating, but is *able* to communicate or able to be, you see, not necessarily when he's being. You know these various things.

You know about be, do and have. You know these various items, see? You know the meter – you know what that's shining up to – and what a session ought to look like and from there on, the sky's the limit, see? You know these basic mechanics.

Now, you got a withhold system which will pull these withholds which are preventing the pc from communicating broadly. But what are the withholds? What chains do they form up? How do they associate in the pc's mind? That's your bicycle seat. See what I mean?

And after you've been prepchecking for a little while, you'll find out that when you give the pc a good controlled session that is going right down the groove of something the pc can talk about because it is on the line and channel of a chain of *withholds* the pc can talk to you about, that are real to the pc as withholds, you'll find out that if you keep the pc's attention directed and you make the pc go on and look and you carry right straight on through at a good heavy controlled session with the pc talking the whole time – I'm talking about the type of session I've been giving on demonstration on Prepchecking; no more witty or arduous than that, but very controlled if you noticed – you find out the pc at the end of the session gets his goals and gains. He makes his goals and he gets gains.

And when you give a sloppy, stupid session and you ride the bicycle all over the town and wind up on the cathedral roof without the least clue of how anybody got there at all and then just leave the pc standing there while you go home to supper, and then never find out where you left the pc thereafter, you're not going to get any goals and gains over on that right-hand channel. It's a question of course plotting, steering, understanding and so forth.

And I'm telling you very frankly the easiest point of departure for Prepchecking is, of course, naturally, when the person is Clear. That's the easiest point of departure. Then you know all the 3D terminals that have given him all the oddball withholds that he has. You know the whole composition of his bank. You know every incident on his time track that is worth knowing. You know what has been suppressing his second dynamic, his first dynamic, his third dynamic and why he and God are on swearing terms.

You know all about these things and therefore you could run a perfect case. But of course, at that stage, the person doesn't need any auditing, so the information is of no value. [laughs] That's the sort of thing you pick up *en route*.

Well, now, how *en route* can you get in a Prepcheck? I'll say that if you audited a pc for four or five hours without finding anything about where you were going, there was something wrong with the way you were attacking the case. So this is always a test of whether or not you are doing an accurate job of riding the bicycle. If every few hours – and I don't mean just every five hours – but every few hours you fail to know more about what makes this case tick, then you must be riding a tricycle or a velocipede, but you're sure not riding a bicycle. You understand what I mean?

If you can look back over the last session or two and find out – know pretty well where this pc lives and get some kind of an idea and anticipation of where this pc is going next – some kind of a prediction factor with regard to the pc, in other words – a higher understanding of the pc, let me put it that way, why this pc got that way, what made this pc that way, how come (the how-come factors, call them those) why, you're probably prepchecking well. Regardless of his goals and gains – that's the other test, of the pc making his goals and getting gains. That's your primary test, of course. But this other one is a test as far as you're concerned as the auditor.

And you sort of know what makes this pc tick. You get a better idea of which way this is going. And you got a better grasp of it. And not only of the pc, but a little bit better grasp of the human mind; a little bit better reality. That applies to me, too, see. I'm not saying a student should do that, you know. Why, man, you must be prepchecking like a wizard.

Now if you're getting his goals and gains and you're understanding the pc better and you're knowing a little bit more about the human mind, wow! See, I mean, gee-whiz. That would be your point of expectancy. That's what you would expect out of a Prepcheck activity. Pc's getting his goals and gains and you understand this pc better and you got a prediction about where this pc's going, you know. I mean, what this pc's done. You understand this better – what he – how he hangs together better. And you understand the human mind a bit better, too, just through having audited this pc. Man, you've just made it, see? And that's an excellent little yardstick by – of finding out whether or not your Prepchecking is pretty darn good.

And if your Prepchecking is pretty doggone good, then all of those things will be true. If your prepchecking is bad, it might first mean that your auditing stinks. You know, just as the matter of an auditor, you know, not auditing the pc, you might be auditing a chair. But this wouldn't be any small thing. This would be not having a clue about what an E-Meter read was. This would be not having a clue, you see, about how to run a session, having total intolerance of sitting there just being a complete *buaaaaah*. You know, first week, co-audit type auditor.

Yeah, well, that could be all wrong, you see and you couldn't prepcheck. But then there's this other zone and area. If you know how to ride this bicycle, why, all these other things will be true.

There'd be two areas wrong, you see, just the person couldn't audit at all. And the next – they can audit all right, but they can't prepcheck. Prepchecking is a specialized activity. And if they can prepcheck, then this is what they should expect out of the pc. They should just expect those things. Pc making his goals, making some additional gains. The auditor understands the pc better, what the pc has done and been, what makes the pc that way and a better understanding of the human mind.

And if you've got all those things taped, my, my, my, are you prepchecking. Wow, wow, wow. Good test. Good yardstick, huh?

You've possibly – I realize in saying that, you possibly for a long time may have been expecting the pc to suddenly grow wings or something if you were prepchecking well. Just as a pc will sometimes give you outrageous goals when he wants to get even with you, so does an auditor sometimes get even with himself by setting outrageous session goals of what he's going to accomplish in this session.

Well, if you can just relax to a point of accomplishing what I've just told you, you'll make Clears, see? You'll go on all the way up there because you won't be straining it and be very relaxed.

Now, there's one other test on Prepchecking. If you all of a sudden think Prepchecking is very easy and you're very happy to go on prepchecking people, then you can prepcheck.

And if you think Prepchecking is very arduous, then you probably can't prepcheck. Because it's odd, but Prepchecking is probably the easiest auditing which you ever did if you've really got the knack of it.

My goodness, it's just a yawn and a stretch for the auditor. There's just nothing to it because when he gets the pc running on a chain that's working, it's just pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. The pc won't do anything else. It isn't a question of trying to get the pc to talk to you. There aren't any problems in this if you're doing it right. The pc will talk to you. And it's just *bong-bong-bong*. And you suddenly get the impression – there is a ride the bicycle sensation, you know? Just as you one day went sailing along the level, you know, "Wheeee! How come I thought this was hard, you know?" You get the same point in Prepchecking. That it feels just as exhilarated and just as easy as that.

It isn't quite like any other auditing you've ever done. It is just a little different. It's just a little bit different because it delivers wins into your hand per unit of time faster than any other auditing I've ever seen and it is easier in that it gives the auditor no strain.

And you can run rougher cases with it with wins. All of these things are true of Prepchecking. When you can do it well, why, you kind of feel like you've got it surrounded and made. And of course, to be able to do it well is worthwhile in accomplishment. And I notice that all but four students on their last Prepcheck session did it without a blunder. Got the chain, got the What questions, had the pc rolling just right on down the chain. Isn't that interesting?

So it must be that you can learn it. It must be doable. Partially due to demonstrations which you've been getting, as I'm sure this is a speed up factor in training – and due to the system itself and also due, of course, to the good instruction you've been getting and so forth and the good tips you've been getting, I've never seen anything catch on faster than Prepchecking. It apparently is not very hard to ride the bicycle and the criterion then is how fancy can you get with this bicycle.

So most of you, the largest majority of you, are in the interesting state this moment of how fancy can you get in riding this bicycle – and not whether or not can you ride the bicycle. As I say there are only about four of you are having any difficulty with it at all and that difficulty was relatively minor.

So it is a teachable process and it's a winnable process. That's why I recommend it to you very heavily.

Thank you.

AUDITOR'S CODE

A lecture given on 27 February 1962

Thank you.

Once upon a time there were three bears. No, that's this time of evening. [laughter, laughs]

All right. Second lecture. February 27, AD 12. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Now, the – I want to talk to you about the basic activities of an auditor and call your attention to the standard procedures which have been invariable over a long period of time. And the first of those is the Auditor's Code. That is an invariable and it is a tool of the auditor. And it's had two or three additions to it over a period of many, many years; and you already know the additions. You think of them as the Auditor's Code, but I'm just saying it came out in its basic form, and it's been with us more or less ever since with just these few additions.

Now, why did the Auditor's Code come out? Why? It was to make auditing possible. If the Auditor's Code is violated, auditing becomes impossible. So it is a practical tool, and all of Scientology is built on practicalities. It has its own branch of theoretical gee-whizzes, of "What do you know ..." "What do you think might..." "Well, perhaps," and "Gee-whiz, if..." "Wouldn't it be very interesting ..." etc. See? It has its own branch of speculation – any zone of knowledge has. But it has a very, very heavy zone of practicality. And its foundations are the foundations of practicality, not the foundations of theory.

The Auditor's Code was compiled in Wichita, Kansas, in 1951 after a survey of pcs who had gone wrong in being audited in the Central Organization in Wichita. And I traced back each of these cases and found the elements which had caused a difficulty in auditing the case.

And I think it's the first twelve items, in the same numerical order as they exist today, were the results of that rather arduous survey. And those things are quite factual.

They come in little groups. The two shuns. And I found out that invalidation and evaluation, wow, wow! Oh, man. You run either one of those in on the pc, or the pc runs either one of those into a session – as you're learning in 3D Criss Cross you have to keep them cleaned up – the net result was no auditing gain. Actually, not as mild as no auditing gain, but actually a slump. The case was worse off. Got that? That was a slump.

Now, the matter of eating breakfast sounds like a funny thing to have in an Auditor's Code but let me tell you something about that. Every case that has ever spun in under auditing – (quote) (unquote) "auditing" – in addition to other things has had as a constant nothing to eat and no sleep. Those two are also present whatever else happened. And that's every case that ever spun.

And you get somebody there who just staggered out of an institution someplace and sat down. They were going to make progress all the way along the line and then all of a sudden you'll find that they are spinning. You trace back and find immediately preceding this that they stopped sleeping and stopped eating.

Now, all of these things, all of these factors of the Code – I'm not trying to cover them one by one – are empirical. That is to say they are the benefit of observation and the coordination of data, and they are there simply because they are practical.

The first theoretical code had greater appeal, and it was something on the order of when knighthood was in flower. Had greater appeal but it was not the practical code. But I still sort of favor that earlier code. I think that that's got some good beef to it. Every once in a while I feel like shoving that at somebody because one of its primary points was the auditor should be courageous.

Audience: Yeah. Yes.

And you just never let an auditor chicken out. Never. But anyway, these are just the practical aspects of things.

Now, we go into such a thing as the Axioms. They are very, very carefully examined over a long period of time. And the first Dianetic Axioms were written during the year 1951, and you will find that they're quite practical as auditing axioms. Not enough attention is given to those first Dianetic Axioms – those and the Prelogics. The Logics are very interesting as a synthesis of all education. The basic common denominators of all education can be found in the Logics.

But there you're on theoretical material. In the Axioms of Scientology, you have a condensation and a recapitulation of all of those early Axioms and Logics boiled down to a more practical, more fundamental, more forthright list. In other words, those fifty-five original Axioms and so forth of Scientology are more or less observed. They're pretty well observed. They are observed from the more theoretical Dianetic Axioms.

Now, as far as the mind itself and its constituency as covered in Book One, do you know there is hardly a thing you're doing right this minute that isn't somehow touched on or handled or mentioned in Book One – which is very fantastic, see? That's written the first part of 1950. That's very interesting.

And you have some data which was in *The Original Thesis*, 1947 – more practically brought up to date; that thing was brought up to date as of 1950 – 49, which is the present version. There's some data in there which is very, very applicable to auditing and has become very strong and more recently has not been mentioned. But I've mentioned it on this course several times but I'll give you a little synthesis of this.

The auditor as a thetan plus the pc as a thetan is greater than the pc's reactive mind. The pc as a thetan is less than the pc's reactive mind. The auditor plus the reactive mind is certainly greater than the pc as a thetan. Do you see how the equation works out? In other words, the auditor has got to work with the pc in order to overcome the pc's reactive mind. And the auditor cannot condemn the pc and expect to have the pc handle his reactive mind. See, if the auditor takes the pc out of the running as a thetan and as a being, you see – he in-

validates his beingness, you might say – you get no conquering of any reactive mind. You just get an overwhelmed pc.

Now, that set of formulas out of *The Original Thesis*, is what the Auditor's Code is set up to effect. You have the Auditor's Code, you see, because of these other formulas – these little basic formulas. Auditor plus pc, as thetans, greater than pc's reactive mind, see? Auditor plus reactive mind, greater than pc as a thetan, see? In other words, the auditor's validating the pc's reactive mind, you see, and invalidating the pc in some fashion, why, you get all sorts of interesting combinations on how these factors could go out.

Now, if the auditor is a reactive mind, you get all sorts of interesting things. And partially as a sort of a little moral code of auditing, it's a moral-technical code, you avoid all this trouble if you follow the Auditor's Code very thoroughly. But you're entitled to know what you're avoiding. You're avoiding the auditor invalidating the pc as a thetan and beefing up the pc's reactive mind and getting the pc overwhelmed by his own reactive mind. That's all you're – all you're doing. And those rules are laid down as a result of it.

Now, the formation of the reactive mind into circuits or valences – they were considered separate once. There are circuits, machinery and valences. Well, machinery – I could tell you very factually – is I don't know what happened to machinery. I don't know where machinery fits in all this, to tell you the truth, because I've audited pcs that have suddenly looked up and found some of the nicest, brightest, shiniest pieces of mental machinery you ever heard of. They go, "Watch!" you know. They have – sometimes have flywheels, and they have goo-jag-godgets that chump-a-chump, you know, and so on.

And I don't know where machinery fits in unless it's a valence of a machine. In other words, the beingness of a machine. The identity of a machine. The individual has been an engineer for so long that he's the engine, and this leaves a machine called an engine which is a valence. It could be that way, but I haven't inspected this any further.

But a circuit, as far as we're concerned, is a specialized function of a valence. A valence is an identity, but when this identity balls up and acts on its own initiative, it is a totally separate functional identity. And when this – when this valence – well, valence – John Jones, see? John Jones operating without benefit of thetan equals circuit. See, when John Jones is an automatic identity, he's all balled up and functioning, and this is very strange because – Lewis Carroll sort of an approach – " 'e 'adn't any thetan for a number of years," see? "And this is very strange because he hadn't any feet."

Anyway, you've got this kind of a thing. He's been dead now for eightthousand-jillion years so that the planet on which the body is – not only is the graveyard gone, you see, but the planet in which the graveyard stood is gone. And yet we have this John Jones – no thetan, see – but this identity, John Jones, totally functional, still giving the pc orders as to what to do. I think it's quite remarkable. Of course, the pc gave John Jones orders over such a long period of time that you get a reverse flow of John Jones, as a circuit, now giving the pc orders.

Well, it's the stuck flow. You throw baseballs at a wall long enough, and by George, you'll get the idea that the wall is throwing baseballs at you. It's inevitable. Just one way, you see? One way, one way, one way. You'll get a backflow there. Well, the pc at the time he inhabited the character known as John Jones gave nothing but orders to John Jones. Of course,

John Jones was not capable of anything else but receiving orders because he was just a meat body or something like that with a thetan resident in it. And as – the pc as the thetan was saying "Do this," and not articulating it, but you know, sort of "Pick up the fork with the right hand. Cut off a bit of the shredded wheat biscuit. Tilt the spoon," you see? "Hold the spoon level. Be careful not to spill the milk. Turn the wrist. Open the jaw muscles. Close the elbow. Close the mouth – not too far – withdraw the spoon. Don't drivel." [laughter] "Unjoint the elbow. Lower the hand. Tilt the spoon" – and this would be taking one mouthful, you see?

And that happens every morning for a long time, you see, in all of its dubious complexities. And don't think it is peculiar if the fellow gets the idea after a while that John Jones ought to feed him, a thetan. See? He's been giving all the orders that fed John Jones. So he sits there as a thetan – naturally, the valence becomes a circuit which gives him orders about eating. Do you see how the mechanism is? It's a stuck-flow mechanism.

Having proceeded only from the North Pole to the South Pole for seventy years, it is now peculiar if the South Pole doesn't proceed to the North Pole for a while. And that's a circuit.

All right. You're dealing with that with 3D Criss Cross. You're dealing with these things very directly. And everything that makes this life miserable made the life of John Jones miserable, too, probably. See?

You know, you have withholds, and you get in trouble with buying stocks and bonds, and you don't sell them right at the right time, and you should be buying a present for your wife and you're whistling at a blonde, you know? Or you should be thinking about your husband's dinner, and instead of that, why, there's a terrific urge to pick up the phone and call Bill, you see?

And there's as many complexities and withholds and upsets and economics and duresses and familial stand-on-the-heads and antisocialities and games of cops and robbers and so forth, going on, you see, in the lifetime of John Jones, as there has been in this lifetime, see? It was all at earnest, too. It was all at – in fact – perhaps because it's earlier on the track even more earnest, even more sincerely arduous, even more dedicated, even more this than the present lifetime, see?

Well, all of that, you see, has been lived, and there it is packaged as the accumulated engrams, facsimiles and ridges of John Jones, all neatly packaged and no longer parked on the time track, no longer parked but definitely mixed up in present time. It sort of floated free. There was nothing locating any time there anymore, is there? So it can very easily bunch up and float free. Well, just as this lifetime can get into a grouper – which is your black case; the no facsimile case is simply somebody whose lifetime, this present lifetime, has gone into a grouper – so you have a valence going into a grouper and becoming a round black-ball circuit which gives orders and does various things.

The thinkingness of John Jones is restimulated every time a little *bing* of energy hits this black ball, see? And we've got that mechanism covered in Book One. And inside this thing we're going to find, as it pulls apart, all of the pictures and all of the picture phenomena that you find in engrams, secondaries and locks and their chains. All of that phenomena is present in that circuit.

Now, that circuit belongs somewhere on a time track in relationship to other circuits, but if it's part of the Goals Problem Mass, it has totally floated free from its position on the time track and every moment of its time is now time; it's instant time. Hence, your instant read on the E-Meter.

In other words, this stuff is not timed anymore. It is "Now-now." You ask, "Did you blow up a planet?" and you'll get instantaneous crash on the E-Meter, you see? Well, how come he gets an instantaneous crash? He blew a planet up a billion years ago and if you were to ask him to travel to the point where he blew up the planet and back again, it would take several lightyears. So therefore, your E-Meter read would be a several light-year lag. It would be latent by several light-years. [laughter] You see that clearly, don't you?

But it isn't. You say, "Do you – did you blow up that planet?" and you get an *instant* read. Well, that doesn't mean that he's on the planet. That means that the pictures that represent this explosion of the planet and so on are here and now and all time is now time. So of course, you get instant reads on the meter.

Now, that data, plus all the phenomena of matter, energy, space and time, and the association of incidents and the confusions, and one of the earliest axioms there were, which appeared in the book, "Excalibur", about identities and similarities – life is composed of differences, similarities and identities.

In other words, you identify two things or two things are similar, or they are different. And all things become identity and then collapse on this same scale to becoming different when they are just alike, and go on an inversion, and you get the disassociation of the psychotic, and so forth. All that data is, of course, pertinent to everything we're doing right now. We get all time identified with this time and then we get all these identities giving the pc all these orders and dictating all these reflexes and so forth. And by George, you know, just the last few minutes here, I've stated everything you're handling, see? There isn't anything else you're handling.

I had a young fellow one time – I sometimes meet disreputable people who – I have been known to associate with disreputable people and so forth. I've heard afterwards they were disreputable. They never – people never seem very disreputable to me. They always seem like people. And it's always a great shock to me to having spent the afternoon talking with somebody that I am afterwards informed is a wanted murderer. This is supposed to make some difference or another. But it never seems to make much difference to me.

And in talking with disreputable people I have sometimes been given to believe that certain actions were bad. I've been given to believe that certain actions were bad and certain actions were good. I have. They actually believe this. Certain actions are bad; certain actions are good.

But having talked to an awful lot of disreputable people in an awful lot of strange and different areas, I find there's some conflict in their statements. This is often puzzling to me. So that – well, you go to Australia, for instance, and you talk to some of the people in Australia about law and order – and they give you some very different ideas. And you examine the law codes of Australia and they find out – if you examine them very closely – you'll find out that they are calculated to prevent the law from ever reaching anybody, which I think is very laud-

able. They mostly concern themselves – I'm not joking now, you'll find all strung through their laws very odd laws which prevent law from ever being applied. And the laws which they pass are to prevent law from being applied, which I consider quite interesting; not necessarily good or bad, but interesting, see?

And you get that law code, and if you took their law codes and asked them to be passed by as close a cousin as the British Parliament, I think there'd be quite a bit of discussion. I think there'd be questions in the House about some of these laws.

Well, there's little things like you've got to post the whole amount of a suit that you're suing somebody for before you can sue him for it, or something like this. I think that's fascinating, you know? And after you've sued somebody and waited for two years, you could lose the suit and forfeit all of your cash, and so forth. It sounds just about the way guys that were edgy about the law and had had enough of it would act.

And there's very curious things. But as far as their morality is concerned, it's comparable morality unless you get back into the bush, and you start talking to some of the aborigines. And I don't think they'd see eye to eye with the white man's law.

I've had discussion with Blackfoot Indians, for instance, on the subject of law. And I was perfectly open-minded about the subject. You're always – you always are open-minded about things that you couldn't care less about, see. [laughter] And I found out that the Blackfoot Indian has certain fundamentals on the subject of law that we would not completely agree with. We wouldn't agree that these were the best possible laws, and so on. But they always looked very sensible to me.

If you murder a man, you have to support his wife and family from there on out. That's the penalty for murder. Gives you to think, doesn't it, huh? [laughter]

Now, all these conflicts of morality, all of these various counterpoints of morality, of what's good and what's bad and what isn't good and what isn't bad and all the shades of gray in between, give us so many confusions and conflicts of *rightness of conduct* that we can then get people seeking right conduct until they go nuts.

Well, now, how do they do that? Well, you're an Egyptian one lifetime and then you're a Persian and then you're a Greek and then you become a Roman and then you become an Egyptian. And these civilizations are wildly and flagrantly different one to the next, but each one has its standards of rightness of conduct.

So if your rightness of conduct in Egypt is inexorably followed, you would be all right unless that got set up as a now-I'm-supposed-to circuit. Rightness of conduct? We always do the right thing automatically. See, training – social training, see? So that in Egypt, never had to think, you know. Just do the right thing, right then. Spontaneous. *Bang!* That is the thing to do. You all got it, see.

And then we become Persian with an Egyptian circuit. Decision of what to do in any given situation in Persia might be quite different, might be quite different than in Egypt. But we – our rightness of conduct gives us the automatic, now-I'm-supposed-to answer. But in Egypt [Persia], that has to be cancelled out first as the *first* impulse of what we're supposed to do so we can do the *second* impulse, see?

Well, that's all right, but we get to going in Persia just fine, and the warrior paints his face, and so forth. And you talk about makeup, I think that's where makeup came from: the Persian knight, the Persian warrior, and so forth. He's real pretty, you know? And – he looked like a Greek prostitute. [laughter] And they – so we just get along fine there in Persia, see, and we get along dandy and then kick the bucket, and now we've got an Egyptian circuit and a Persian circuit. And we pick up a body in Greece. So now rightness of conduct consists of stopping the Egyptian impulse, stopping the Persian impulse, in order to do the Greek impulse. That's very interesting, isn't it? And then we kick the bucket in Greece and get another body in Per– in Egypt.

Now we've got, first, an Egyptian conduct line that is now a century out of date. It's the moral codes of Ramses II or something, see. And then we've got a Persian one and now we've got a Greek one and now we've got a new Egyptian one. Well, that new Egyptian one, that's real easy, isn't it, because we're in the most restimulative country, except we're very old-fashioned in our courtesy at first.

Ah, but wait a minute. While we were being a Persian, while we were being a Greek, we stopped all the early Egyptian impulses, so rightness of conduct is stopping an Egyptian impulse. So rightness of conduct in Egypt now is being antisocial. Isn't it?

Now we're antisocial, you see, and the way to act properly like an Egyptian is to stop an Egyptian impulse. And about this time we sit down and wonder why we don't feel free. [laughter] And why we feel a little bit confused by our environments. And why we don't think instantly. And why our power of decision seems to be a little bit slow. And why we comm lag before we speak and other such mechanisms.

Well, now all this would be all right if rightness of conduct were given very light weight. See, if we had very little weight attached to rightness of conduct, you know? I mean, if we had individuality and some people acted one way and some people acted the other way, and there was nobody putting any pressure on it.

So having worn out numerous bodies in this Mediterranean circuit, we arrive in England in Puritan times, during the time, well, let's make it worse – the Roundheads – the time of the Roundheads, you see, where an insistence on rightness of conduct is the exclamation point of the day. Now we get some real good ones laid in. The penalty for unrighteous conduct is so fantastically huge that we go in danger of our lives daily. And we're coping at the same time with all these other circuits that tell us what rightness of conduct is. And some of those just as forceful, practically, as the Puritan one.

So we think, "Well, you know, I think the best idea – I tell you, Bill – I think there's a solution to all this. Let's just forget the whole damn thing. Let's just bury all these things and let's not pay any attention to them and let's get them safely out of sight and tucked under the chair and totally not-ised. And we'll say we only live *once*. And that will solve the whole thing" – except, of course, nightmares and the impulse of rightness of conduct in Egypt and all these other rightnesses of conduct coming up automatically as a dictation. Because now they're from a hidden source, we don't know the source from which these orders are coming, we can no longer stop them because we don't know from which they emanate and we go around with ideas racking around in our heads. And we feel peculiar, to say the least.

Now, if it was just rightness of conduct that we were worried about, that would have been all right. But rightness of conduct is usually enforced by somatics. And the somatic is most intimately connected in mental phenomena with rightness and wrongness of conduct – punishment.

If we drive a car correctly, we seldom get somatics. And if we drive it incorrectly, we are liable to get somatics, as one of our students can represent. That's just a matter of rightness of conduct, isn't it? It all goes under the heading of measurement and estimation of force, doesn't it? And correctness of action and all of these other things go along with it.

And if we don't do these things, we get the idea of punishment, from – and punishment from just the punishment of the physical universe for incorrectly estimating direction and effort. And it's no wonder that children spank their parents when they get into their teens, for having been spanked all during their childhood. We get a reactivity going here of magnitude. Punishment. Punishment. Make them guilty for punishing, and just punishing. And punishing to be punishing and punishment just to make people guilty so that they will have right conduct and the right conduct becomes punishing. So rightness of conduct becomes sadism and masochism. Rightness of conduct becomes, inevitably, an enforced conduct. We enforce rightness of conduct with pain and deprivation and that sort of thing. It becomes a considerable discipline.

So these various valences and circuits, because they are founded on rightness of conduct, enforce rightness of conduct on the pc. Because, of course, they are formed by pain and collision, they, of course, enforce with pain and collision. So every time we collide with one of these things, we get a somatic. That's all there is, basically, to the somatic phenomena.

And we try to run them out and we get somatics. And the somatics appear to be so formidable before we actually contact them – they appear to be so formidable – that we'd better not approach the valence or touch it or interfere with it. And of course, if we mustn't touch it or interfere with it while carrying it all the time, it just gives us – the total order flow comes straight from it. You would be surprised at the command value of valence.

If you want to witness this sometimes, get the list that you're making up in 3D Criss Cross, just note carefully what the pc is doing, saying and what the pc is thinking in the few minutes just before you nail the item. At that time you will have it in its highest level of res-stimulation. Its command value will be extreme at those few minutes. And then, of course, when it's found and identified, its command value drops off. But if it's also a very unsafe thing that had tremendous withholds in its own lifetime and tends to keep dropping out of the pc's sight so he keeps asking you, "What – what was that one I just gave you? What was that item we checked out yesterday? Oh, yes, buzz bomb. Yeah. Thank you. Um – what was it again? Oh, thank you." In other words, it's unsafe to reveal, and it keeps bobbing out of sight and into sight and out of sight. The pc will dramatize that one occasionally or feel he is.

Now, just that it's been put into view desensitizes it so he really can't capably dramatize it now. He doesn't ever do a good job of dramatizing one that's been brought to view, but he can still feel the impulses and feel upset about having the impulses. And that makes him feel very odd.

He actually isn't in any danger of suddenly going and blowing up the ... One of our dear students here – it very much looked like one of our classmates went around here for some time with the horrible thought in mind all the time how lovely it would be to blow up the East Grinstead bell tower. It was just to the shape and size that it just invited being blown up. And she'd regard that with some appetite every day, but know that she weren't really supposed to do it. Very appetizing. And that was on a terminal that was bobbing in and out and was being run at the particular time. And of course, it would come into heavy dramatization.

If you actually operate with a 3D Criss Cross terminal and you push this 3D Criss Cross terminal a bit under auditing and get it into a higher degree of restim and it's a long, strong one, the pc will go around all the time questioning the rightness of his conduct, wondering whether or not it isn't the conduct of this terminal. And he will do the peculiar thing of equating all of his most normal activities into the terminal, see?

It doesn't matter what the terminal is. He'll equate, "Well, that is the way, that is the way a vicious thief would eat. That's for sure." He suddenly catches himself eating, you know. [laughter] "Ha-ha... Nobody noticed. Close one."

He feels himself on the borderline of being found out in any given moment of the day or night. It's very funny, but it's sometimes, over a period of three or four days – when one of these things is being audited particularly, and continuously agitated and so on – how the pc passes through the strata of being it and then not being it and then deciding at length that he doesn't have to be it or obey it. These are all quite interesting as phenomena.

Of course, these are – 3D Criss Cross items are the items, the identities and the beingnesses which the person has actually been. Don't call them so much a beingness as an identity. And they are a package of conduct. They are a package of training patterns, and so forth, which are residual from that particular life. And oddly enough, every facsimile that they gathered in that life is still in that bundle. And you start taking that bundle apart, it looks like a stage magician producing cards from behind his back, you know. Here's a pack, you see, and here's a pack. And here's another pack. And then he reaches over into the girl's bodice and brings out another pack, you know? And here are these pictures, pictures, pictures, incidents, and so forth; that sort of thing coming up. And at first the rather disgusting thing is you really like to see the pictures, but they are a kind of a smudgy piece of charcoal with a white fringe all representing nothing really very tangible.

And when you try to audit them, why, they go in and out, and they don't go – they aren't in focus, and they're all improper, and if you really could see them, it would be so much better. And then you find out that they're laid in with terrific cold. There's enormous cold. A bad time to run 3D is during a wintertime. [laughter] That's a poor time to run 3D because one has a lot of chills that come off of this thing.

And it's very funny, sometimes you'll be running 3D, a pc who has been cold all his or her life has never realized they've been cold all his or her life until the cold wave suddenly departs. And they feel much changed now, and they're not quite sure what's changed. Actually, they were right resident in the middle of the iceberg, you see, because these black masses are drained of their heat energy factors. They don't have too much heat left in them although waves of heat and fever still come out of them. They're dominantly cold, occasionally warm,

occasionally even hot, occasionally even fevered, but those are just residuals. They're like burned cinders.

"I burn my candle at both ends. Some say it isn't nice, but, oh, my foes, and oh, my friends, it makes a lovely light," or something like that, whatever the poem was. Because they sure burned that life up. And that's the way the thing kind of sticks on the time track, you know? Charred. And when you get into it it's real cold.

Did you ever realize that the last time you died you probably didn't stay on Earth. You probably went out into the ionosphere and did one of these transorbital migrations that they're doing lately from the left to the right. Very often pcs yo-yo – I mean people yo-yo out into the outer dark. And it's cold out there. And they very often will go out there and get their whole track collapsed. And then they say they've been brainwashed or something of the sort. There's a lot of phenomena connected with this.

But all I'm stressing at the present moment is these are simply the items and the phenomena with which we are operating.

Now, every one of these bundles, a lifetime or a whole cycle, is composed of pictures in greater or lesser state of decay. And here are all these pictures and when you take one of these things apart, you start running into pictures. But because the pictures are already burned out and deteriorated to a marked degree, they sometimes don't show up as good pictures at all. And a pc is very, very disappointed sometimes. He runs into his life as the custodian of the bathing beauties or something like that and he thinks he's got a nice picture file in there, and he keeps digging for this picture file. Well, hell, he wore it out years ago, you know? In fact, he wore it out in that lifetime.

And he gets into a condition of where the item itself was scarce so he made a picture of it. And then, of course, because he didn't have the item but he did have the picture, the picture itself became scarce and therefore became very valuable and can become so scarce and so valuable that he can't have it at all. And that is the condition in which most of these circuits and valences are.

So these pictures show up. At the same time the pc wants them and has to have them, the pc won't have anything to do with them and can't have them. So you have a no-havingness of the pictures and views. So he uses the picture, he's dependent on the picture to orient himself and tell you what he is doing and he can't get the picture clearly to tell you what he is doing and so orient himself and tell you what he is doing, so he remains in a state of God-'elp-us.

Now, as you remedy his havingness and bring these things back and prepcheck it out of existence and get the withholds off of it, and get his overts off basically because a person's – a person's havingness deteriorates to the degree that he commits overts. This is the other part of the puzzle, is the overt-motivator sequence. And the overt-motivator sequence consists of when the individual has done something to something, he can then receive a similar action from the thing he has done it to. It's as elementary as that.

You cannot be run over by an automobile till you've run over somebody with an automobile. I mean, it's as positive as that. You cannot be hooked by a wild boar until you've gone

around hooking some wild boars, see. A girl can't mess you up until you have messed up a girl. This is something that a lot of fellows overlook.

Now, if it went quantitatively one for one, like the law of Hammurabi, God-'elp-us all because I was counting up the number of lifetimes I would have to live for – just to counter-balance the overts of World War II, see? I was counting them up, so on. Well, it seemed like an awful lot of nonsense about the thing one way or the other.

So it actually isn't a one for one quantity proposition. It's the sensibility of having done something. Because when you've done something to something, you have cut your havingness down. And the elementary sense of all O/W is just based on that.

You get individuated to the point where "It's their havingness and my havingness. And therefore, I can protect my havingness by destroying their havingness." And we totally overlook the fact that it's all your havingness.

Well, we've got – a little boy has four lead soldiers, and you have four lead soldiers. So in order to protect your lead soldiers, you teach him not to destroy your lead soldiers by destroying one of his lead soldiers. You now have seven lead soldiers. See? So then, because you've destroyed one of his lead soldiers, he's going to destroy one of your lead soldiers. You now have six lead soldiers. So to discourage any further incursions of him upon your lead soldiers, you destroy another one of his lead soldiers. You now have five lead soldiers. But because you have done this, he gets even with you by destroying one of your lead soldiers. You now have four lead soldiers. Two are yours and two are his.

Now, because you've both become that upset with each other you have a hell of a fight and break up the remaining lead soldiers. You now have *no* lead soldiers. See, the misnomer of havingness is personal ownership.

I have been up above a lot of real estate that has been owned by a lot of people. But while I've been up above this real estate looking at this real estate, let me assure you it belonged to nobody but me. I think you'll find that's the case in all cases: that you own that which you can perceive as far as havingness is concerned. And this is degraded down to the idea that you can only own that which you personally can fully use. Of course, if you just walked on some of this real estate you're looking at, they'd set the dogs on you. You're not supposed to use that item.

So freedom of use is the final idea of havingness to an awful lot of people whereby it isn't really the idea of havingness at all.

See what that is? If somebody debars you the use of something, and you say you don't have that thing. You can look at it, but you mustn't touch it. You mustn't use it. You mustn't do this. A lot of nonsense is entered in onto like this. That's why the communists, the socialists, and so forth, can make such large windrows on society, because he's talking on a mockery harmonic of what is basically true, is nobody owns nothing. See?

All ideas of ownership are postulated ownerships. They're not actual ownerships except those things which one owns by the right of having created them. And, therefore, some people fall back on creativeness as the only way of life because it's the only possible method of declared ownership. Do you see that?

"That's mine, I made it," which is unanswerable. But what they neglect to point out is what the other fellow made is theirs, too.

Now, the commie gets down into the point of, "Everything you made is mine." It belongs to – then they don't even own it. It finally belongs to the state. Everything belongs to the state and there is no thetan called the state so they got it taped. Anyway, that's a lower mockery, community property is a lower mockery of what is actually a fact.

Now, I don't even know that you own everything you create, see? You can continue responsibility for the things you create actually, without owning them, strangely enough.

Now, here's your problem in a nutshell in processing a pc, is to understand what fundamentals are important and what are not fundamentals – what things are not fundamentals.

Don't make the mistake of considering all data equally important. It is not. Sketchily it is true, but I have nevertheless touched on, in just the last hour, every important item that you are handling in Prepchecking and 3D Criss Cross and the mind.

I have mentioned these things and actually their behavior and their role and relationship in modern processing. And these are the important items there are. They're all developed items. You handle just those items.

Now, if we say that it's equally important across the boards, from one end of the scale to the other end of the scale, that the pc must not smoke cigarettes during the session and the auditor must use the Auditor's Code, we have approached most philosophic idiocies.

And you'll find out people will come along, and they will tell you, "But these truths of Scientology that you say, they have appeared in other philosophies." That's true, too. That's absolutely true. They have occasionally appeared in other philosophies. By the way, the enormous majority of them have not. But some of them have, see?

And you sa – if you wanted to be very cruel and shatter this person in their tracks, just say, "Well, show me the book." And they will show you the book, and they will look it up and they will find the line and they show you this very proudly. This book usually is about a foot and a half thick, you see, and so on. And you say, "All right. Now where's that line?"

And they say, "Well, look here. 'Man is basically a soul, and all of his beingness is contained in his soul.'"

See, they show you a piece of philosophy like that. You say – they say, "Well, there's a thetan."

You say, "Now read the next line."

And they read the next line, and they say, "And every man should be good to his mother."

You say, "Go ahead and read the next line."

"For the finest role of the being is making a family of which he can be proud."

And you say, "Where's the notation by the author that only that top paragraph has value?"

This slaughters them. They finally get it through their heads that, yeah, there's a piece of philosophy there, but it just happened that nobody had marked out whether it was important or unimportant.

And the importance of a datum in relationship to other data is the sole criteria of the value of the datum. You can utter truths and idiocies consecutively for hours, and some will look upon you as wise, but others would say you're only pretty confused.

Now, there's this story about fifty-five thousand monkeys or something like that could write for fifty thousand years on fifty thousand typewriters – I don't know. Some typewriter company must have put this out – [laughter] and they'd write all the books ever written. Well, I think that's very interesting. It's very interesting.

But I know one book they wouldn't write. And that'd be *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*. [laughter] They couldn't write that without finding out what they were doing.

Anyway, it's the importance of the datum. And one of the things you must learn in all of your activities on study and so forth is the relative importance of what you are learning. How is this important to a session? How is this important to a pc? How is this related to the final goal of getting something done?

You could just memorize all of these things as just strings of words. And that's a valuable action, too. You would be considered learned if you did that. Yes, you could become very learned and still be as dumb as an ox.

If you never related any of your learning to any activity or evaluated any of the things you had learned, where would you be? You would merely become learned. And it is not enough to be learned. There have been lots of learned men. I have seen them neglected and thrown overboard and dropped in rivers along with unlearned men. In fact, sometimes a little quicker.

But to be wise, to actually be wise, you have to be able to relate data to activities and actions and evaluate them for their own sake and their relative importance to other data.

You can't go through a training manual and read the number of pints of water carried on a route march as being relatively important with the fact that you should always salute subalterns. These data are not of comparable importance. And yet you will find that most people tend to make data of a monotone value. Well, beware of data of a monotone value.

If you think of the hundreds of thousands of facts that have been developed in Dianetics and Scientology – the hundreds of thousands of them, because they actually exist and much of that data, almost all of it, is brand-new in the field of the mind – if you think of that vast body of data and then think that I was able to sit here in the course of an hour and give you a summation of the data that you're handling in processing, then it must be true that some of this data has greater importance than other of this data. And that's a basic role in study: To find out what you're studying and how it relates to what you're doing or intend to do. And you have to make that bridge, too.

Because in auditing you haven't time to think of a hundred thousand data. But if you know very well the basic and fundamental data that you are addressing, the basic and fundamental things which you are handling in the auditing session, you don't become confused at all. You can make very, very wise and smart decisions with regard to the pc. You know exactly what you're doing with regard to the pc. You can wade right into this one left and right. Why? Because you're handling only the important data. You're not handling the valueless and the unimportant and the merely interesting data. You're handling what has to be handled.

So it's not enough to know data. You must know the data's use and where it belongs and how it fits together and how it aligns with what you're doing and what you intend to do.

And I'd advise you when you're studying to try to align what you are studying with whether or not – with how it applies to a pc that you will be auditing, and how relatively important it is to pay attention to it in the pc. And if you ask the question of any data – of any datum as to whether or not it would expedite an auditing session, then you will quickly and rapidly align what you should be handling in an auditing session. And you suddenly will realize what you should be handling in an auditing session and you will cease to make any mistakes with regard to it. And you'll cease to be adrift with regard to pcs. Okay?

Thank you.

Model Session, Part I

A lecture given on 1 March 1962

Thank you.

Well, I'm glad to see you're so rested tonight. [laughter] I really am very happy to see that. But why are you so pale? I doubt it's the light.

All right. This is ...

Audience: One March.

One Mar. AD 12, the month of bad auditing. [laughter]

All right. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

I'm going to talk to you tonight about Model Session.* The genus of Model Session came about because auditors were varying patter to a point where a session was hardly distinguishable as a session from one to the next, and because, frankly, as early as 1954, I began to notice that Scientologists were quarreling between themselves as to what was the right way to go about a session.

I say this advisedly because actually, practically, fisticuffs and ARC breaks, and so forth, "You didn't run this session right," you see? And "Here you should say so-and-so."

We know now this was because he had missed a withhold. [laughter] But it became evident very early that a Model Session was necessary. However, the session sort of evolved and over a long period of time, why, a great deal of patter and so forth was used very variable. And the genus of Model Session itself very precisely was a discovery that if all sessions were on the same pattern, then subsequent sessions tended to run out earlier sessions.

And the value of this is not to be gainsaid. You have an auditing session today and if you get the same wording in an auditing session tomorrow and the next day and the next day, just by duplication, you get a predictability on the part of the pc because duplication is taking place and auditing becomes a better communication thereby.

Now, I do not pretend that Model Session in its present form is either perfect English or perfect form or anything else, but it is a usable form. It is acceptable and it's been agreed upon.

* *Editor's Note:* the Model Session LRH described in this lecture was from HCOB 21 December 1961. This HCOB was later cancelled. The full data on the points of Model Session are given in the lecture. The current HCOBs on Model Session are in the Technical Bulletin Volumes.

Recently the rudiments entered in much more heavily than previously, and the value of rudiments became extreme at the same moment that the first auditor had difficulty finding goals and terminals and going down lists.

And it was discovered that some people just couldn't have anything like a session unless the rudiments were in. As a result the need of rudiments became, well, just they were the difference between auditing and no auditing.

Of course, rudiments are quite early, but in its – 1955 – but in its present form these rudiments are less than four, five months old. And its present form has even been refined even a little bit further beyond your Model Session script – one end rudiment has been changed. But this is all in the line of evolution, and this end rudiments are your newest and they came about because assessments were not occurring in numerous sessions because pcs were doing peculiar things with the auditing session and that's where you get the end rudiments.

So Model Session is actually tailored against clearing. It is not so much tailored against Prepchecking or something like that. Beginning and end rudiments in Prepchecking might occasionally even get in your road, but they will never get in your road in actual assessment. They are *vital* in assessment. They are not quite so vital in Sec Checking, old Sec Checking and present time Prepchecking. They're not quite as vital as that.

Prepchecking, of course, takes up an awful lot of the things which are found in the rudiments. And as a result, there can become – come into being a confusion between Prepchecking and rudiments, and rudiments can actually throw the session.

The pc can use rudiments to throw the session on the auditor. All he has to do is have a rudiment out and his Prepchecking is parked for the day providing you use any form of O/W to resolve any of the rudiments. If you use any O/W of any kind whatsoever on any of the rudiments, regardless, you are instantly and at once in trouble on Prepchecking.

In other words, the preclear can throw the session over into a new channel of withholds while you are sitting there with 0_A, 1, 1_A, 1_B, 1_C, 1_D, 1_E, 1_F, 0_B, [laughter] 1, 1_A, 1_B, 1_C, and the pc comes in and all – your first chain had to do exclusively with candy and overts with candy or something of the sort. And your second chain that came off of this was overts against bathtubs. And your 0_A, your 0_B are very, very comfortably running on candy, and it went over to bathtubs in some peculiar fashion, and that connected up on glorious short circuits, and the result of this – the pc comes into session, and he has a present time problem on the subject of automobiles.

So you get a present time problem on the subject of automobiles, you use any withhold of any kind whatsoever to resolve this, and you are now over onto, whether you have put it down in that form or not, 0_C – And you're not going to see, during that session, any of your 0_A or any of your 0_B. You won't see any of those 1 questions at all. You have been derailed. That has happened several times, and it is a frailty.

That is why I tell you that rudiments can get in your road in a Model Session during Prepchecking, but only if you use any form of withholds to get your rudiments in.

Now, you possibly could use withholds to get the rudiments in on 3D Criss Cross or a clearing routine because you're not doing withholds in the body of the session, and so there is nothing to be thrown. So it requires two different looks at rudiments.

But until you have gotten into trouble with this, you won't appreciate how agonizing the trouble can be, you see? You had a chain on candy, just to be ridiculous, and a chain on bathtubs, to be more ridiculous, and the pc came in with a chain that he was all ready to launch all on his own volition, and because he sits down and tells you he has a present time problem against – with automobiles, you now are tempted to say well, what automobile have you withheld from whom, you see? And whether you've stated it or not, you are right there on a third channel. You've got two live and you've got a third one going now. And you're not going to get off that third one in that session. Why aren't you? Because you already fouled up the session, see?

Your disobedience of the Auditor's Code – you're running a new process without flattening the old. So it's too many processes. You see?

So therefore, there's different ways that rudiments are used. Basically, rudiments are vital to a session. They get a pc in-session. They will hold him in-session. They will keep your needle from suddenly springing up on oddball othernesses. They will keep ARC breaks out of the way. They have a lot of value but at the same time, particularly in Prepchecking, they can also throw the pc out of session just as fast as they can throw the pc into session.

Pc comes in. He's all ready to get off withhold A, B, C, D. He's figured it all out. He thought it up in his sleep during the night and he's all ready to sit there and say, "Well, I've just realized that I killed the girl."

See, he's all set to say this, so you say, "Well, are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

And he says, "Well, I'm all *mmmmmmm-mmmmmmm*. Well, yeah. I can talk to you about the difficulties. Uh ..."

And you say, "Well, how's your havingness?"

And he says, "What, ah, well, it's all right, but you see, this *girl*, I mean ah, that..."

And you say, "Well, all right. Are you withholding anything?"

"Well, that's what I'm trying to tell you. I'm not withholding anything, you see, because I – I want to tell you about this girl."

"Well, do you have a present time problem?" He says, "God, yes! Trying to tell you what the hell this withhold is, you *idiot!*"

So the rudiments formed an ARC break.

In other words, the rudiments *created* an ARC break. See, rudiments can be used as a method of preventing the pc from communicating with the auditor. Do you see that? And an ARC break is only a prevention of communication by the pc from his viewpoint. Do you see then how rudiments can get in your road? Well, they definitely can get in your road, so therefore this is a matter of judgment.

The pc comes in, he's giving you all the answers to the Prepcheck questions you were asking him yesterday. Well, for heaven's sake, start the session and get the answers! Don't form and establish an ARC break. In-sessionness is something that has to be humanly detected. The E-Meter will do everything else for you but tell you whether or not the pc is in-session or not.

It will tell you the pc is in-session if you check the rudiments and find them all clear. But the process of checking the rudiments can establish an ARC break that will make all the rudiments unclear providing the pc is thoroughly in-session, interested in his own case, eager to talk to the auditor, quivering to get on with this situation.

Yes, your rudiments could all check out clear but you've established an ARC break. Why? You prevented the pc from talking to the auditor. Do you see this? The E-Meter will tell you everything then at a glance except one thing: whether or not the pc is in-session. Because you cannot use the E-Meter to find this out, for two reasons. The process of finding it out can throw the pc out of session wildly if the pc is eagerly in-session, and on the other side of it the E-Meter will not register that second point.

There's two points that aren't in *E-Meter Essentials*. And point one is the data on instant read. You only pick up instant reads for items and out-rudiments and that sort of thing. Only pay attention to instant reads, you know. The read right now. Don't bother with latent reads. You see me in demonstrations using latent reads to help the pc.

When his mind passes the charge, I can call it to attention – I'm not hounding him trying to get him to say something, but I call it to his attention as it goes by the charge on a latent read. "Hey! What was that?" See?

He's looking for something. That's only when the pc is sitting there thinking, "*Wha – wha – wha – wha – what is it?*" He's looking, you know, and he's looking, and he's got the garbage can turned over, and he's searching through the contents, you know, and so on. And the E-Meter goes *flick*, and you say, "What's that?"

"Well – I – oh – that. Oh, well, I just ..."

"That," you see.

And he goes over and he looks at it and tells you what it is, and "Oh, well, that is important isn't it?" You see? The E-Meter can find out before he does.

You don't use that to hound him with, see? You haven't seen me hounding anybody with this. But you see me helping somebody out. That thought or that thing you just looked at is important is what I'm saying to him. Now, let's have another look at it. Otherwise, it's all instant read. And the other thing – and actually that isn't for detecting anything, you see. That's just helping the pc. The other thing is this ARC break. An ARC break can be so extreme that the E-Meter does not read at all.

The auditor has no command value of any kind over the preclear so therefore the E-Meter does not read an ARC break. So therefore, in-sessionness or the presence of an ARC break must be humanly detected. You've got to detect it. Or, let's say, Scientologically, de-

tected by the auditor. Not humanly. That's probably a very bad phrase, and so on. I didn't mean to insult you, you're all – I didn't mean any of you were human.

All right. There's the limits of the E-Meter. The E-Meter does have that limit. The auditor must have some command value over the pc before the E-Meter will register anything. And the greater the command value over the pc, the better the E-Meter registers.

Now, this is not an extreme point. This is not a delicate point. This is yea and nay. This is black and white. How far out does a pc or a human being have to be that another human being cannot get him to register on an E-Meter? Oh, man, it's way out. It's in the cold dark of Uranus, you see? Because I can get a newspaper reporter who has come down to get a lousy story to register on an E-Meter, you understand?

You could probably get somebody who was all set to rob the house to register on an E-Meter. You understand? You must get the idea of what extreme condition it must be. What an extreme condition it must be to have no registry of any kind. And when you see the pc not registering on the E-Meter in any way, for God's sakes, assign it to a *very* extreme condition. It is *very* extreme. There's nothing light about this.

If the pc weren't so far south and so apathetic at that moment, if he had the energy to do so, he would probably cut your heart out with a very dull table knife with great glee. I mean it's way south, this condition where the E-Meter doesn't register. You see?

Some of you who have tiny reads on a list watching an E-Meter, some of you have very tiny reads of that character, very scratchy sort of tiny needle reads, needn't really think that it's command value over the E-Meter that you're registering. Yes, the rudiments are not in very well before you get this sort of thing, but they're probably in as well as you can get them in. It is just the list itself is not much charged, and it is reading over the top of a very heavily stuck item, which is continuing to read, which is giving you this scratchy needle effect.

In other words, you can take somebody with a flow stuck wrong-end-to and get a scratchy read, see? But it'll still read for you. See? It's microscopic, but it's still reading for you. That isn't what I mean by command value, see?

Frankly, if your command value over the pc were sufficiently great, you theoretically could overcome this sort of thing, but actually the pc is terribly introverted, paying attention to some very hostile terminal of some kind or another, you see, and the pc's attention is so much on the terminal he hasn't got any chance to pay any attention to you.

But you can still make the thing read. That's a different thing than an ARC break. That's a terrific introversion. You'll never ever see it anywhere else – or a terrific dispersion. And it's consequent to having a clearing process run. I mean it's ordinary. Don't consider this extraordinary. This isn't anything very weird.

Before you run a flows assessment on a pc, you could almost expect, well, some indifferent type of line. You just decide the pc is goofy, so you say, "Who or what would oppose goofiness?"

Well, you get that type of line, you're liable to get that type of read, you see? Just by the fate you occasionally find something that's out, and you start running a line on a pc and

you're very sorry you ever had anything to do with it because you watch down the line and that needle is doing nothing but scratch and tick. It's a dirty needle, you can't read through it, and so forth. And you say, "Oh, God, why did I ever start this?" Do a flows assessment and it clears up.

But this is the needle registering against the bank more than the auditor registering on the pc because you'll find out that the auditor does have an effect on the pc even though you have a little scratchy needle. The needle is electronically, internally inhibited is what this scratchy needle situation is, see?

He's got some kind of a mass of a terminal or something that's very much in the road of everything. It's constantly knocking. It's doing all kinds of things. Tiny little reads. Well, that is not your ARC break type of read. Your ARC break type of read is just blank. It's just blank.

You get the same thing, as I've just been telling you, of the pc was so introverted you couldn't get his attention. But where he overtly is not going to pay any attention whatsoever to the auditor, *none*, the auditor can have no command value on him of any kind whatsoever. And you can actually say, "Do you have an ARC break?" You get no read. "How's your havingness?" You get no read. "You withholding anything?" You get no read. "Do you have a present time problem?" You get no read. And all those rudiments are live as a cat. It has to be humanly detected. The pc won't talk to you, either.

Pc is sitting there with his eyes on the floor, the cans are over on that side, they've been thrown down sometime since. [laughs] It's just "No!"

And finally the pc musters up enough energy out of this well of despond that he has been placed in to answer the question, "Well, do you want me to audit you or don't you?"

And he manages to say, "No, God damn it, no. Please go away. If I had enough energy to walk, I would, but I haven't."

You know that's the way that goes. Well, you aren't going to get an E-Meter registry at that time. The time to detect what's wrong with the pc is before the pc gets into this extreme condition.

So just to make a – keep auditors from making a mistake at this point of the beginning rudiments, you give them that reservation. Your E-Meter may not have command value because somebody may be so stupid as to never perceive this condition on the part of the pc. So you make it humanly. So if you're going to find out anything about running the session, you look up and look at the pc. This is a very, very, very good thing.

Now, the first test of this comes before Model Session opens and that is, "Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?"

And if the pc doesn't answer you, or if the pc says "No!" profanity, exclamation point, the probability is that the E-Meter will not read on the pc for the remaining rudiments. You see how extreme this is, see? So that is your test way up at the top of start of session. That is your basic test.

You ask him, "Has the session started for you?" and, you know, and you've got another test. Makes another test. That's to find out whether or not the pc's going to read on the meter. That's why you're making these tests, as well as put him into session.

And you say, "Well, has the session started for you? Has this session started for you?"

And the pc says, "*Huh. What session?*"

I don't think – I don't think you should go on monkeying with the E-Meter. Don't go on monkeying with the E-Meter. Pay attention to the pc. Ask the pc what's wrong. Do anything you're going to do to patch this pc up and just skip the meter at that point because the probability is that the pc is not reading on it. So don't even take a chance that the pc is or is not reading on it. At that point use your skill to get the pc to talking to you.

Now, if you can get the pc to talking to you, you go on down the line here and you will find that the thing will read. So if the pc will talk to you easily, the E-Meter will read. And if the pc won't talk to you, the E-Meter won't read. You got that?

You should recognize this because the pc can be given an ARC break with the E-Meter as well as the auditor. And don't give him an ARC break with the E-Meter and the door and the floor and everything else. At least try to minimize the effect on this.

And how do you give him an ARC break with the E-Meter? Well, I'll give you a method of doing so. This is not recommended. You say, "Do you have an ARC break?"

And the pc says, "Yes."

And you say, "Well, it hasn't registered on the meter."

At that moment, the pc will question the meter and the probability is will never thereafter believe in a meter. And that is the exact test, by the way, that is the exact test that established this point – the E-Meter doesn't register on an ARC broken pc. See. I discovered this by inspection of the factors and actually saw it work.

The auditor says, "Doesn't read on the meter," and that was the end of the meter for the pc. Now, you had to patch up the meter and the auditor, but how could you patch up the meter because you didn't have the auditor patched up, and oh, God 'elp us. What a rat race. Do you see that? Do you follow that? You're all looking at me like you might not think it's true.

All right. Now, let's take up Model Session here just step by step. I've given you some preliminary music on the operational function of this sort of thing. We know now one of the reasons "Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?" is so that you could humanly detect an ARC break on the part of the pc.

And the reason you start the session is so that the pc knows that he's on a specialized section of track; that what goes from here on is not social relationship; that he is now a pc and you are now the auditor; that you are taking command of the situation as of this moment. And is a service of warning of the starting of a specialized section of track known as the session. And that the relationship between auditor and pc will obtain from here on out. It is the beginning of a contract.

And now, you want to know if the pc has agreed to this. Don't ask him after you've started session if he has now agreed to start the session. Because you've already taken the command of the situation. As close as you can come to finding out if the pc is in agreement with this specialized-section-of track situation is to ask the pc, "Has this session started for you?"

All right. Pc says, "Yes." You go on. If the pc says "No," you once more say "Start of session," and you say, "Now, has this session started for you?" And if he says, "No," you assume that it has started anyway and you say, "Well, we'll cover it in the rudiments."

In other words, you just bull on through, well recognizing at this particular time the pc is in possibly an ARC break. Not possibly. A pc *is*. Excuse me. It's an ARC break with life or existence or something of the sort.

Now, we get down to the beginning rudiments. Now, the beginning rudiments are designed for the order of logical progress of a session. But what do you have to take up before you can take up something? You see?

Now, if you put a present time problem first, in the rudiments, you would be running a session without goals and very often having to run the present time problem, you would be running a session without having cleared the auditor or gotten any goals or remedied any havingness or anything else.

So the most complicated action you can take up is a present time problem which is the last one. Now, the one just before that, "Are you withholding anything?" is a little less complicated than a present time problem but it is most likely to clear the present time problem which may follow it. And above that, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" and if the pc realizes that he or she is, you are much less likely to have a withhold, and then again much less likely to have a present time problem. And then going higher than this, "Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room." If the pc's havingness is down and you remedy the pc's havingness, he's much less likely to have difficulty with the auditor, withhold anything or have a present time problem. Do you see this?

And then the least innocuous thing that you can possibly run that is calculated, if you are clever – and very few auditors ever use this as a point of cleverness, so I'm bringing up something that is rather new to you right now – if you cleverly enough run goals, you can put the pc sweepingly into session. You'll get him interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor. Because the most likely piece of conversation that a pc can be embarked upon is what he means to do or what he hopes will happen in life. And that is the most likely piece of conversation.

Even if it is "I hope I will die soon," that's still a goal, you see? And a goal like that is better than a pc sitting there saying "hm" to any goal, is better than no goal. That's the easiest one to audit. That's very easy to audit unless you're going to get a goals list and find the goal on it and that sort of thing. And that – people find that rather difficult.

But the easiest thing to audit then is, "What goals would you like to set for this session?" Now, that's, of course, your first rudiment then. "What goals would you like to set for this session? Are there any goals you would like to set for life or livingness?" both under the

heading of goals in two sections followed by environment: "Look around here and tell me if it is all right to audit in this room." Followed by auditor: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Followed by withholds: "Are you withholding anything?" Followed by present time problem: "Do you have a present time problem?"

Those are the beginning rudiments in proper order. But let's see how they are used.

All right. I said an auditor could be clever. You can always get a pc to talk about goals if your definition of goals is broad enough. And you can put a pc into session overtly with the subject of goals unless you have a specialized category of goals.

Now, I know of a case, not a pc, he's not been audited. I thought at one time I would ask somebody to audit this pc but the pc subsequently was electric shocked and given wet packs and, man, they got this pc from merely being apathetic to just being a frantic, sodden piece of catatonia, you see. So that's that. Let the psychiatrists have their meat. And we'll catch him next life. And if we catch the psychiatrist who did it, we'll know about that, too. We'll make sure that he has a withhold before we audit him.

Now, you can be very clever here. This pc, potential, at the time he was going to be audited, and even now, has got the same goal. And nobody will recognize it as a goal and it's stuck the pc with the goal because nobody okays this as a goal.

A goal is simply a hopeful postulate of future. That is all a goal is. The pc hopefully, not very positively, he just – it's whether by luck or it's going to happen because a roulette wheel turns up, or he wins a football pool or any other confounded thing, this is something that he hopes might happen in the future. And that's all a goal is. And when you take that broad definition and look at goals, you will stop shutting the pc up on the subject of goals because they don't fit your idea of your goals.

You're there to make him well. The pc says – this same goal this person has been giving now for a year and a half is "I want to die." It's a perfectly valid goal. Recognize it as such.

And nobody has cheerily said to him, "Well, I'll see what I can do to help you out with that goal." And you know, a pc will come right on up and out of that goal and give you another goal rather rapidly.

If you ever see a suicide hanging out the window about to plunge into the street and so forth, hand him an anvil so he'll fall faster or something. He isn't likely to go into the street – unless he thinks you're being sarcastic. [laughter]

So, here is a wild tool if you care to use it. And honest, when I see a consistent or blank – well, you know, a consistently reiterated statement as the only goal the pc has, or a blank no statement of any kind whatsoever, all I recognize about it is, is well, there's probably a little bit of an ARC break here. Yes, probably so if it cared to be detected.

But certainly the auditor is operating with a paucity of inventiveness. The auditor – it's just merely a stamp of the nonoperating auditor. That's all. He hasn't any pat process by which to get the pc to give him goals and he just doesn't bother, and so forth.

But I wouldn't leave a pc in that situation. The pc that wouldn't give me a goal I think would park me right there in the rudiments. That rudiment, too. Not any further rudiment than that. I would explore possibilities of future. I'd explore them one way or the other.

I'd find out such things as, well, what would the pc was sure was going to happen in the session. And you find out that you're probably sitting on a certainty that he's going to feel worse.

You say, "Well, good. Is that a goal of yours?"

"No. Quite the contrary."

"Well, what goal do you have?"

"Well, to feel better."

"Thank you." And you write it down.

The well-oiled auditor can always get a chain of goals if he cares to apply a little bit of cleverness to the situation.

Now, when you go upwards to twenty goals for a session, you're overdoing it. There's moderation in all things as the fellow said when he put down the empty five-gallon jug.

And if you get too many goals, of course, what are you doing? You're doing some kind of a Routine 3 activity. Well, that has nothing to do with rudiments. Two, three, four, something like this. This is within the realm of reason or even seven or eight. That's fine. That's fine. But for God's sakes, get the pc to make some even though you sort of trick him into making some.

I don't know what aplomb one or would not use. It'd all depend on the situation. If the pc said goal for the session, "I want you to drop dead," you know? Well, I don't know whether one would really with aplomb write down "To have me drop dead." But if I really wanted to get the pc squared away and under control, I think I would write it down.

Now, flying in the pc's face and saying, "Oh, no. You really don't want that, do you?" and so forth, is a refusal of goals and you'll throw him out of session. After all, he gave you a goal. Whether it's feasible or polite or socially acceptable or agrees with your basic goals at the moment, it is nevertheless a goal, see? So the least you'd do is acknowledge it. But you actually can use goals in far more ways than you have ever dreamed of. But don't audit the pc in the middle of a "no goals" because there's an incipient ARC break there.

I don't have to read the meter that the auditor was running on the pc in an auditor report. I look up there and I find no goals of any kind whatsoever. Then one of two things was true. Either the pc came into session at a high roar, totally in-session, spilling every withhold on the track, laying his case in the auditor's lap, and the auditor had barely got time to say, "Start of session" into one of the *hhh* [takes in breath], as the pc gasped for more breath, you see? The session evidently started a half an hour before or some time like that, you see? Well, there'd be no goals in the thing.

Obviously the pc's goal is being expressed in the fact that he wants to lay his case in your lap, and so on. He's living his goal for the session, so you'd have that. But that would be

accompanied over here by terrific successes in the session, see, if he really came into session, and so on. You could see all this stuff he got off and everything is squared around, and the auditor guided him over finally and got him onto the groove where he wanted him and kept him going on down that groove, a very expert method of handling it.

Or the pc is at the other opposite end of the spectrum, totally out of session and won't talk to the auditor, and at that time I'd like to see some work put in on the situation. See? And that's one of the best ways to get a pc into session is take it right at that rudiment. Of course, that rudiment's a sneaker.

Now, "Are there any goals you'd like to set for life or livingness?" sort of jumps up out of nowhere. But pcs, about their second or third session, begin to learn these rudiments, and this isn't for the first session that this has any bearing.

You want *session* goals. And this sort of disciplines the pc as he gets interested in it into having session goals. Possibly even it should be first, but it's a little bit too far out. It is one of these questionable rudiments. Is it vital? Is it necessary? But it's very useful and the pc seemed to like it, and you said it, but you never use it. You never check up on it. You never check up on it. This is as far as from the pc's viewpoint.

Now, I will tell you why it is there. It is to trap and locate present time problems of long duration. And the pc will set them right down like a little soldier if you spend a little time on this.

And you want to know the pc's present time problems of long duration, just ask him, "Now, are there any goals you'd like to set for life or livingness?"

And he says, "Well, to get over present time problem number one, and to recover from present time problem number two, and to recover from present time problem number three."

And this is a very interesting cross auditing report check – is you can find out whether or not the pc was operating consistently on a present time problem by finding out if this same present time problem continues to recur session after session. And after one of these things has recurred about three sessions, you begin to wonder when somebody is going to take up this present time problem.

But they will. They'll state it beautifully. So it is a bit of a covert way to get some data on your pc. And he will, he'll give you his present time problems under that line.

Of course, it looks like it isn't important. There isn't anything much to this, and so forth. If these do not contain problems – and in the majority of the time they don't contain problems; it's just interesting and shows the pc that you're interested in him and so there is no motion wasted here particularly.

All right. Now, that step handled well can get the pc in-session, see? Your next step almost any pc can run some version of and benefit from it, even if temporarily, and any auditor can audit. One of the easiest things to audit, apparently, there is, is Havingness, environment. And apparently, apparently, auditors will run Havingness, can run Havingness, on anybody. I've had auditors who would ordinarily have a terrible stage fright auditing me, be able

to sit there and just run Havingness just beautifully, you know, and not have any difficulties running Havingness or anything like this.

Then they have to run something else that takes a little bit of invested address to the pc and they just fall all over themselves, see, but they could run Havingness. So I just take it from a subjective reality on this fact and watching auditors audit, and that sort of thing, that they will and can run Havingness. This is an easy one. In other words, we've got our easiest process first.

Now, the other side of the thing, the pc for some reason or other will usually run Havingness. No matter what else the pc can run or refuses to run, the pc will run Havingness, so you of course got your easiest process first, right?

So the auditor's comfortable and the pc will run it and you could go on from there, and you get a little bit of a win.

Now, of course, there are Havingness and Havingness and Havingness Processes, and trying to find one of these Havingness Processes is a bit of a gymnastic activity, but everybody seems to be able to do that very easily.

You just take the 36 Havingness Processes and test them with can squeezes. Keep the pc squeezing the cans every now and then even though he has to lay them down and pick them up. Why, make him pick them up and squeeze the cans again. You saw me doing that the other day in a demonstration.

And keep testing your Havingness from time to time. Make sure it keeps working.

In other words, find your Havingness by the can squeeze test. If you've got the pc's Havingness, if that's his Havingness Process, you get more of a needle throw. And if that isn't his Havingness Process, you get less of a needle throw on the same sensitivity setting. You just get that sensitivity good and low there and test.

And while you're testing and it's starting to tighten up the needle or it doesn't loosen it, get out of there, get out of there, man, get out of there quick. Give him five commands, didn't loosen the needle, you say, "Well, that's it, son."

I don't care what form of auditing you're going to use at that point, that's exit fast and get on the next process. Because a Havingness Process is something you should find with a minimum of mistakes.

Therefore, Havingness test processes are published in the 36 Havingness Processes in a frequency table. In other words, the most likely Havingness Process that will fit the case appears earliest on the list. And that's only done out of class averages. This is an empirical finding. Whether or not it's theoretically true or not or whether or not some of our more recent Havingness Processes which aren't even on that list would go higher on the scale or not, I don't know.

But you get that Havingness Process, and you get that early in auditing and you're probably going to get a change of process before you go too far with this case. So you're going to have to find the Havingness Process much more frequently if you find it early in audit-

ing the pc. And it's a question of whether or not more time is saved by not finding it early and finding it later or something like this.

The safe thing to do in all such cases, is of course, find it early, even though it's going to change and then watch it like a hawk. See, early on in the case is the most complex and idiotic Havingness Processes will be found earliest on.

So you've got a pc that's liable to ARC break – well at any time when he is workable at all or even vaguely workable, find the Havingness Process, and you will have it here. But on a pc who apparently is auditing very well, it isn't so important. Got it? Early on it's not so important. That's a fact. It just isn't.

It's not whether I say it isn't or is, but you could audit 50 percent of the people you audit without ever running a breath of Havingness. You realize that? Providing you are a very skilled auditor.

Now, I would not be giving an HPA class the same advice. Because the havingness of the pc during the session is directly proportional to the smoothness of the auditor and inversely proportional to the roughness of the auditor. *Direct*, these are *direct* ratios. The rougher the auditor, the more the pc's havingness has to be remedied. The rougher the auditing, the more boobs the auditor makes, the more the pc's havingness has to be remedied.

If you have to remedy the havingness of your pc every three minutes during auditing, I would take a look at my auditing. It's probably rough. This is interesting to you, isn't it, and so on.

You can do a can squeeze test, find that the can squeeze has lessened – in other words the pc's havingness has dropped. This is negative testing. The pc at the beginning of the session was dropping a third of a dial very nicely on the can squeeze test without your touching the sensitivity knob whatsoever. Ten minutes later, just out of nowhere in the middle of doing something else, ask him to squeeze the cans. If it has dropped a half or is only dropping now a sixth of a dial, you could ask him at once, "Have I done something wrong?" And if you keep the pc pushed to this and get him to look at the earlier part of the session, he will find something you have done wrong.

And the second he has found what this is and you've cleared it up – you see, it wasn't even evident in the session – you ask him to do a can squeeze test again, and you'll get a third-of-a-dial drop. Do you see that?

It is ARC breaks which reduce havingness. Now, whether or not they're introduced by the auditor or the environment or restimulated or – doesn't matter where they came from, your havingness drops in direct proportion to the number of fancied or actual ARC breaks the pc has during a session.

So the smoother the session, well, the less havingness you have to remedy. The smoother the auditor, the less havingness you have to remedy. The rougher the auditing, the more havingness you have to run. So if it's geewhiz, God almighty, rough auditing, we start in and say, "Let's see, now, I think it says here – let me see. Just a minute. Let me find this piece of paper here. I think I've got a Model Session. Let's see. Start of, ah, the light is very bad. Move aside a little bit so I can see that. Ah, let's see, it says ah, 'Start of session.' Yes, 'Start of

session,' it says right there. Ah, is it all right, is-it-all-right-with-you-if-I-begin-this-session – now?"

If you were doing it this way, I think the can squeeze test just before the session started and just after the session, you see, would reduce in magnitude. You got the idea?

Auditor confidence may be very great, but if auditor blunder exceeds pc's expectancy of auditor confidence, you get a drop of havingness. You could probably draw up a lot of formulas about this. [laughs]

But here is your criteria of Havingness is that it is the easiest process to run, it is the most likely to be run by the pc in any ARC break situation. He may not run "What weren't you able to tell me?" and "What haven't I done?" He may not be able to run that process. He may not be able to run any ARC break process. He may not be able to run anything except Havingness. And he will, however, point at the floor and the door and the ceiling and so forth, and he'll go on.

And the commonest mistake that an auditor makes is not flattening it. When this is being used for an ARC break, for God's sakes, heavens on earth, realize that if you're using Havingness to heal an ARC break, and if it is the only thing that the pc will run, you probably had better run it for the next half-hour or hour. The various uses of Havingness dictate this as a fact.

The commonest auditor error in utilizing Havingness particularly on an ARC broke or breaky pc is not to run enough of it. And therefore, that being the commonest auditor error, auditors do not get a high level of reality on Havingness healing ARC breaks. They quit. They knock off. They say, "Well, now we've got the pc running Havingness, let's get on to something now and clear up the ARC break."

Well, look, the ARC break is clearing up through the duplication and mechanics of the auditing session. They're clearing up the ARC break and they would be guilty of a breach of the Auditor's Code – they would cease to run a process which is working and which is producing change before that process was flat. That's something to think about, isn't it?

And listen, you can give a pc one God-awful jolt this way. The only liability of running Havingness is not running it. You've got this pc and he was down, just down on the lower rungs of nowhere. You dropped the bottom out from underneath him, inadvertently or accidentally. He had a hell of an ARC break and you couldn't get him back into session; this is a desperate situation. And you finally do manage to get him to point at the room object – his current Havingness Process, you know?

So he points at the ceiling, and he points at the floor. He's all ARC broken, but he can do this. And he will do it, oddly enough. And he can point at the window and the chair and the auditor and the ceiling and the floor and the chair and the window, and he can point at the floor, and then you say, well, he's operating fine now. So you say, "Well, all right. If it's all right with you, I'll give you two more commands and end this process."

Now, man, you've handed him an ARC break on the process which is handling ARC breaks because he had just gotten to the point where he could have the end of his nose.

He was starting to come out of the ARC break. And now you've given him a new one on a Havingness Process.

So let me tell you something just as a general rule in the use of Havingness Processes. For God's sakes, don't cause an ARC break with a Havingness Process! I don't care what you cause ARC breaks with, do it with anything else. Do it with lists or do it with running present time problems or evaluate for the pc on how he ought to – not to beat his wife. Suddenly look up in the middle of his running a PT problem and say, "Well, I should – don't blame your wife at all for treating you that way," [laughter] you know.

I'm not kidding you. This has happened, you know. I mean this is not a – not even necessarily a rare occurrence. All of a sudden some kid auditor without very much experience behind him will all of a sudden get totally overwhelmed by all of this horrible social conduct on the part of his pc, you see? And he all of a sudden goes into the stern, puritanical lines of life in which he's been educated. And he steps out of the role of auditor into one of his minister valences or something like that, and says, "We must bring order here for the church," or something of the sort and makes some kind of an offball comment.

But even that isn't anywhere near as bad as ARC breaking a pc during a Havingness run. That is cruel. Because when you end the Havingness Process, before you even announce that you are going to run two more commands, before anything else going to do, and so that this announcement then doesn't serve as a pattern that when you ask this, you are then going to end the process, you got that as a training pattern?

You know, you can ask, "How are you doing" and if the pc says they're doing all right or says mm-hmm or something, the fact that you have said "How are you doing?" is now a trained pattern. Because you're going to say, "How are you doing?" then you're going to run another command. Then you're going to say "I'm going to give you two more commands and end this process," and so you've signaled the end of the process by an inquiry to the pc.

Well, look, unfortunately, whether you want to know it or not, you had better salt down all of your Havingness Process with questions about how the pc is doing every now and then rather than to have this thing become established as a signal. You get the trick?

So don't let that inquiry as to how he's doing become an established signal that you're going to end the process or you're going to hang the pc – this is particularly applicable to Havingness Process – you're going to hang the pc with a new phrase that operates just like a Model Session phrase to him.

You're going to say "How are you doing?" and he's liable to blast right straight in your face, "Well, damn you, I was doing all right, but now you're going to end the process." See?

You said "How are you doing" and he knows that this is an end of process, see? He knows that's the signal because you've always – you said, "How are you?" he says, "Fine," you say, "Good," and sometimes this crudely, "I'll give you two more commands and end this process," see? Inevitable pattern.

Well, you just start that pattern, and you ARC break the pc. You can't then find out how the pc is doing unless you have frequently inquired how the pc is doing and gone on running the process.

So part of every Havingness Process that is being run for any purpose whatsoever should be to inquire after what the pc is doing and how he is doing it. How is he doing? "What are you doing?" "Did you do the command?" Anything you want to ask the pc. And that should be part and parcel of Havingness Process.

Run a few commands and you say, "Well, how is it going?"

You know he says, "All right."

And you say, "Well, did you – did you have the wall?" and so forth.

And "Yeah. Oh, yeah. Yeah. I'm doing pretty good on the thing."

You see, that's making the pc talk to you a little more and actually wipes out some of the possible little, tiny unseen ARC breaks. You're not even using it to handle an ARC break, you see? But just by making the pc talk to you a little bit during Havingness Process, of course, uses this as a benefit to get the pc more into session. Those are the skillful ways of Havingness.

So it's the easiest thing to run, and run with an understanding of what you're doing is the most successful of the ARC break processes.

Havingness Process well administered by the auditor and actually run by the pc, if it's the right Havingness Process, will get your pc over some mighty tough ARC breaks and rough spots of the trail that you otherwise would find it very difficult to get over, and I personally believe that some of them you wouldn't get over at all. You'd just have to let it drop that day and skip it.

A very intelligent use of Havingness, an extremely intelligent use of Havingness would be, when the pc starts to look kind of walleyed and so on and he's talking to you a lot less and doesn't seem to be interested in what you're doing, and so forth, and any shadow of any of these things, just run Havingness.

And then inquire often enough and find that the pc brightens up and then follow it through because Havingness is marvelous stuff.

The proper use of Havingness is to patch up what you're doing. That's a very intelligent use of Havingness. But *not* to use Havingness to interrupt the pc's in-sessionness. That's also an intelligent use of Havingness.

The pc's going down the line, the pc said, "*Wog, wog, wog, a – a frog, a weasel, a dog, I think, ah, let's see, what else would inhibit the inflow on another? Let's see – a dog, a weasel, a ooooo oooooh. You know, God, I get groggy on this, a dog, ah, whewf! Ah, ah, let's see now. Ah, any, any small farm animal. A wog. Any small farm animal. Let's see now, anything else would inhibit uuuuuu. A sign. A sign. That would, and so forth.*"

Well, there's some point there where you would find it necessary to run Havingness, but there's some point there where if you ran Havingness, you would throw him out of session.

The rule for Havingness is *not* "every time the pc dopes off, run Havingness." That is not a good, stable rule for Havingness. You understand? It's when the pc is incapable of going smoothly on with the session that you'll run Havingness.

Now, as far as nulling lists are concerned, you get the same read on the list whether the pc is conscious or unconscious, so who cares? Did you know that?

Male voice: Uh-huh.

Doesn't matter what you do. I mean you get the same read. The pc can be out like a light, and you'll get the same read on the meter.

All right. There's more to this. There's more to this, and I want to go on with this and give you – cover this Model Session with you rather thoroughly, so we're going to have another lecture. But right now we're going to take a break. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Model Session, Part II

A lecture given on 1 March 1962

Thank you.

Okay. And this is still the 1st of March, second lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, on the subject of Model Session, AD 12.

I was talking to you about Havingness. And the uses of Havingness are intelligent uses, and that's why it belongs where it belongs in the Model Session. And Havingness is the easiest to run and the easiest to audit of any process. So, therefore, it belongs right there. So if your pc is out of session, you can start immediately into Havingness and get them into session.

But if your pc is not in-session, you mustn't depend on the remaining rudiments to do a thing for you. If by this time you have not managed to get your pc into session, you've practically had it.

In the first place, you've got your first test, "Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?" A little two-way comm should have settled – "Well, at least let's begin the session, so that we'll just have this inside the session. Start of session" – that kind of a – of a response to a pc's recalcitrance.

You can go on down the line and get the pc to set goals. And by getting the pc to set goals, you should be able to get a pc into session. Just like that, with goals. Bang! You can't get the pc into session with goals, you've got Havingness and you should be able to get the pc into session with Havingness.

And if you can't get the pc into session with Havingness and so forth, the probabilities of your getting the pc into session with auditor section, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" are quite remote. Because that confronts directly the reason they won't go into session. And it's almost too steep an incline.

So if you depend on "auditor" to finally get the pc into session, you will occasionally lay a nice, great big ostrich egg. Do you see that? Although it apparently could be accepted by you as, "Well, then naturally, you'll go into session, you know? Well, we'll work this out. We'll knock out the ARC break." See?

If you haven't got it handled by that time, you're not going to get a chance to run anything that will knock out the ARC break because the pc will just claw at you.

Now, O/W has a terrible liability. O/W was the oldest and at one time looked upon as the best method of getting the pc into session. And it has a hell of a liability. It can miss a withhold and throw the pc *wildly* out of session. Do you see that?

Now, you want to know why the pc occasionally – you probably have all felt this: "I wish to God – if I could handle an ARC break with the pc," see? "If I could just handle an ARC break ... "

Now, some – you've run into pcs that you possibly had difficulty handling the ARC break with. You understand? And that's because you depended on this section of the rudiments or the processes under it to put the pc into session. And that's almost a misuse of the rudiment.

The pc's got an ARC break, you don't use an ARC break process to throw him back in. See, don't use a process to throw a pc back in. Don't use an ARC break process to handle an ARC break if they're that incipient.

Your – there's a difference here – the pc won't be audited and the pc being made more auditable. You see, these two states of the pc. *Ah*, he's talking to you, but he really isn't paying much attention to you. Your command value's not great.

Well, if your command value is not great over the pc or there's a little thing went yickle-yackle, you know and the pc is still in-session but a little bit cooled off. They're just a little cool, you know and something or other on this and so forth. That's your ARC break. That's the old ARC break level auditor. That's the time you use that, see, anything you're auditing there.

You're improving, so that rudiment – the auditor, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" is to improve the in-sessionness of the pc, not to create the in-sessionness of the pc if it's totally nonexistent.

Now, it's quite remarkable, the liabilities of healing the ARC break, they are numerous. And if your pc wouldn't talk to you to tell you if it was all right to start the session and if your pc wouldn't set any goals for the session and you think to yourself, "Well, we'll catch this pc." And the pc – you're not going to run any Havingness and you're going to catch all this under "auditor" – "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" You've already set up a hurdle that is almost unhurdable.

See, by that time, you should have handled the situation. How should you have handled it?

There are numerous ways of handling this situation. I've just been going over them and they all had to do with Havingness or a little bit earlier than that is setting some goals – getting the pc interested in getting someplace and so forth.

The ARC break, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" is enough if the pc's in-sessioning is poor, you know. That's good enough if the pc isn't well in-session, and so forth, to put them better in-session, but not good enough to put them in-session. See, straight in-session. Requires a gradient, why? Because it is a process. And you have to have him in-session enough to run the process and if they're not in-session enough to run that process, oh, they'll point at the ceiling and they'll point at the floor. They won't point at you.

And if you've ever noticed, the last thing the pc is pointing at, if you're running Havingness to cure an ARC break, is the auditor. Have you ever noticed this?

Audience: Yeah.

Well, add that up. So don't use that type of a rudiment approach to heal an ARC break except *in extremis*. So let us say there's nothing else. Or if it's not very light at all – I mean it's not heavy enough not to – it's just a little bit, the pc's cooled off, they're kind of looking at you with a walleye. You could ask them, you'd say, "Well, do you have an ARC break?"

"No." And so on.

"Well, what weren't you able to tell me?" Excellent question. "What didn't I do?"

But now remember, you're in a Prepcheck area. If you use that, you're in a Prepcheck area. So that is feasible only in using it with 3D Criss Cross or some type of process like that. Not in a Prepcheck session.

So that is why you find your first level of action in Prepchecking is with this as the Zero Question. This is always your Zero Question, no matter how many Zero A or Zero B or Zero C you add after it. That is always your Zero Question for Prepchecking. Because it's an open invitation to Prepcheck, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" It's a beautiful Zero. That forms the body of the session. So it must assume to some degree that the pc is in-session if you're going to use that as a departure point.

Now, this'll improve your pc's in-sessioning. Improve it and improve it and improve it and improve it. And pretty soon, why, they don't have ARC breaks with you, if you handle this thing well.

But to use "auditor," just to sit there and argue with the pc as to whether or not you should – you have to be somebody to audit them or something like this, you're not going to get anyplace. Not if the pc's got an ARC break. Don't you see that?

If the last thing the pc points at in, "Point out something" is the auditor, in healing an ARC break – so the last thing that you would run, if he had an ARC break, would be the auditor. Do you follow that? Hmm?

Now, you can carry that out to too great an extreme. Auditing, remember, is what you can get away with. I'm giving you just a basic, general rule. All right, pc has an ARC break. The pc has a bit of an ARC break, still talking to you. Well, you can use the rudiments process to go along with that.

But, I don't think that process would ever heal an ARC break down to a point where the pc will not talk to you at all. You see how far south it goes? Not very far. And that is why you have had difficulties in handling ARC breaks. Okay?

Remember, confronting is a companion to havingness. You did something so the pc – or the pc thought you did something, so the pc is left without an auditor. Now, what are you going to do? You going to say to the pc, "Now, that you can't confront me, confront me."

Is that what you're going to do? Because any process that you run that immediately addresses the auditor is also going to run that process. Do you follow that easily? So the only way I know of to get a pc in-session and hold it in-session easily if the pc is totally out of session – you know, just won't at all – consists of the upper parts of the rudiments. Never this one.

All right. How far out of session can a pc go and you can still handle "auditor" rudiment? Well, you can go this far out. The pc is saying, "Oh, you're the lousiest auditor in the world – I have never seen the like of you," and so forth and, "My God, the number of mistakes which you make are absolutely colossal and catastrophic."

He's still in-session. You miss that left and right, you see?

The person is – why is he cussing you? He's cussing you for only one reason: he *wants* auditing. All ARC breaks stem from no auditing. The only reason the pc ever has an ARC break. No auditing.

Let's take the ARC break of the fellow on the street. He must be in an awful ARC break if you say, "I'm interested in Scientology and Scientology makes you better. Wouldn't you like to know some more about it?"

And he says, "I never pay any attention to – what are you talking about – *grrrrr - grrrrrr - bowwww*. "

What's that? That's an absence of auditing, isn't it? [laughter] Scientology didn't exist early enough to put him in good shape, so that when you approach him with Scientology, he despises it. Perfect. No auditing. It's weird how fast you can put them in-session when they do that. They'll still talk to you.

But the fellow who just turns his back on you, he won't argue with you. You know, I've never had anybody argue with me about Scientology that wouldn't go at once into session? Do you know I've had psychologists and government lobbyists and oh, I don't know. I think I could even put a pig in-session. As long as they'll argue about it. [laughter] See? They're in-session.

The best thing for you to do is to adjust your definition of "in-session." You see, what is "in-session," don't you see? Well, he's willing to talk to the auditor and he's telling you he is not interested in his own case, he's in-session.

But oddly enough, won't even speak to the auditor and totally absorbed in own case: not in-session. See that? Or, not interested in own case, not talking to the auditor: not in-session.

But a pc who will sit there and say, "*I've never seen such terrible auditing in my life. Grrrrrrr-grrrrrr-grrrrrr. Why do you keep making these blunders? Grrrrr.*" He's in-session. And the auditor that thinks at that point that he has an ARC break to handle is making a technical error. He has no ARC break to handle. There isn't any ARC break. There's just an absence of auditing.

And it turns up very recently – which is why I'm giving you this pair of lectures on the subject – it turns up very recently that a missed withhold is an absence of auditing. You didn't audit it. You should have known about it. And you missed it. And all the pc's doing is accusing you of an absence of auditing. That's all. You weren't careful and you didn't pick it up and you should have known about it and he sits back and he festers.

And if you – if you think to yourself that it's because the pc is afraid you'll find out about it, you're actually making a bit of a mistake. Because if you notice, the most fruitful

tone arm responses, I mean the most active tone arm responses is to the most fruitful question: on the "Who", and if you play that "Who" up and down and watch that needle very close while you're running the Who section of the withhold system, you will see that that question which gets you the most frequent release of charge is, "Who should have known about it?" Not "Who didn't know about it?" "Who could have known about it and failed to find out?" And all of a sudden you'll get a resurgence of charge. And the thing tends to blow at that point.

Well, isn't that interesting? That's an absence of auditing then, isn't it. *Hmm?*

Well, if you're knuckleheaded enough to miss a withhold on the pc and wait and let the pc find it out by blowing up, you, of course, are – should have somebody blowing up in your face because it's damn bad technology, that's all.

When you're monkeying around with Prepchecking, when you're fooling around with rudiments, I don't care how many times you ask the question "Have I missed a withhold on you in this session?" See? I don't care how many times you ask that question in between ... I don't think you should go so far as to ask it in a 3D Criss Cross session between null items. "Weasel, weasel, weasel, thank you, it's in. Have I missed a withhold on you?" [laughter] I don't think you should run like that. "Cat, cat, cat, it's out. Have I missed a withhold on you?" I don't think that frequency is called for. But in Prepchecking, it's pretty confounded often.

You're sailing down the line... Because it's the only guarantee when you leave a What question down to a further-lettered What question – you know, you leave a What question because it isn't clear yet because you got to get something earlier on the chain, well, it's only sense that after you've done this once or twice or three times that you possibly missed a withhold. Because you're jumping off uncleared What questions hoping to get a lower What question that will unravel the whole chain.

Well, sure, you've missed a withhold, but has the pc at any time gotten the idea that you've missed a withhold? Has he confused your going earlier to clear the thing, with missing a withhold? Has he confused these points? He knows it's not clear. He knows it's not clean yet. He can still feel it kind of biting. Well, is he still holding onto something? Well, so every, every – every What question would be about as frequently as you would ask it. Once every What question. That is to say, you got the What and you got four or five withholds off on the same What question and you maybe twenty or thirty times – well, actually, five or six times have run through the "When? All? Who?" routine on each withhold, you see, if you've gone even that thoroughly at it. That's being very, very thorough. Yeah, after one of these What questions, why, it just very well might have established the idea on the part of the pc that a withhold had been missed.

Of course, you're setting up the ARC break. You're going to go on about three more What questions and all of a sudden the pc's going to get nattery and the pc's going to do this and the pc's going to ARC break on you and so forth, because you've missed a withhold.

The only reason you ever get an ARC break of that magnitude where the pc is climbing all over you ... Let's say you had the pc in-session and then all of a sudden half an hour later you find the pc shouting at you and screaming at you. The pc *was* in-session and has *ceased* to be in-session – please hear me this time because I've only said this about 500 times,

but please hear me this time – is because you have missed a withhold on him. It's the only reason that situation arises.

So the best remedy for that sort of a situation is "Have I *missed a withhold* on you?" And that is the best ARC break process there is because it's the only reason there is an ARC break. That is the only reason there is an ARC break occurring after an in-sessionness.

Of course, the man on the street who screams at you even before you audit him, why, the world's been missing withholds on him left and right. You could do the same thing with him. After a fellow's ranted on about you, about how he didn't want to know anything more about Scientology and it was just a fake and it was terrible and he wasn't going to – thought everybody in Scientology ought to be killed and he said something like this – well, you should just look at him very interestedly and you should say to him, "Well, what should Scientologists have found out about you and failed to? What – what should they have found out?"

I don't care if you've got him on the meter or not. Man, I tell you, the least that'll happen is he'll shut up. [laughter]

Oddly enough, he probably very often would simply tell you.

"Oh, well, if you put it that way, that's something else again."

Of course, it's a bad thing, I suppose, to put men in-session on the street, but I'd put them in-session before I would sit there and let them scream and rail and rant and rave. The guy's already said he's in-session because he's ranting and raving. You see? So you lower your sights on the subject of what in-sessionness is and you stop flubbing just because somebody blows up in your face and start running an ARC break process or something of the sort *late* in the session.

Ah, nah, you aren't going to get anyplace with it. Why not? Because it's all based on a missed withhold. But of course, if your pc won't have anything to do with you and won't audit and so forth; and is just totally ARC broke and won't talk to you or anything like that, and now you ask him what withhold has been missed on him, you're not going to get any further either, because the pc isn't talking to you. But you can get a pc into session with those earlier steps, but not at that point, "auditor."

So at that point – from that point on, you are trying to *improve* the session. From "auditor" level *on*, including "auditor" level, is simply session *improvement* and nothing else.

Now, the question, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" perfectly all right. It's the perfect Zero question, but it sometimes is not the perfect "auditor's" process because it doesn't indicate any process.

So you say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" and you get an awful fall, well, it's the E-Meter that's telling you and you didn't possibly detect the pc was or wasn't in-session or something like that. I would advise you if you were prepchecking to totally avoid any withholds or missed withholds or anything of that sort. Just avoid that because the pc's going to throw the session on you.

You know, all of a sudden you'll be prepchecking something else and you – that you don't want to prepcheck. You've already got him on another line and so you run some of the old, moldy processes. "Who would I have to be to audit you?" Anything like that, see? The old, moldy process. Don't run any one of them that had anything about an O/W process in it. "What have you done to me?" and "What have you withheld from me?" and so on. You're liable to throw him out of session.

There is – there's some wheezy ones. That's one of them. That's one of them. A much later one is ARC '61. It will run to a high stuck tone arm but is nevertheless a pretty darn good process, and so on. A lot of interesting results have occurred to it.

Another thing that you could use at this particular level, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" to get yourself in sideways is a very interesting process, but I don't advise you to use it on a member of the opposite sex when you're auditing them. Now, seriously, I don't. Because they get sexually restimulated, and that is, "Touch my knee, touch my other knee, touch my shoulder, touch my other shoulder, touch the top of my head, touch my chin." It violates to some extent the auditor using his body in the session, but it works. It works. ARC comes way up.

And one of the reasons I advise you not to use it is not that it doesn't work on a criss-cross like that, but sometimes, you frail creatures, you get into the middle of this thing, you know, and you skip it. You don't flatten the process. And it's a rather lengthy process and it is a process. It is a process. It apparently runs up – when it's done by a girl auditor on a man or a man auditor on a woman, it runs up the second dynamic channel. You got to clear it all the way.

And you've set yourself up then not to run a hunt and punch process. You've set yourself up to run the next two hours on it, but if you consistently had difficulty with this pc staying in-session with you, it's well worth doing. If you remember to flatten it and not fall in any second dynamic nonsense. Girl's a third of the way through this confounded thing, you know, saying – realize that she loves you desperately. Or the man, he realizes he's loved you all of his life and that he's known you in 18 past lives, and so on. [laughter] Man, flatten the thing. Flatten it. Flatten it. Don't leave it at that level.

Now, it oddly enough is the cure for auditor falling in love with pc, pc falling in love with auditor. You run it on the auditor on some other auditor. It does a nice transference. [laughter]

We have had problems with this. HGC – you get a pretty girl, a staff auditor in an HGC, she always has problems with this sort of thing. Get a male pc and my goodness, he's phoning his wife and getting a divorce and he's got the whole structure all planned up and going to town in all directions and so forth. And she has – the girl staff auditor hasn't even found out about it yet, you see. What's this, you know?

Well, you can pick it up at that point and you can run it on up and out because it's basically simply reactive. Something has gone into restimulation and it's gone into restimulation because of the proximity, that's all. So let's close the proximity; only let's flatten it. That's all I say about that one. Let's flatten it. And it is flat when there's no longer any misemotion, love, anguish, unrequited swearing coming off with it.

I give you that one with reservation. If you use it, why, for God's sakes, remember I give you the limitations of the thing is it has to be flattened, so it's hardly a rudiments process. But it could be used at that stage. And it is a specific. It's pretty much a cure of the pc falling in love desperately with the auditor.

You shouldn't feel too complimented on that particular line, by the way, because I never have had a psycho woman spinning someplace or another that wasn't also desperately in love with me. And it ceased to be complimentary to me. [laughter] I finally figured out that this wasn't so much due to my charm, but leaving something unflat. [laughter]

The difficulties that you run into are – contain that as an occupational hazard. And it's a good one to run. It's a good one to run. You don't go into the private parts of the body or anything like that. You just use the knee, the ankle, the head, the shoulder, the hand. You know, just ordinary, routine, casually. Go on and on and on with the confounded thing. Misemotion and emotion and love and then dying, God knows what, and the 18 times they didn't know you on the past track, all these things blow off.

In the first place, I don't know what your body has to do with the auditor anyhow. But evidently this is all associated one way or the other.

All right. Now, we get down to this interesting question of the rudiments, "Are you withholding anything?" And if you're running a Prepcheck session, you have to modify this particular Model Session question.

"Since the last time I audited you ..." sometimes you have to say this two or three times, even give its date – "have you done anything that you are now withholding?" And if you get a fall, you ask it again, stressing its date very *hard*: "Five o'clock yesterday afternoon, 28 Feb. 62. Since that date, have you done anything that you are withholding *from me*?" And the pc's various withholds from you sort of fall out and scatter around and then they finally say, "Well, no, no, no, as a matter of fact." And the needle goes clear.

One of the best ways to clear the needle is to clear it from the end of the last session until *now*. You just clear it for that period. And you don't get into any hot water at all. Do you understand? That's cleared rather arduously. Sometimes you have to be *awfully* ironclad and thump about that particular rudiment because your pc is withholding something for their grandma and they've got you vaguely associated with grandma for reasons we couldn't have a clue of, you know.

And you're a male auditor, so they've got you associated with grandma, you know? And they're withholding from grandma in the Prepcheck and they don't see who you are. And they don't see where the auditor is and so on. You just have to start emphasizing the *time* and the *date*, you know, of the last session *end* and *now* and, *me*. *Me*, *me*, *me*. And they finally say, "Oh, *ha-ha-haha*. Withholding something from the Instructor. Wasn't withholding anything from you."

And then, so you won't miss a withhold, you say, "Well, what was that during the period?"

And they say, "Well, ah, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"Well, all right. That's fine." And then *repeat* the question in that lengthened form and make sure that it's clear and go on.

You only want the interim period from the last auditing.

Now, that would vary if you restarted a session after a break. You note the time of the break and so you add from the moment, you notice that the tone arm is up. "*So have you done anything since 2:22 today that you are now withholding from me?*" It is now 2:32. Quite interesting. Quite interesting.

Don't pay too much attention to the tone arm going up on a break. We scouted it down here two or three months ago and actually did a little searchout on what this was all about and we found out that tone arms went up on very interesting things like pc who was just getting assessed on the terminal "woman," had actually talked civilly to a woman which, of course, was a total violation of his mores. [laughter] A lot of that stuff. So it isn't too important.

All right. That's your withhold question. Now, on a Prepcheck, you don't want that going anyplace but there because if you're going to ask this thing very broadly, of course, the pc now launches the session. He fires the cannon without you standing to and nobody at the flagpole and so on. And it doesn't turn out to be a shot to start the war, it turned out to be the sunset gun on the session. That's the end of that session. You might as well skip it and go home and go to bed because the pc is now going to give you a whole new chain that you haven't anything to do with and didn't want anything to do with and you have lost control of the session.

So, if there's any doubt in your mind, if the pc on former experience does not seem able to respond to what you're asking the pc, just omit it for Prepchecking, see? It's a little bit dangerous to do that. Just a little bit dangerous, but if you've gotten into trouble doing it, even with this positive way, I just wouldn't attempt it again. You got it? I mean on the next session, I just wouldn't attempt it on the same pc. Say – as we go across it, why, we say, "Well, all right. This session is mostly concerned with withholds anyway. So we're going on to the next rudiment." Don't even mention the rudiment beyond that point, see? You've heard me pulling this gag.

Now, it's a good thing to do that with new pcs if you're just sogging right straight into Prepchecking. If the pc's brand-new, they haven't had any time to have any missed withholds. See, first few sessions and you've not missed any withholds on her. You've been checking during the session for missed withholds? Fruitless question to ask.

Now, you can ask this, you can ask this at a time you were doing 3D Criss Cross. And your use of the rudiment in 3D Criss Cross definitely calls for just this rudiment exactly as it is. "Are you withholding anything?" By that time, we assume the pc has had a lot of Prepchecking and is pretty well in-session, and so on, and won't make a bunch of mistakes about the whole thing, so it's now safe to ask the question. You see the logic that follows that?

So you can just ask the question. It goes bang! And you say, "What's that?"

And, "Well, I was out with Joe last night and I didn't want to tell you about it – and ..." Withhold. Run a – run a When, All, Who on it. You know, just a little withhold system on it and *bzzzzt*. Because it'll clear up fast if the pc is in that advanced state of case.

Early on, during a Prepcheck period, a pc is *not* in any advanced state of case and they *can't* handle it and they *can't* tell one withhold from another withhold. It's all just sort of solid *thooooo*. So you ask her, "Are you withholding anything?" and they try to lay their whole case in your lap or try to keep from laying the whole case in your lap and you get a whole bunch of missed withholds and at that point, because you can't clear it up, you've set the session up for an ARC break.

All you have to do is ask that question and miss it and you've set the session up for an ARC break, so it's too dangerous to come near on a Prepcheck session early on, see? It's a dangerous question.

And now we get to *PTP* and pcs don't like a *PTP*. They don't like to find them. They don't like to run them. They like to avoid them. And if you audit a pc with one, you've had it. You make no session progress. It'll jump back up in your face, so it's vital that you handle it whether in a Prepcheck session or a 3D session. That's a *PTP*. Present time problem.

The way to handle a present time problem is not with withholds. Now, you could handle it and I gave you some advice earlier that you could handle, but experience has not borne it out that it could be handled this way in a Prepcheck session. You can't ask for missed withholds or anything like that. "Oh, I had a terrible fight with my husband last night," and so forth.

Well, you – in a Prepcheck session, you just don't *dare* say, "Well, what should your husband have found out about and failed to?" Early on and in a Prepcheck session, you wouldn't dare ask it because the pc will now throw the whole session into that channel and you've now got new Zeros and you won't be able to clear it up. You'll find yourself on new chains and here you go. So you avoid, again, O/W. Just avoid using any version of O/W or O/Ws or any version of withholds, in clearing a present time problem for a Prepcheck session.

Later on the pc's rudiments have been put in well, the pc's had quite a bit of auditing and that sort of thing, yes, you can ask the question if you're running 3D Criss Cross.

"Oh, I had a terrible fight with my husband last night," and so forth.

"Well," you say, "what withhold did your husband miss on you? What should he have found out about and didn't?"

"Oh, well, that's different. *Ha-ha-ha-ha*. Just so-and-so and so-and-so."

"Okay. All right. Thank you very much. Now, do you have a present time problem? Thank you very much. Well, have I missed a withhold on you? Thank you very much. Good."

That would be exactly how you would handle that. That's a rather advanced case that is auditing very, very well, don't you see?

Early on, "Do you have a present time problem? Do you have a present time problem?" *Clank!*

And you say, "Well, Ron said you didn't have to pay too much attention to rudiments, so I'll just let that be" and then the session doesn't get anyplace and the pc doesn't make any goals and gains and God almighty and it comes up in the middle of the session, you have to

handle it while your attention's on something else and the pc's down the channel. Oh, God. You can get in an awful lot of trouble auditing a pc with a PTP.

But we had some old processes that were lovely. The best of them, which was most generally runnable, even though it wasn't necessarily the shortest one, is "What part of that problem have you been responsible for?" Get him to state the problem. "All right. What part of that problem have you been responsible for?"

And you'll find out it'll fall out.

Now, as you're running it, you're not trying to flatten the whole process of responsibility. You're just taking the problem, so you ask occasionally for the present time problem again. "Do you have a present time problem?" And as soon as you can get *no* reaction on the question, "Do you have a present time problem?" you come off of it. You just stop running the process. You say, "I'll give you two more commands and end this process if that's all right with you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? What part of that problem could you be responsible for?"

Now, you better define the problem in that auditing command, so it better be, "What part of that problem with Archibald have you been responsible for?" Something like that.

Or you could be much more definite about this present time problem. "What part of that problem about Archibald wanting the car and you wanting the car at the same time have you been responsible for?" I don't care how specific you get, but it's just so finally, the only reason you're running it is "Do you have a present time problem?" must go null on the meter.

All right. Now, I'll give you the reverse of this. Somebody did this the other day. I almost shot him right here. The present time problem didn't register and the pc said it still was there and the auditor ran it. Running a present time problem that doesn't register. That's amongst the high crimes of auditing. Because it's just a rudiment.

A session is *not* designed to make the pc anything but auditable. It is *not* to make the pc happy with life. The rudiments are not designed to give an auditing gain of any kind. They're just to make the pc auditable.

And you talk about a major Q and A, that's a major Q and A. Pc says, "Well, I've decided that we're going to clear up my grandfather in today's session and this auditor isn't going to have a word to say about it," so he says, "I have a present time problem with my grandfather."

And the auditor says, "All right. It didn't fall," and audits it. Not only is he auditing a rudiment into the session and God help us how, but he's auditing a dead line. It doesn't react. God help us.

He's auditing something on which the pc either has no reality or can't be audited or doesn't need to be audited or it's unassessed and he is probably auditing something that isn't even part of the 3D Goals Problem Mass. It may beef up the whole Prehav Scale. There are many wild things can occur on taking an uncharged PTP and auditing it. So you run it by the meter. And a session has rudiments to make the pc auditable and it doesn't have rudiments to

get any auditing done of any kind whatsoever. See, that's not the purpose of rudiments, to get a big gain on the pc.

If you get a gain accidentally by running rudiments, oh, fine. Nobody's going to argue with gains. We're not going to hit the pc because he's had a gain on the rudiments. But we're sure not going to bother to expect one.

All right. Now, we take the body of the session and let's slide down and inspect *end rudiments*. The *end rudiments* begin with the truth rudiment. "Have you told me any half-truth, untruth or said something only to impress me or try to damage anyone in this session?" Awful mouthful, isn't it?

So when you say this, you don't say, "Have you told me any half-truth, untruth, said something only to impress me or try to damage anyone in this session?" That is not the way you say that rudiment.

You say four rudiments with one suck-in of breath. And you halt at each fall and clean it. So you say, you – I'll give each one a split second to answer. So it's properly said, "Have you told me any half-truth? Untruth? Or said something only to impress me? Or tried to damage anyone in this session?" I gave you enough space to see if there was a fall.

All right. Let's supposing there was going to be a fall after "untruth."

"Have you told me any half-truth? Untruth? Well, what untruth have you told me in this session?" See? You didn't even bother to finish the sentence.

"Well," the pc said, "well, I just – it wasn't very much – ah – very much. I said I inherited eight million dollars and ah – as a matter of fact, I owed twenty cents and *ha-ha-ha-ha-ha*," so forth.

Say, "All right. Good."

Don't bother now to go back to the beginning of this thing because it was "untruth," see.

So you say, "Have you told me any untruth in this session?" And it goes *clank*.

And you say, "What was that?" And you finally get this thing all sorted out. There is no process goes with it. Except, "What was that lie you told, you dog?" And you get all that off.

Now, you cleared up "untruth," didn't you, see? So you finally got a null on "Have you told me any untruth in this session?" see? That's null now. So you say, "Have you said something only to impress me? Or tried to damage anyone in this session? Thank you."

And go on to your next one. You got it? That's the way you test that one out. See, if it's null, it's null. That's it. Don't go back and invite disaster again. [laughter, laughs] See? A rudiment is just to make the pc feel better and get him out of the session zone area and straighten it up, get the little additional charge off what he was telling you. That sort of thing. And verify you. And actually, these rudiments are just basically that, these end rudiments. To make the pc feel okay by session end. They're to clean up additional and residual charge left

by reason of the session. And they're to put the pc in a frame of mind to end the session. Those are the basic reasons you have those rudiments.

Now, let's take a subordinate reason: to correct the most common auditor errors made in sessioning. And although that's secondary, these things are there to hold these auditor musts in front of auditors' faces. Because these are a list of the most common auditor misses. The things which auditors most commonly miss on pcs.

And let me tell you, you can turn out bulletins and you can give lectures and you can scream and you can hand out infraction sheets and you can talk to Herbie until he gets mad at you, and these things will still go out if they aren't right in the frame of a Model Session.

These things will happen and they cause – most randomness caused in sessions is caused by these various items. This is all secondary, you see, once we've given these first reasons. They keep these things corrected. And they keep them held to view because, you know, pcs can make absolutely no gain at all and their case can be all loused up if any one of these end rudiments, except goals and gains, is out consistently.

Now, "Have you told me any half-truth?" My golly, if you're auditing a child someday, you will actually spend three minutes in the auditing session, including beginning rudiments and the next half hour cleaning up the half-truths. Just little prevarications that aren't really prevarications. They didn't tell you all or they're trying to safeguard or help somebody. They're wild, you know.

And if you let that pile up, the child, all of a sudden, would get an auditing time track that was just total black muck. And they just wouldn't want to be audited anymore. Same way with any pc, of course, but you'll find this most flagrant with a child. Their level of responsibility is poor on the exactness of the world and that sort of thing.

And they very often give you quite delusory activities just to entertain you and so forth. Their motives are not very bad.

"Oh, yes, I was walking down the hall and this old lady jumped out and frightened me, you see."

Well, you could spot that at once. But you don't spot "Well, ah, actually I slapped my little brother." See?

You can say, "Well, that's all right. He shouldn't be doing that, so that's a laudable withhold," and so forth.

You get down to "half-truth, untruth," you know, "Well, I didn't – I didn't really slap my little brother, as a matter of fact, I haven't seen him all day." [laughter, laughs] It'll be as illogical as that.

And this goes on with adults and children equally well. But if you let them pile this stuff up, it can get quite serious.

Now, "Said something only to impress me" is not really very important, but sometimes it operates as a missed withhold and the pc gets a little bit mad at you, or feels rough about you because he said something only to impress you, not because it was true, don't you see?

And if you miss the thing, he sort of operates to some slight extent as though he had a missed withhold. You see? It's a cousin and it can bring about a downscale attitude by next session.

And now we take, "to damage anyone in this session." And now let's catch the whole basket-load of pcs who use auditing to spread entheta and to downgrade and to – so forth and in short, dramatize. And it – it's getting – it's less these days around here. It's occasional. But brother it really roars in HGCs and far areas of the world. Oh, wow! And every time they do it, it's an overt. So their auditing sessions take on the complexion of a long concatenation of overts. They will give you all kinds of other people's withholds and data and weird, oddball things that don't give them any case improvement. They're just overts, that's all. Trying to damage someone. And if you let them get away with that continuously, they've stacked up their auditing track and the next thing you know, they become unauditible. Less for the pc than for the auditor.

The auditor very often develops a fantastic idea of the pc. The pc sits there and lies about himself. Tries to damage himself. But do you know that's the last person the pc knows about?

And listen to this one now. You quite routinely, if you don't clear it at once and it's still falling, you routinely have to point this fact out to the pc. It's not evaluation. Just say, "Well, did you try to damage yourself?"

"Oh *ho-ho-ho-ho*, well, *ha-ha-ha-ha*. Yes."

"In what way?"

"Well, so-and-so and the actual truth of it was such-and-such, you see?"

All right. Any time this whole thing is violated you get an alter-is, not an as-is. So that's why you get the session mucked up. And this is the prevention of alter-is, is what you could really call that particular clause. Okay?

Now, the next one, I don't know, I had the percentage once. What was it? Oh, somewhere between 10 and 20 percent. I've forgotten, but I had the exact percentage once. It's an impressive percentage of people will throw or sell items or sell charge or try not to sell charge and they get fixated on the E-Meter and they get in a games condition with the auditor on the subject of the E-Meter. I've known a pc, actually, the second you started to give them any withhold question or anything like that, skilledly, with great practice, be able to raise the fingers one after the other so as to get a needle rise just as that question is about to be asked. Interesting.

And an eight-year-old child has actually thrown or sold an item because she liked it and thrown a whole assessment just absolutely haywire and could have just been knocked in the head if that item had ever run. Fortunately the item was never run.

But it wound up, because she'd done it and this thing has not been cleaned up. Actually, the whole thing went out and everything went null, you see? And this could have all been mysterious if we didn't have this question. But influence of the E-Meter, influence of the

E-Meter is a very, very important part of this thing because the E-Meter hasn't anything to do with a pc. It's an auditor's tool. It isn't anything the pc should be interested in.

If the pc is interested in the E-Meter, we automatically assume one of two things. That the pc is afraid of revealing something or the pc has in the past had some type of incident where the meter was proven wrong according to the pc's viewpoint.

And the pc has no confidence in the E-Meter and therefore has lowered the command value of the auditor because the pc knows the E-Meter's a fake and so the command value of the auditor's poor, but that's because somebody's devaluated the E-Meter. And the most flagrant way the E-Meter is devaluated I already gave you earlier. I gave you that. It's just, auditor says, "Well, there's no fall here on an ARC break and you say you have one." That is the most fruitful source of evaluation of the E-Meter.

But the E-Meter has become invalidated in some fashion. Now, if that thing continues to knock, you had better take that up in the body of the session and clean the whole subject of meters, metering and E-Meters on a Prepcheck basis because there's something been missed on this pc and there's something wrong with this pc and there's something wrong on it.

Now, actually it'll fall, tick or a fall or react in some way. Well, "Did you try to influence the E-Meter?"

"Well, I really didn't want it to read when you said ..." certain 3D Criss Cross item and so on. And it blows. Just standard lines. See? Those things, they clean up as you go through the rudiments.

But if this thing is always out, session after session, you roll up your sleeves and you take it and make a whole session devoted to nothing but it, prepchecking that one as a Zero Question. And then just clean this up and find out when this E-Meter was invalidated and when it was wrong and what they have done to the meter and all that sort of thing.

And you'll find out there's plenty on it and once it's cleaned up, why, bang, all of a sudden, they'll operate just fine on an E-Meter. And the question will go clean.

All right. "Have you failed to answer any question or command I've given you in this session?" This is one of the earliest admonitions of auditing. There's one auditing command or question for one response. And it is the one which is the oldest and is the one which is most frequently forgotten. And pcs have not answered auditing commands and so forth and it's a great case foul-up, and for lack of attention on this one point, I had a pc who had been given, actually had had in hundreds of hours of auditing, had thousands of auditing commands on the subject of havingness and had *never yet answered one question on Havingness*. Therefore, no Havingness Process ever worked. Interesting.

You could run Havingness Processes by the hour and test them all and of course they never would have worked because the pc had actually had alter-ised every Havingness command, had tried to tell auditors, "But Havingness doesn't work on me," and that sort of thing. And nobody had listened. It'd become just a perpetual withhold so the pc just sat there and alter-ised every Havingness command and did something else. Whenever any Havingness command was given, the pc did something else. Interesting, huh? So that's why that one is there. That's a safeguard. That's to hold in the oldest admonition concerning auditing – that

the pc must answer the auditing command. And when it doesn't, you'll get a fall. When the pc hasn't, you'll get a fall, so you clean that up.

Now, "Have you withheld anything from me?" is all right for 3D Criss Cross but is not all right for a Prepcheck end rudiment. So a Prepcheck end rudiment you would say, "Have I missed a withhold on you in this session?" And you'd finally clean that up.

Your "auditor" question, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" actually it isn't read this way, but it possibly is understood this way, "Are you still willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And that is a second check on this withhold question.

By the way, I could give you a variation on that withhold question that is a very clever one that somebody had originated out in Seattle. "Is there any withhold that you would hate to have me write down in full on this auditor's report?" or any such question. "Is there any withhold you would feel uncomfortable about having me mention to anyone?" That is a good parallel view, a second test of the thing because the one they mentioned was not cleaned up and you've missed a withhold on it. There's always more on that withhold. Follow that? That's a trick. That's a trick end rudiment Prepcheck question. And you can use that and you'll find out there's more to clean up. You just go ahead and clean it up then.

All right. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" is just an effort to make sure that we don't have an ARC break involved in it and as far as "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" and the pc said "Well, not so much," and so forth.

Just say, "Well, what did you find yourself unable to tell me?" or "What didn't I receive?" or something of this sort.

You ordinarily clear it up just that easily. Just a two-way comm situation. If this is wildly out at end of session in Prepchecking, remember, you are probably still cleaning up "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" in the beginning. So you would tell the pc it is not flat and you will now leave it, however, because we are working on it in the session.

Now, in 3D Criss Cross, you clean it up. Regardless of what you have to use, clean it up. Because you find the pc coming into session next time, it's not going to null well or something of the sort, so clean it up right then. Usually cleans up very easily. Follow that?

All right. Now, goals and gains. Now, well, "Look around here and tell me if you can have anything." Naturally, you have a Havingness Process ending the session as the last process out, the easiest one. If you haven't gotten something else, you've certainly got the Havingness Process.

One of the ways to do this, the safest way to run that particular end rudiment is have the pc give a – turn your sensitivity down and have the pc give a can squeeze. And then run five commands of the pc's Havingness Process and ask the pc to give another can squeeze. And between those two, if you see a broadening of the situation, probably the pc needs some more Havingness. Because remember, in the body of the session, you might totally have changed the characteristics of the E-Meter on the pc. Well you can't count on the fact that this... But if five commands loosen the needle, you're pretty well off to give him twenty more. Okay? Because his havingness must have been either down or improvable.

All right. And that lets him out and takes him off with anything you've missed in the rudiments – will usually come off in that little smidgen of Havingness.

And then your "goals and gains," and your "goals and gains" are basically for the auditor because an auditor wants to know if he has made any progress in the session. But secondarily, they are for the pc to point out to the pc that he did or didn't get someplace in the session.

Now, "goals" we have always had, but we add "gains." See, we've always said "Have you made any part of your goals for the session?" but "Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention?" has been added in exclusively for the auditor because pcs very often want to tell the auditor they have made some other gains.

They might not have made all the specific goals such as "to have three children" or something like that as their session goal, they haven't made that one. But they have made some gains. They don't feel quite so pregnant or something of the sort. [laughter] Something weird or impossible is liable to come up like that where they have not actually set very real session goals. You never argue with these session goals, of course.

But they have made gains for the session and it gives them an opportunity to tell the auditor. In other words, that is the auditor's pay period. That's where the pay line starts. Starts right at the beginning of that rudiment. And you'll find out that since we've had that, an auditor feels better paid. That's right. And, because you'll find out it's amazing. Pc at the end of the session – say, "Well, did you make any of your goals?" It's all right, by the way, to read the pc's goals back to the pc if he can't remember them offhand. "Did you make this one, did you make this one, did you make this one? And what do you – what do you think about that?"

And then, of course, put it on the freewheeling and say, "Have you made any other gains in this session you'd care to mention?" And the pc will tell you they did or they didn't or something of the sort and you make your notation on your auditor's report and then comes end of session.

And of course, you end the session to end the session. And when you end the session, make sure that you end the session. Don't leave it in question. If the pc's still sitting there going kind of like you – like this and makes no motion or doesn't yawn or relax or you don't feel attention break on the subject of the auditing session, bust it. Go right in on it again and you say, "Has this session ended for you?" And I don't care what you do particularly, but say, "All right. Now, look at me. Look at me. Look straight at me now. Now, feel your feet on the floor. Look at me now. Feel your feet on the floor. Now, touch the table in front of you. *Pat it. Pat it.* Feel your feet on the floor. Look at me. All right. *End of session.*"

"Oh, well, yeah. *Ha-ha.*"

They're very often hung up in some fashion and you just *mustn't* end sessions with pcs in-session. You want to know how often you do it? You want to know how often you end a session with the pc still in-session? Is the pc talks to you about the auditing session right after you've said, "End of session." You want to know how often you have ended the session with the pc still in-session? Pc goes right on talking to you in the same way. Walks down the hall

with you in your same role as an auditor. Goes right on treating you as the auditor. The session has not ended.

That actually – no disaster involved with it because he shakes out of it after a while – but that actually is the most common auditing error is not to end a session. Because it goes unpassed. It's not a very serious error. Therefore, it becomes extremely common.

You expect time is going to end the session. Well, the old man with a scythe – I haven't met him for years, you know? I just haven't met him for years. And I don't think he comes around and says, "End of session" to your pc.

I know the pc's still suffering from what happened 200 trillion years ago and so I don't think anybody ended that either. I don't think time is very efficient this way.

I don't say there's anything wrong with time. I just say that the auditor should not rely on the old man with the scythe to come up and look fixedly at the pc and says, "Hey!"

And we have this other one which is terribly optional. It's terribly optional. Is "Tell me I am no longer auditing you." And that tends to end the thing. Okay?

All right. Tell me I'm no longer lecturing to you. [laughter]

Good night.

THE BAD "AUDITOR"

A lecture given on 19 March 1962

I see some of you have made some progress and some haven't. I don't see anybody has totally retrogressed, however – except you, of course. [laughter]

The – that clock up there is two-and-a-half minutes slow. Beg your pardon. Five minutes slow. Shows you. I go away two weeks you lose five minutes worth of time just like that. Five invaluable minutes. Now, you can think back down your time track when five minutes would have been a long time. Just before you ran into the brick wall. Another five minutes. Wouldn't that have been marvelous? [laughs]

Well, tonight we have a subject which I must approach with considerable diplomacy. A subject which, however, means much more to you than you would at first glance recognize and one which if you're ever going to train anybody, you had better know pretty well. It took me quite a while to work this out. I sniffed around the edges of it and finally hit it right on the button. The bad "auditor."

You notice the bad "auditor," the auditor is in quotes. Because there is no such thing as a bad "auditor" the auditor is not in quotes. Do you see? But frankly, before I go any further, do not expect me to do a condemnatory dissertation and spit my teeth out on the subject of how bad a bad "auditor" is. Because I'm not going to.

Frankly, people who have this combination wrong with them deserve an enormous tribute for auditing at all. It must drive them straight up the wall.

Now, this is based on HCOB of 8 March, supplemented 15 March 1962, AD 12. I notice these are two different time strata. It's HCOB of 8 March 1962 and HCOB of March 15th, AD 12. And so there are two entirely different time tracks.

Now, I am not at any time ever going to be found in a situation where I am ranting and roaring about how bad auditors are. This is not true. I have enormous confidence in auditors. And I always feel when an auditor is not able to make the grade with a pc that it is I who am at fault, not the auditor. Because the willingness and good-heartedness of auditors has been proven to me time and time and time again over a long period of time.

The difficulties which people have in learning to audit are two-fold. One is technology, adequacy of – that comes under the heading – and two, my lack of experience with their troubles in auditing. Now, those are the first and foremost difficulties with auditing. As soon as I find what you don't understand or I find out that you don't understand it, under the second heading, I can pretty well be counted on to remedy it rapidly, because I only have my auditing to judge by until I observe somebody else having trouble auditing.

Most of the modifications which you have gotten throughout 1961 and thus far into '62 have been modifications which have come directly out of part two of which I just gave you. They actually don't come out of the first part – technology, adequacy of.

But now we have a piece of technology which gives us the key to an auditor's having difficulty. So you see, we've got a number one boost in the first part I just mentioned to you – technology, adequacy of.

Now, this technology, of course, pervasively speeds up cases and does a lot of things. Every time you get a new piece of technology, it of course speeds up all cases. That's about the first thing you can expect of it.

But this does more than that. This tells you why people make mistakes. And that is all there is to it. This tells you why people have difficulty learning and so on. This tells you an enormous number of odds and ends about human behavior. And therefore if I weren't so interested in making you an excellent auditor, this would have come out under another heading entirely, advance, which it came out under March the 15th, you see. It wouldn't have come out under the heading "The Bad 'Auditor'." It would have come out under the heading of "Suppressors." But I wanted to call this to your attention and I was most interested in the fact that this does explain the diffidence and difficulty of an auditor.

And therefore, if you are ever a D of T, this data is absolutely priceless because this tells you why you're going to have trouble with every student that you're going to have trouble with.

This person that we're talking about who becomes a bad "auditor" would, of course, have rather an exclusive corner on this aberration. In other words, you recognize that all aberration is, is a concentration on a single ability. For instance, the communist is crazy because he is totally concentrated on the third to the utter abandonment of the first. That makes him crazy, you see. I mean, his concentration is so enormous that he looks insane.

Now, if you look this over, you'll see, then, that a person who is utterly mad, as viewed from a psychiatric viewpoint, is describable as sane. Let's look at this now. The psychiatrist collects madneses and when he's all through collecting all the madneses, one sample of each madness in his spinbin – they call them hospitals; they don't know better – when he's got one sample of each, he then actually has a chart of sanity, you see? And that's why the psychiatrist has never been able to understand sanity and that's what he can't understand. The psychiatrist can understand insanity, but he can't understand sanity. And this is the main difficulty that the whole society has with the psychiatrist.

You know, he never has a sane conduct. He has insane conduct and to him the absence of insane conduct gives us sanity. But by that same definition, the only sane man would be a dead man because he'd have a total absence of insane conduct, with one exception – catatonia. And that would throw that out, too, you see?

So the psychiatrist has nothing like sane conduct. He could not describe sane conduct. He has no observation of sane conduct. Therefore, any one of you or any citizen in the United States or England or France and particularly Russia, brought up in front of a psychiatrist to

find out whether or not he is sane or insane, could be taken with any response to be insane by the psychiatrist. You see?

And he said, "Well, do you eat?"

"Oh," the fellow said, "I eat. Oh, yes, I eat. I..."

"Crazy, he eats."

"Well, you – you think this is right?"

He says, "Well, have you ever eaten any strange objects? Or eaten anything odd? Or anything strange?"

"Oh," you say, "well, in the normal course of human events, I was out camping one time. We used to eat ants and dirt."

"Ah, well. You've had it."

Now, of course, what he should ask and possibly even does, is whether or not the person exclusively eats ants and dirt. Now, this person eats nothing else but ants and dirt, you see, he's perfectly insane. That's for sure.

You see that insanity is a nothing-else-than. That's what insanity is. It's a fantastic concentration on any sanity to the exclusion of all other sanities and then the fellow goes nuts. There's no reason why you shouldn't be able to eat ants and dirt. But if you never wanted to eat anything but ants and dirt and you felt you couldn't ever digest anything but ants and dirt and you felt it'd kill you to eat anything else but ants and dirt and you never thought about anything else except eating ants and dirt and you never did anything but go find dirt and ants to eat, you'd be crazy.

Do you see that it's the degree? Now, that's why you, time to time, have thought you were crazy. You see, because all sanity has its lower harmonic, its mockery. Every sane impulse, every sane action has its lower harmonic and mockery. It's intensity of and to the exclusion of anything else that makes something that is pretty nutty. Do you see?

We would not consider a person mad for drawing squares on walls, but now we get a person who does nothing but draw squares on walls and doesn't do anything else but draw squares on walls and doesn't want to do anything else except draw squares on walls and couldn't draw anything else on walls except squares and must fill up all possible walls with squares; we don't get an architect, we get a nut. [laughter] You see, it's to the exclusion of other things.

And so, with that small preamble, you must view this subject of the bad "auditor" as one of degree. Now, you are often leery of your own sanity, as I started to say a minute ago, only because if you ever read a full catalog of insanities, you would find you in it repeated several times. You see?

"Insane patients do..." And then we just list a whole bunch of things, you see? And then you look down this list of things and you say, "Huh, wait a minute, I do that. Huh, well, wait a minute, I do that. Huh, I do..." [laughter]

That puts you on a beautiful withhold because you go out in the society, you don't tell everybody you think you're nuts, you see? Inevitable.

This is one of the most generalized mechanisms you could imagine. The person – what does he do? All of these various things. An insane person, you see and what does he do, you see?

And actually, if you listed all insane things that all insane people did, all you would do – you know, without any degree of it mentioned – you'd just get a sane person, that's all. You're liable to do any of these things, see? There's no accounting for what people will do. It isn't even in an unguarded moment. They will do some of the wildest things, but if they don't do anything else, that's what makes it insane, see? I'm sure maybe sooner or later, you have had an impulse to join the army or something like that. Well, it'd just be degree of how you join the army. And of course, if you joined a new army every week, we would get it up to a highly insane level.

But you, reading this list of what insane people do – this "has impulse to join an army." And you've had an impulse to join an army, so you classify yourself, you see? And similarly, every auditor reading this bulletin, "The Bad 'Auditor'" – let me say this: Every auditor except those who should have thought this – said to himself, "*That's me. That's me.*" He wasn't even grammatical about it. Just that was it. We had him labeled now.

That wasn't true. That wasn't true. Everybody's got a little bit of this. Well, the last time you saw a buzz saw buzzing and didn't put your finger in it is easily explained. You didn't want to see your finger lying on the floor, no longer attached to your hand, you see? Well, that's perfectly rational and understandable.

Therefore, you would say to yourself, "Well, I must be trying to suppress things if I don't want to see my finger cut off lying on the floor."

Well, nobody does want to see his finger cut off and lying on the floor, at least until he can mock up a new finger in exactly the same place with the same mobility as his old hook. A little bit easier in space opera. You go down to the tin shop and they bang you out a new finger. But... That is if you've got pull with the commanding officer of the armorer or somebody, you can always get a new finger.

But these humanoid bodies are triggered to live only once. The philosophy of "live only once" the philosophy of "when you are dead, oh, boy, are you dead" gives you a superprotect, a superpreserve, a supersurvive computation with regard to the body and you get so that you mind losing fingers in buzz saws. And so you don't want to find your finger on the floor, so you tend to suppress actions which would lead to finding your finger on the floor.

Well, that doesn't mean that you classify under this heading. Anybody could run any of these processes and lines with a considerable benefit. Anybody could run any of them, see? And they'd get something out of it. Don't worry. But the case we're talking about starts running this thing – and this isn't even the worst case – and they start running this thing and they say, "*Agggghhhhh!*"

And you say, "Give me another one."

"Agggghhhhh! Oh, no, no."

And you say, "Well, give me another one."

"Agghhh. Oh, no, no. No thank you. *Mmmm.*"

And you say, "What's the matter?"

"Oh, I don't know. My God."

"Well, what's happening?"

"Well, my whole spine just turns into total, solid pain. Let's not think about it anymore, huh?"

You ask them a question and you get, "*Oh, no!*" And then they finally give you one, see?

That's the case I'm talking about. You see, that's the reaction we're talking about. Not, "*Ugghh.* Hey, what do you know? *Ooomp*, you know. *Ooomp.* *Haw.* My stomach feels funny. *Urp.*"

"All right. Here's another one."

"Oh-oh. There went a bullet."

See, we're not talking about that reaction. We're talking about, "*Oh, no, my God, please. Not another one. Oh, no.*"

You know, I audited a guy through a terror charge one time. He was lying on a couch. Tell you how I got that terror charge off of him one time. It might – it might amuse you. You might find somebody sitting on a terror charge and you might want to try this. I told him to, "Go to the beginning of track and scan all the way forward to present time. Thank you. Go to the beginning of track. Scan all the way forward to present time. Thank you. Beginning of track. Scan all the way forward to present time." Take him four or five minutes each time to come the whole track, see.

Of course, I was sticking him in the engram necessary to resolve the case. That's all. That's the only reason you do that. You're not trying to erase track. You just erase the illusion of moving on the track because the guy's been stuck in this particular engram for a very long time. And after about the third or fourth one of this, the terror charge turned on and he was lying on the couch. And I am not kidding you. The couch was perfectly even and its legs sat perfectly on the floor and there was nothing uneven about this floor. And the person started vibrating. He was shaking with such terror and such violence that the couch was picking up and banging against the floor. I've never seen this happen before. I watched it with some amazement. I told him that was very well done. [laughter]

And found him in an incident that he'd been sitting in since *mmm*, whereby he and his friend were out on scout and they got captured by the other tribe and he watched his friend spitted on a stake alive and broiled to be eaten. And then he went mad and they threw him over the cliff. They didn't eat him. And he had been stuck in that thing ever since. It isn't even much of an incident as incidents on the whole track go, see? Boy, he really must have been –

what we know now about him is, man, man, he must have really served it out of the deep-freeze every day: human steak, you know?

But he actually was in such a terror charge that that whole couch just beat against the floor at some low, droning note. Well, it was beating up and down just about an inch and a quarter, something like that. Just *banging!* I thought the whole couch was going to shatter. I ran him through it. I just sat there and ran him through it from beginning to end, having stuck him in it with scanning, you see?

"What's going on?" Ran the thing out. He was sure never the same again. It took a tremendous terror charge off of him.

Well now, if a person can contain this much terror on the whole track in a single incident, imagine – because that must have been free track or I would never have discovered the incident, you see – the amount of charge that's possibly there in a valence which is dictating terror, you see and which is all composited on terror and that sort of thing, which is terrified of anything appearing anyplace.

Well, now what is the exact action of a person who is terrified? It isn't just terror that this is in, but terror is a very good one to describe it with. Terror is as the result of something having appeared engrammatically and then later on threatening to appear again. Remember that a secondary or emotional charge can only exist later on the track than a physically painful incident – technology of 19 – late 1951, early 1951.

The only way you can ever get a grief charge or a terror charge or an anger charge or something like that is after the fact of physical pain. If you trace this back – if you find a loss of an ally. Let's say you find this girl and her father's dead. And you run off the death of the father. And you're bleeding tears off the death of the father and that's fine and you run this thing out and it looks like it's disappearing and so forth: do you know that you can ask them a question which drops them immediately into the similar engram which lies below that terror charge, see? You'll find that there's some similar physical pain engram, overt or motivator, which lies immediately and directly below that grief charge that the person is experiencing.

In other words, a person cannot, actually cannot experience a misemotional charge independent of having received physical pain.

In other words, your emotion is always lighter and is always secondary to actual physical contact and pain. That's why it's called a secondary. That's where the word came from.

So you – one day you're riding in the car. You're nine years old, you're riding in the car, the old man has had a few snifters too many and he goes off the edge of the road and you bung your shins up and you feel bad about the whole thing – physically. You're not hurt seriously.

You're twenty-eight years of age and you read in the newspaper how a little child has been killed in an automobile accident and you feel very sad. The very funny part about it is you wouldn't feel sad if you yourself hadn't had some pain connected with a similar incident. Do you see?

The way to knock out all secondaries, of course, is to get at the engrams and run them out and the secondaries pour off like mad. But sometimes the secondaries lock up an engram, so if you don't get the emotional charge off, you can't get at the engram. And that's very important. And a lot of auditors have noticed this. Before they got off a grief charge or six or eight or ten or fear charges or anger charges or something like that, they never did find the lower incident. But after that they found that after they'd run this grief charge or something like that off... And you realize any misemotional charge compares with a grief charge. You can run off terror, you can run off fear, you can actually run boredom off, you can run apathy, any of these things as well as grief. I don't know why the psychoanalyst only found grief as his tone scale. His tone scale consisted of just two things: apathy and grief. That's as far as he ever got up off the launching pad. Because he really didn't consider euphoria an emotion. That was life. But he thought euphoria was bad, too.

Now, when you got into a physical pain situation, you could later on expect to get an emotional reaction to a similar situation. Now, that is everything on which this bad "auditor" proposition depends. I mean you remember that relationship between the engram and the secondary.

After you've had a few automobiles wrapped around your head, you do one of two things: You either get used to having automobiles wrapped around your head and decide that you are now familiar with this phenomena and to hell with it and go on or you decide that the threatened appearance of an automobile or the threatened – well, anybody is in this state – a threatened accident must be instantly suppressed, you see?

You're going down the road and you see a fellow coming your way and he's weaving from side to side and you go '*Agggghhhh*,' and the passengers all try to put on the brakes and that sort of thing, you know? Suppression. They're trying to suppress something from happening. They're trying to keep something from happening. That's their action there because it's obvious that an accident might occur. Well, that's visible, isn't it?

All right. Let's take this person who has been in fifteen wrecks and hasn't become familiar with them yet. Hasn't lived along the M1. And this person – accident before last was with a red car. And they just look way up the road and they see a red car and it's parked. But that's enough. They instantly suppress the red car.

Now, you could ask them immediately afterwards, "What automobiles and what color were they, have we passed in the last five minutes?" and he'd tell them all, but he wouldn't tell you the red car. See, he'd omit the red car because that must be suppressed. Now, that person's pretty batty. He's not just around the curve, he's a bit around the bend.

Now, in earlier activities we called this a restimulator. The red car was the restimulator of an accident. And then car, any car, would be a restimulator... Well, car tire tracks would be an associative restimulator for a restimulator.

All right. These are all substitute, substitute, substitute. You have the real car in the real accident. Now, the person substitutes similar situations to the first accident. He associates those to the first accident. So every one of those he starts reacting to as though it were the first accident. Now, you call that a restimulator. So any situation or environment which is similar to that first accident in which he was really hurt he tends to suppress.

And the very funny part of it is if you ask him to spot everything in his environment at the moment of restimulation – you see him turn pale all of a sudden and you ask him to spot everything in the environment – just that way. You just say, "Well, now point out everything there is here." That's a good auditing command on somebody like that. Experimental I'm talking about – experimental auditing command.

You say, "Point out everything there is here." And you just keep that up, see? And every time he slows down, you tell him, "Go ahead, now. Point out everything there is here."

And he points out a few more.

And "Well, point out everything there is here," you see? And he'll point out everything and he'll point out everything.

Now, look. If you're what's wrong with the auditing session, do you know he'll never point to you. If you are a restimulator for this person, he will never point to you. He will always omit you. By the mere process of elimination, havingness and familiarity with the environment, he may very well, finally, point his finger at you and at that moment have a sigh of relief.

Well, you've all of a sudden ceased to be a restimulator for that particular accident. In other words, that is the action of keying out. The person without knowing what the earlier instance was has the lock vanish. That's a key-out.

The first key-in is the first time he ever got a restimulator for the original accident. This accident's been riding along just fine. All of a sudden, the same car's coming, the same circumstances, under the same situation, all from the same direction, at the same time of day, the same day of the year, you know, riding with the same girl, you know, with the same guilty conscience and all of a sudden, *boom!* He has an awful pain in his stomach and he goes on having this pain in his stomach. And doctors analyze him. And they give him barium meals. And you don't dine well on barium meals, you know. And they decide that he has to take bromides and listen to political speeches – anything – anything, you see? Put him to sleep. Get him quiet. And just nothing does anything for this stomach.

And then you come along one fine day and you say, "Well, have you ever had an accident to your stomach?"

"No. Never have." See?

That's a dead giveaway. He's given you the suppressor. Now, just think about it for a moment. A person walking on this planet in the space of any two years who has not had something give him a knock in the stomach or who has not knocked his stomach against something doesn't exist. Or who has not eaten something that slightly disagreed with him. You get the impossibility. Almost anybody would say to you normally (no somatic in the stomach, you see), "Well, did anything ever happen to your stomach?"

"Yeah, yeah. I suppose. Yeah, probably. Oh, yeah."

But not this guy, see. Not this guy. You say to him, "Anything ever happen to your stomach?"

"No. No. No. Never has. Never has. No. It just mysteriously got ill."

Here's the somatic, you see, which calls him a liar at once. You as a Scientologist know damn well something's happened to his stomach; he's got a somatic in it.

"Anything ever happen to your stomach?"

"No. No, no, no."

"Well, now, are you sure nothing has ever happened to your stomach."

"No, No. I couldn't think of anything."

Well, he's not going to try either. *Ha-ha.* You'll finally get him on the E-Meter and spot it on the time track. The person goes through horrible sensations, something is liable to appear or something like this. And then if you're lucky all of a sudden, this time he socked somebody in the stomach or time he got socked in the stomach suddenly turns on and this automobile accident, you see, turns on, whereby he hit his stomach on the dashboard or something like this, you see and there's the accident.

The person who says to you, "*No.* Under no circumstances has anything like this *ever* happened. *I tell you now! Never! It never did!*"

Of course, this fellow's lived for 200 trillion years. You know it's a damn lie. You see? Just on the law of averages. On the law of averages. Not with any degree of aberration. But you, as you sit, have certainly done to some slight degree practically everything that could ever be done anyplace with and to anyone, you see?

And this person tells you – he's sitting there. "Well, what kind of weather are you having? Well, you're having weather? Fine."

"Yes, I like to go fishing."

And all of a sudden you ask him, "Well, did you ever have an accident or ever have anything happen to your stomach?"

"*No!* No-ho-ho-ho. No. Never have. Never."

Sort of "What are you going to do about it?" you know?

You can find it with the E-Meter and suddenly present him with some interesting pictures and he can fit these into place and you can work these out and probably get rid of his somatic.

What you've run into is a suppressor. A person is suppressing restimulators using the original power of suppression in the original painful incident. And that is a suppressor. Just before he was hit with the car, he tried to unmock one car – *crunch!* You see, he's had a terrific impulse to unmock this car. It hit him anyhow, so that made him lose. But later on, it's that same *crunch*, see, that comes down and unmocks the restimulators.

Now, he finds out he can unmock the restimulators and because it's no longer there in the bank, the first incident appears to be unmocked. A thetan never gives up. See? There he is lying there, you see, squashed as a bug, you know. Green juice. I don't – some – on one planet or another it's different colors, you know. [laughter] Splattered all about, you see? And there is the car utterly triumphant, snuffing contemptuously through its radiator. Not even a slight

dent, you know. Not even any green stains on its bumper. Not even ruffled. But in this guy's bank, you have a totally wiped out car. There he lies stone dead, but his picture is of a totally wiped out car. Thetan never gives up. He couldn't mock it – unmock it in actuality, he will unmock it in the bank.

That's why it takes you so long to run an engram. You've run off the unmock. And then you can find the actual incident, don't you see and then you eventually can erase the incident and get the pain.

And you know how long it takes very often when you're doing a Touch Assist for the physical pain to turn on. You – sometimes you'll audit the guy for a half an hour before he gets any physical pain out of the incident. Well, you're running into the suppressor. And you have to get the suppressor all the way off before the physical pain is connected with and all of a sudden *ouch!* And there it is, you see? And then you get off little other pieces of the suppressor and you get these little flicks. That's why he doesn't get the somatic all at once. And that's why it didn't run out instantly after the accident.

Now, if he wasn't suppressing and if he wasn't in such a games condition with MEST, this is what would have happened: The car hits him, *splat*. Knocks him into a telephone pole, *splat*. He comes around and drops on the road again and gets run over by a bus, *splat!* And if he didn't feel so undignified, he simply would have said, "Well, *splat, splat, splat*. What's a few...?" [laughter] And he would have picked the body up and dusted its clothes off and so forth and it would have been totally uninjured.

In other words, the somatic would have run out as fast as it happened. But because of his not-is, the somatic stays in place. And this alone is disease, aberration, physical malformation and all the other difficulties he suffers from – are all contained under the heading of not-is.

Now, a person goes through various phases of not-ising – suppression – talking about the same thing. He goes through various phases of not-is. He not-ises slightly or not-ises more. And a person's impulse toward not-is, if failed, can turn into an alter-is.

Now, a person's alter-is can turn into a not-is and his not-is can turn into an alter-is. So a person can have a suppression stacked with a change. And that is dub-in. See, you get a – you get a suppression and he knew the suppression wasn't successful, so he alter-ised. He knew he couldn't suppress, so he alter-ised, you see? So you get dub-in. It usually happens below the level of unconsciousness, hence dreams. And they're just alter-ises of the things you can't not-is.

Now, when you get into a situation as an auditor where you feel a little bit leery about auditing somebody, you have entered a specialized field of suppression.

Now, some auditors have difficulty only auditing a certain type of pc. In HGCs this gets to be traditional. A D of P who knows his staff auditors very often will have to be very careful with one or two auditors. One, he doesn't dare assign a certain auditor to audit a young man because no auditing occurs. Or the pc will just be torn to ribbons or some mal-auditing activity will occur. You don't dare let a certain staff auditor audit an elderly lady. Something bad will happen as a result of the session.

And yet, these two staff auditors, one that can't audit the young man and one that can't audit the elderly lady, you see, can audit every other type of pc with perfect equanimity but can't audit one type of pc. Now, that's what you call the most selective condition of a suppression.

Their suppression on this particular type of being is the prevention of a restimulator. They're afraid something is going to appear. That is the only way you can state it adequately. They're suppressing something.

This person puts them into a certain frame of mind, so they have to *suppress* this person. And what result do you get? We get the immediate result that one way or another, in a – *ten thousand* different guises, this pc must *not* talk to that auditor. Pc mustn't give up withholds. Pc mustn't do an auditing command. Pc mustn't ever change. Pc mustn't ever originate. And how many ways can this be expressed? Well, they're just invariable, the number of manifestations we get out of a suppressor.

How many ways can we keep a pc from communicating? Well, we can let the pc go on forever without an acknowledgment. You wouldn't have thought of that at first glance as just a method of preventing the pc from communicating. You see, you never let the pc – you never direct any of the pc's communication, so the pc is just left to fish and wander, you see and steers all over the place and doesn't know where he's going. And the auditor says, "Well, if I just let him go get good and lost, he's not going to say a thing. *Ha-ha, ha-ha*. But if I got in there with a couple of smart questions, *ho-ho*. Oh, well. That's a different proposition. He might suddenly reveal something. Something might leap up about this that would be harmful to one and all, particularly me or him. Who knows?" But that's a good way to keep him from communicating – by never directing his communication. Don't you see?

Oh, there's many ramifications of this. Pc starts to answer the auditing question and the auditor instantly acknowledges. The pc doesn't answer the auditing question, you see. Pc says, "Mm-hm. Ah..."

"*Thank you!* (We'll keep him under control here real good.)" [laughter] "Now, have you ever seen any mice?" "Ah, yes. I..."

"*Thank you*. What are you upset about?"

"Well, I wasn't upset about anything."

"Oh, well, you look upset to me" and so forth.

"Oh, well, yes. I was a little..."

"Well, you – I don't see any ARC break registering here. *Thank you*. Now, let's see, let me see."

How many ways could you keep a pc from revealing something? How many ways? Well, there are just thousands and thousands and thousands of ways. And it's the composite, one or another or composites of one or another of those ways that combines every auditing fault. Once an auditor knows the form of auditing, once a person is trained into the form of auditing, if he persists along any of these ways, I can tell you now, since I've gone through

this with a fine-toothed Ron, to recognize exactly what he's doing. This took an awful lot of worry and work on this thing, of trying to sort it out and exactly what the conditions were.

No, he's just using a method of suppression and that's all.

I'll give you a method. If he doesn't ever learn how to audit, he won't ever get anything revealed, will he? But he's willing, isn't he? Perfectly willing to audit, but can't ever learn how to audit. You never get the pc to reveal a thing, do you?

Well, that is the slow freight out. See, that's the slow freight. You see that mostly in an Academy. A person grinding on through – can't do the TRs, *ha-ha-ha*. Just can't seem to get any of the TRs, you see? Can't sit there and look at somebody, you know. Just can't do it, you know? Can't do 1, 2, 3 and 4, you know? Just muffs one or another of these things. Goofs up, see. Does it for months and months and months. They actually have been.

Well, the actual fact is that if you keep a person at it long enough, he will run this out. He will find out – unless it is absolutely potty, you know, totally neurotic and psychotic in intensity – a person will eventually run it out.

Person says, "Oh, well, pcs. They don't – aren't going to reveal anything that's going to knock my head off, you know." They get used to it.

In other words, they get used to it by familiarization. Now, that's the only cure we had to the bad "auditor" in all former training. Some of them, however, never did get used to it by familiarization. There are two courses you can take about automobile accidents. You can either have enough of them so that you get familiar with it, you see and skip it. Or you get to a point where you totally suppress all automobiles. And some people, in studying auditing, take this other route. They are in a minority. They are only about 20 percent or something like that. But you just keep it up forever. You can train and train. And it's just taking them so *long* to get over this by the route of familiarity that it hardly counts.

Now, that's 20 percent. Now, about 30 percent get over it rather slowly. Well, it's a case of, "Well, another six or seven ACCs, we'll have an auditor." [laughter]

And then 50 percent of them, in varying shades of gray, get over it rather rapidly. Rather easily. Well, they're all getting over the same thing. Every one of them whether they're nutty on the subject or it only bothered them for their first week of training. We don't care which. But they're all on that band.

The length of time required in training is directly proportional to the number of suppressors you are trying to overcome in the student. And that establishes the length of time in training.

Now, I think, from what I've seen around here, that a person would be pretty darn well trained after about four months. A person should be pretty well trained. They should be putting up a pretty good show after about four months.

If they go into their fifth month or six month, we can consider them at least guilty of having a shade of gray, here. There must be a shade of gray. If they go into the sixth month

and haven't learned yet at all hardly, we'd say, well, that's starting to look suspect. That's starting to join up with the 20 percent, don't you see?

But it all comes from the same thing, is how – how much is a person going to suppress. What is this effort to suppress? How great is the effort to suppress? Because, you see, they're dealing with the root stuff of human aberration and of course there is likely to be revealed from the pc... Don't think of this now in terms of withholds and how somebody would spank them if they found out. Well, let's not worry about that.

Let's just take the idea that if they had an automobile accident and if another automobile accident showed up like that, they'd have to go through all the pain and agony of the automobile accident they had, they're not going to have anything to do with the automobile accident, that's all.

So they say to the pc, "All right, now..."

They were – they were fine. They were doing fine. Their first two weeks at the Academy, they just did swell. You'll find this, too, by the way. You'll find this abundantly. Just did fine. And one day they were saying, "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting " – they're running this as an exercise and they're sitting there all keen. And the person says, "An automobile accident with an E-type Jaguar."

They didn't even hear the answer. See, the suppressor is right there on automatic, see? They quit.

"Oh, well. Something you wouldn't mind forgetting. Where's the Instructor? Do you have an ARC break? Why not?" [laughter, laughs]

And they all of a sudden don't like auditing. The one thing they mustn't reveal and the one thing they were trying to get rid of in their own case without ever revealing it to them, you see, was an automobile accident with this type of car. And by *God*, the pc sat right there and handed it to him, you see?

And the person says, "*Brakes*, see, *scream*, you know. No, thank you. No. Ha-ha. No. Ha-ha." "Now, why don't you answer the auditing question?"

They frankly wouldn't even have heard the answer to the auditing question. Because they just would have gone *clunk*. *Gone*. Everything would appear rather dazed. If you run them through the session and tried to find that piece of the session, it'd be gone. And you'd know what it was, too. Because you went over it long enough, you'd at least get what the pc said, but you wouldn't be able to analyze what the reaction of the auditor was or why. You'd know it was because the pc said a restimulator of the auditor and the auditor's suppressing that.

Well, then you just check back kind of similar incident in the life of the auditor and – *bang!* – that would knock out that suppressor. But in view of the fact that several hundred trillion suppressors exist in every case, to run out each and every one of them, individually, would be very nearly impossible. Therefore, it requires a much better approach.

It requires drills of suppression, familiarization with suppression, not familiarization with incidents. Let's familiarize with the mechanism and the identity of who or what would

suppress. And we get these things sorted out and these things out of the road, we can start clearing up this particular mechanism.

Now, who is the person – who is the person with the field, the Black V, the invisible field and so forth? This is a person only in a tremendous suppression.

A person with a black field, of course, is more prone to suppress at night than in the daytime. It's natural. You go around walking around the dark streets of the town and you're liable to have things appear that you can't recognize because you don't have enough light to recognize them, so you just go walk around the corner and you go *oomph*, "Oh, well, that's a newspaperman," and you go past an alley and you *oomph*, and, "Well, that – that's a horse – old tie-up stand for a horse," and you go around the next corner and you go *oomph*, and you say, "Oh, that's a – just a restaurant sign." By the time you've finished a few blocks of walk, you've got a black field for a while, see, because you're suppressing all the blacknesses, see? Blacknesses are just difficulty of recognition, that's all.

Invisibility is rarer, but people who are suppressing glass objects, we learned a long time ago, will develop invisible fields. Yeah, you can actually put out a glass ashtray and tell them to, "Try to make it disappear. Thank you. Try to make it disappear. Thank you. Try to make it disappear," and their field will change.

"Make the window vanish. Thank you. Make the window vanish. Thank you. Try to make the window vanish." And you'll get a change in their field. Those are not good processes, but they give you an idea of an invisible field.

And of course, the person who is suppressing thetans has an invisible field. He has a total nothingness involved and other types of suppression. So you'll have suppression of visible things, suppression of invisible things, suppression of matter, energy, space, time. You get suppression of almost anything you can think of.

And anytime you suppress anything in a certain time stream, you, of course, are also suppressing time. So time becomes the primary suppression. And therefore, you get the instantaneous quality of the reactive bank, so that all time is *now* in the reactive bank because of the suppression of the reactive bank. And that is simply not-is-ness in the reactive bank.

All right. As we look this thing over, then, we see that almost anybody is trying to suppress something. That anybody is trying to suppress a lot of things, not just something, lots of things. I'm not now talking about trying to suppress bad things about their past or anything like that. They're just trying to suppress things, see?

They suppress the impulse to put their finger into a buzz saw. See, people just – normal human conduct calls for suppression.

And now we go from that into suppressing things which are likely to appear. And then we go from that into suppressing things which are likely to become known about them – we get the withhold. And then we get suppression of things that others are liable to think. You're really doing a honey then, suppressing other people's thoughts, you know? Man, I tell you. If you want a good failure, try that. It leaves more invisible fields scattered around and various things like that. And you get various complications of suppression and various automaticities of suppression.

Now, it's only the person who has suppression of banks on total automatic, completely out of their own control, utterly lost and completely nuts on it, that actually are damaging as auditors. And such people are damaging as auditors because they will not let a pc ever reveal anything. So therefore, the pc gets totally stuck in everything he utters. And if a process works today, that auditor is going to change it to another process tomorrow because if he kept on with a workable process, uuuuuu. That auditor will only run processes which are totally inactive on the case. He will only run processes that are flat. He will only change processes that are changing. There's the primary source of Q and A.

It's actually quite horrible when you look it over. If the pc is trying to get rid of a withhold, the pc is trying to reveal something, the auditor will totally Q-and-A with him and say the pc must never reveal this thing. Doesn't matter what it is. Just it mustn't be revealed, that's all.

So the auditor's attitude is to goof, ARC break, not find it on the E-Meter or only pick up something that he's well aware will be very, very safe, out of which nothing will occur.

"Now, do you have any withholds?"

Well, he just misses that one and that one and that one and that one and then picks up this withhold where the person says, "Well, yes, I do have a withhold. This morning I sneezed."

That's safe. That's all right. He can have that one. So he works on times the pc has sneezed. There's going to be nothing ever reveal itself on this channel and he'll work that channel endlessly because it's a perfectly safe operating channel, because nothing is ever going to be revealed out of it. Perfectly all right with him.

You come around to the back of this auditor and he's running the end rudiments, "Have I missed a withhold on you?"

Clang! the needle goes, you see and goes *spung!* and shivers on the side of the pin. This person says, "All right. That one's straight," and goes to the next end rudiment.

They'll do it. And that, of course, we know by present technology is a dangerous auditor. Now, that is a real dangerous auditor because that auditor, willy-nilly, all with the very best of possible intentions, doing their very, very best, will ARC break anybody that is ever audited by them and drive them out of Scientology. He isn't trying to do this, see? All he's trying to do is do a good, safe job that isn't going to upset anybody.

And they know how to do a good, safe job that isn't going to upset anybody: You just never find anything out. You never let anything be revealed.

Now, naturally, you refer this to the field of study. If the person looks at the paper and never lets the paper reveal anything to him, he never can learn, can he? And if he's hearing a tape or something like that and he never lets any of the sense or meaning of the tape ever come through to him, why, he never has anything revealed, does he? So that's a perfectly safe action. Funny part of it is he'll sit there and listen to hundreds of tapes. That's a fact. I mean, he'll sit there and listen to tape after tape after tape and never register anything off of any of the tapes because that's a safe thing to do.

Everybody to some degree is suffering from a staggeringly bad memory. I'd say if you'd killed as many women as you have or killed as many men as you have or something like that or disrupted as many lives as you have, normally you're going to have some slight suppression. So you listen to a tape four or five times before you've got it verbatim, you see? I'm talking about this as a – as a total thing, you see. A person sits there and listens to this whole tape and it's on the subject of how you should do the TRs, you see and listens to this whole tape from beginning to end and comes through at the other end and the Examiner says to him, "All right, now, what does TR 0 consist of?"

And the person says, "Well, it's like the twist, only different." [laughter]

And he really can't understand how he doesn't know anything about it. It looks like such an innocent activity. But the last person to notice this about himself is the person. That's what makes it grim. Because, of course, that person is in a total suppression.

So the one that you worry about when you're training people is the person that doesn't have this wrong with them and they know it.

"That doesn't apply to me. You see? It has nothing to do with my auditing. It's perfectly normal and natural that Isabel today, while I was auditing her and so forth, she had an ARC break. Any auditor auditing her would have had an ARC break. And when she left the session, I went and got her back, didn't I? How can you perfect – say that I was ever trying to suppress anything about Isabel? I've been trying and trying and trying to find out about why she drinks water." [laughter]

And this doesn't seem reasonable to you. You can assume that this auditor was suppressing something on the subject of Isabel because he won't let Isabel give or get rid of her case or get audited. And yet the auditor will audit Isabel, which is very fascinating.

So frankly, the person would help them out and this is the only exception to a person's helpingness – there's just this one exception to helpingness. A person will help another to the degree of his tolerance to stand something being revealed. And that's to what degree he will help another. Revealing something establishes the degree he will help, so that this works into blackmail and dossiers and everything else. "If you don't help me, I am going to reveal about you."

You get that mechanism. Well, it works the reverse. The person will help somebody unless that person is likely to reveal something. That would be the most natural thing in the world. That consists of the coordination of the suppressor and the bad "auditor." It also is a bad student.

But remember, I'm not saying these in any reproving tones. I am simply calling to your attention that we have the mechanism. And it's taken us an awful long time to find this mechanism and you'll find this mechanism will work like a bomb. Once you get used to using this mechanism, why, you will understand why auditors won't pull withholds.

In other words, this is what keeps people from employing the technology of Scientology. And I've been looking for that for a long time – the – that little point. Well, why won't they employ it even when they know it sometimes? And if I could find that button, why...

That actually is all the importance the button has. It's the importance of learning rate and the importance of application. It has, of course, vast case repercussions of one kind or another. It produces dub-in and various things.

But frankly, from our point of view and from the point of view of this lecture, we're only interested in the degree that it inhibits good auditing.

And I stand for that.

Thank you.

MECHANICS OF SUPPRESSION

A lecture given on 19 March 1962

And this is the second lecture. What's the date?

Audience: 19 March, 12.

Nineteen Mar. 12. And the first lecture that was not dated there was "The Bad Auditor." And this lecture has to do with the mechanics of suppression.

Now, for a long time you've had a lot of Axioms. You may have heard of them. And they actually contain the basic data on suppressors. The Axioms, of course, are way ahead of us. Always have been. Trying to get technology to catch up with the Axioms is one of my tougher jobs.

But the suppressor is already forecast in the Axioms under the heading of not-is. And it is simply not-is-ness and what is not-is-ness. And I for a long time have played with not-is-ness from various angles and you get a simple statement there in the Axioms – simpler than I'm making now, actually.

And that is you get the *is-ness* of something, you get the *alter-is-ness* of something and you get the *not-is-ness* of something. And a not-is-ness is, peculiarly enough, a suppressed is-ness and that is all it is.

And if you redefined not-is-ness as a suppressed is-ness: it is the effort to put out of existence energywise an is-ness. It is an effort to *suppress* an is-ness. Elephant is standing on the front steps, we say, "Well, elephants don't belong on the front steps, so there is no elephant on the front steps."

Now, whenever you find that running out lies out of a bank – has enormous numbers of applications and there are tremendous numbers of ways you can apply these particular Axioms – when you run lies out of a bank, you, of course, are running alter-is-nesses or not-is-nesses.

Now, a lie could simply say it was something else, that it's a child's toy on the front steps – it's a live elephant, you see – we could say, "Well, it's a toy. It's an advertisement," you see? "It's something made out of rubber so they're advertising something." Or we could say, "It doesn't exist," you see? And you'd get a lie actually covers an alter-is-ness and a not-is-ness.

Now, alter-is-ness is change. And it sits between an is-ness and a suppression. And therefore, we're getting nicely tied up with time here because time is basically, only mechanically so, but is change. Time is change.

Now, a cycle of action does run from a nonexistence to an existence to a nonexistence. That is a cycle of action. And if you look over the time track, you'll find that a cycle of action goes from: there's nothing there; there's a creation there; and then there's changes in the creation; and then deterioration-type changes, but they're nevertheless still changes; and then we finally get a nonexistence again. So we run from nonexistence to existence to nonexistence. And that is a cycle of action.

They are all types of creation and so on, as we know. We know a lot about this sort of thing. But let's look and see how this directly applies. The first material we have on this is Science of Certainty. The Something-Nothing Process. Process in England. You know, they don't work in England unless you call them processes.⁷ [laughter]

And the cycle of action was never entered into this. We just talked about, "Think of something. Think of nothing. Think of something. Think of nothing." You know, that type of alternate, to get out the maybe. And that was under the heading of the "anatomy of maybe." A maybe, an uncertainty, a guess or as most people conceive unknowns, an unknown – that isn't really what an unknown could be but it could be a mechanical variation of unknown – is simply the no-man's-land between the certainty that something is and the certainty that something isn't.

So we have these two things. The certainty that something is and the certainty that something isn't. And between those two things, we have the maybe. See, we have "It is," and then we have "It is... It is? Uh... it is. Uh... it isn't." And we get the cycle of action.

So you can stack a cycle of action alongside of maybe. And you could say change is maybe. These are approximations, not exact things, you see?

Now, it looks in the reactive mind, then, as though a cycle of action is a maybe – the middle of a cycle of action. So that all change is a maybe. And therefore, if anything's changed, maybe it isn't, you see? And you get all kinds of things.

If we change techniques in Scientology, a lot of people don't think Scientology exists. See? They say, "Well, he – Ron's just changing his mind again."

Oh, Ron hasn't changed his mind about this in a long time, see? But they never look at the certainties we have. They look at the middle, see? And we get something that's very peculiar. We get a new process. And this is a process.

Now, to show you how difficult it is to immediately approximate this semantically so that it can be run by a mind, I'll call attention to the fact that the Something-Nothing Process is quite limited in use. It has some value. It – you could do various things with it. And other types of processes all about not-is and so forth, had practically no use at all. There have been many of them. There have been processes about lies, processing lying and that sort of thing and their use put it off into the Step 6 phenomena – Creativeness. We started beefing up a bank and various other things have occurred by lying – the processing lies, you know?

⁷ Editor's note: LRH here plays with the different ways to pronounce "process" in England and in America.

That wasn't very successful. There've been a lot of efforts here. Only thing I'm trying to sketch out for you here is this has a long history and a lot of efforts involved with it.

Well, a lot of things come together at the same point, so we've been around the fringes of these things and a lot of people on the whole track have been around the fringes of us.

But the point I'm making here is I came across a process which is a runnable process, which is a Class I process. You're perfectly at liberty, by the way, to run this process on somebody. I don't care whether you do or don't. It isn't an exactly tailored process yet. You probably have to fish for the wording of it. But actually the process is, simply: "It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't."

After you've gotten the pc to do the "It is and it isn't and it is and it isn't" for a little while, he'll move on the time track, but he ordinarily will give you a direct application of this process to his case. And he'll deliver up to you the chronic automaticity of his case or the chronic present time problem or the chronic something of his case almost at once. This is quite peculiar.

What you're doing, of course, is running the cycle of action on him. You're running those two portions of the cycle of action which are important to him. And in view of the fact you have said, "It is" followed by "It isn't," you haven't said whether it was vanishment or not-is. And he'll always run it as a suppressor.

So you're running direct suppressors. And the thing which he is most closely and most immediately suppressing is the most likely to come into view. His hidden standard or the thing that immediately is wrong with him is liable to appear almost at once.

Now, of course, the thing he's trying to make up his mind about stems from the fact that he at some time or another had said that it is and then he didn't like that, so he has said that it *isn't*. And this has left him in the maybe of whether or not it ever was or is or ever will be.

See, there is – you wouldn't ever get anyplace processing a person this way: "Maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe." See, you would get no place processing this. "Get the idea of maybe. Maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe." A person will fog up, go out, go anaten, that sort of thing. Basically, there is no such thing as a maybe. See, there is only a creation and the conditions of the creation. Because even when a cycle of action has been run, it still stands there as a memory. The person remembered there had been.

See, he got married, got divorced. He actually doesn't get a nonexistence again. He gets a remembrance of having been married. And more deeply in the bank, he gets a recording of having been married. I don't care at what fabulously far-away time it was in time, he'll have a slight inkling of it.

In other words, so you don't get – ever get a pure nonexistence after you get any existence, see? The only pure nonexistence is prior to the existence.

So you get a positive assertion of is-ness followed by a positive assertion of it isn't, you will inevitably get memories and cognitions and various other mental phenomena will

occur. And oddly enough, this fantastically simple process – "It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't" – will produce practically every other phenomenon in Scientology. It stems out of existence and nonexistence, which of course stems out of perception and don't want to perceive – which, of course, goes over into creativeness and destruction. And all the time you're jumping across wild bands of change.

So you're getting the certainty that it is and the certainty that it isn't and the certainty that it is and the certainty that it isn't; and all of a sudden you get all this change boiling up and boiling over. Because, of course, change is simply the different conditions of an existence leading to a nonexistence or a new condition of positiveness.

The uncertainty of the case blows off. Now, the fellow with the open mind, the fellow who doesn't know, the fellow who isn't sure, the fellow who just grinds and never gets a cognition, this fellow who can't find out, the fellow who has no memory of the whole track, the fellow who just doesn't ever recognize that maybe it – "Well, I can say that it does and I can say, yes, I suppose I could assume. Uh-huh, maybe, uh, well, yes..." and all of his conversation is like this.

You ever read any scientific papers of the last twenty or thirty years, you know?

"If the universe exists..." They don't want to get stuck with any is-nesses. See, they don't want to be guilty of any is-nesses.

"I was sitting in front of the meter, of course. I was sitting in a Mark VI type chair using hung-over type lamps. And the reflective qualities on the screen were X970 and I uh-uh-uh-believe that I perceived uh-uh – apparently, uh – as the needle registered – uh – that is, if the machine were on, which would have to be verified by the machine operator – uh – that uh – if I uh – recall properly, uh – and if I am not controverted by the faculty or my immediate superior, there were 230 volts on the mains that day, I think."

That is a *forthright*, scientific statement. That's just about as flat out as a scientist these days could get without being shot by his brethren.

Most of the boys get upset about me in the field of science is because I will say something is or something isn't. And I don't qualify it. I don't say, "Well, if the faculty gives me permission," you see, or something like that, "then I could guess that maybe adjectival clause modifying paragraph B that adverbial phrase modifying verb G might finally turn out to be a guess," you see? And in view of the fact that I don't talk that way, they think I'm unscientific. You have to be doubtful to be scientific.

Well, it sure hangs these guys in an awful muddled mess, doesn't it? Now, the very funny part of it is you could take that exact frame of mind and have the boys say, "It is and it isn't and it is and it isn't. Get the concept that it is. Get the concept that it isn't."

Fellow says, "Get the concept of *what* was? What?"

You say, "Well, just *it*. It. Anything. It. It. It."

"Uh... I don't know what you mean by that," you see?

He might have quite an argument on this other. It'd be very laughable because, of course, he is trying to get the idea that it is and he runs into the maybe, see and he can't get a clean idea that is, see? Nor can he get a clean idea that it isn't.

You'd have to actually rehabilitate him into being able to get a clean idea that something was and something wasn't. You watch. The boys in charge of the A-bombs and the stuff we breathe right at the present moment⁸ are mostly in that frame of mind.

You know, the H-bomb marchers missed their bet, you know? They miss their bet all the time. If they wanted really to wipe out the H-bomb, they wouldn't worry about that. They'd just insist that all the atomic scientists and politicians that had anything to do with the H-bomb produce proper sanity certificates so that they could be – and that they should be examined by psychiatrists and so forth. They'd drive everybody batty.

But the funny part of it is none of these guys could pass, see? Because "It may be all right to drop it, maybe, see, but it might not be all right, but that's neither here nor there. That doesn't have anything to do with us." To even that they add irresponsibility, you see? They all stand in this middle ground. It's the no-responsibility attitude.

So you'd have a hard time on that type of case. That's very low scale as a case. You'd have a hard time getting that person to get positive idea of something *was* and something *wasn't*. And they could get no such clean-cut idea. They'd get "Something was, I guess," and "Something wasn't, *rrrrrrr*, perhaps."

So they're always on the verge of having something being revealed suddenly. And it would scare them to death. They make very bad auditors. They in fact won't talk to you about auditing anybody. They'd much rather jump out of their scientific boots and instantly and immediately hold forth with Pope Pius, who said that nobody should monkey with the human mind. I think that's a direct quote. "Nobody should monkey with the human mind." "You or I would not want somebody coming into his basement." I think that was a direct quote. I think it was. It's a papal bull. "And therefore, you shouldn't want to have somebody come into your mind." That's right. "In view of the fact that we got withholds, we don't want to be invaded."

Now, there's a frame of mind that is always on the idea of revelations. Only their revelations, let me call to your attention, are delusory revelations. Tremendous numbers of angels are going to sing on heads of pins, you see? You're suddenly going to get a vision of some holy messiah holding his head in a saucer or something of the sort, standing in front of him.

You're going to get a word which is going to come down from a shaft of light through the heavens, you see, and suddenly all is going to be well; only the shaft comes over the left shoulder. You get terrific superstition. You get all types of religious revelations.

So you get scientific revelations. Well, of course, our current scientific revelation is so out of control that it takes the form of an H-bomb. Now, that's a revelation. *Boom!* And of course, nobody can face that much revelation, so they say, "well, it doesn't exist." So people

⁸ Editor's note: This refers probably to the fact that at the time of the lecture there was a lot of radioactivity in the atmosphere due to the testing of nuclear weapons.

keep calling attention to the H-bomb, the H-bomb, the H-bomb, the H-bomb, the H-bomb, the H.

Nobody can look at this H-bomb, see? What they got to do is call attention to the fellow who pushes the button, the fellow who pushes the button, the fellow who pushes the button, the fellow who pushes the button. *Ha-ha-ha-ha*. People would look at him.

And you say, "Well, we want to see a psychiatric investigation of all the fellows who are going to push the button."

Immediately, the whole public is liable to get very interested, see? Because they can face the guy who's going to push the button and they can face a button, but they can't face the bomb.

So you see, the H-bomb marchers are trying to get too much revelation for the public to assimilate. So all they got to do is cut back the revelation. Very simple mechanism. Cut back the revelation, to ping, ping, see?

Now, you do that with Scientology. You say, "Well, we make the Clear, we do this and do that and you get healthy and all that sort of thing. And it's terrific and you get more intelligent," and so forth and it's just too much revelation.

Now, if you said to the fellow, you know, "Have you got an ache or pain?"

The fellow says, "Well, yeah, as a matter of fact I got a bad pain in the back of my neck – back of my neck, back of my neck."

Well, you say, "Well, Scientology would take quite a while to help that."

"Say, it must be pretty true."

Then you could do this weird stunt with him, see? You could say, "Well, I'll show you. I'll just show you. Now, get the idea there's pain there. Good. Get the idea there's no pain there. Good. Get the idea there's a pain there. Good. Get the idea there's no pain..."

"Ow!"

You'd say, "There, you see? That's Scientology."

The fellow says, "You just about blew my silly head off! That's Scientology?"

Well, you could say – you could say, "Well, can – is the pain still there?"

"No, as a matter of fact, it isn't."

"Well, there you are. No pain – Scientology."

"No pain; Scientology. There was a hell of a pain there a minute ago."

Nevertheless he could confront it because it's slightly on. Did you ever stop to think about that?

He may have an *awful* pain. His stomach may be in *absolute agony*, but he's got it totally suppressed. So he doesn't know that. See, he's going totally to pieces, but he doesn't ever find out about that until you started running just a general, "It is or it isn't" and he was functioning on this and was thinking the ideas. I'd check on this, "Have you followed the auditing

command?" or "Have you missed any auditing commands?" I'd do that about every six or eight commands if I were running this, you know. Just check the end rudiment. Do five, six commands. "Have you missed an auditing command?"

"Well, yes, I didn't get that one." I'd make him go get that one and then give it to you a few more times. Get him so he was really doing it. And you'll be amazed. Some of the most fantastic pains that people are totally unaware of will suddenly turn on in parts of the body where they're having malfunction.

"Nonpainful malfunction" is what drives the medico mad. This the medico can't understand. What is a "nonpainful malfunction?" You see, there's no agony connected with it. There's no pain connected with it. The person is just all out of gear. You see, he should be standing up straight and he makes a picture like a corkscrew. Doesn't hurt.

Now, you try to do something for this fellow and, of course, it doesn't hurt and nothing happens. Well, why does nothing happen? Well, he just suppresses you, too.

And you want to see one of these guys twisted up like a corkscrew and all messed up like a fire drill – you try to do something for that person, he lets you, he won't have any cognition and nothing will happen and he'll break your heart. The only thing that happens is he just suppressed you and the treatment, too.

Ah, but you get him to say, "It is, *ha-ha*, it isn't, *ha*, it is, it isn't." I don't care how you get him to say it is or it isn't. You could probably do it by "Feel it, is it there? Don't feel it, now. Don't feel it, feel something else. Don't – don't feel it. All right. Now, feel it, feel it. Good. Now, don't feel it." Probably something wild would happen.

I mean, there's various ways you could do this. It appears, it doesn't appear. It appears, it doesn't appear. You see, that's the "it is, it isn't." There's various variations. But you, oddly enough, don't have to go off into these variations. The mind tries to go off into dozens of variations the second you start to think of it because it gets into this obsessive change, see?

If you were trying to run this on yourself, I guarantee that within five or six commands you'd be running another command. See, I just guarantee it. Because you'd be running another command and you'd never really notice a change. You got on to something that was hotter. [laughter] That's how you'd explain it to yourself, right? How the hell did you get onto something hotter if "It is, it isn't" turned on the hotter thing. *Ha-ha-ha*. You get back to run "It is, it isn't, it is, it isn't." And the thing that you got on to that was hotter will blow off.

That's just the is-ness and the not-is-ness, is really what you're asking somebody to run. You're asking him to run directly suppressors.

You say, "There sits the object unsuppressed. Good. *Ha*. There it sits suppressed. *Ha-ha*. Good."

You're running this identically, you see? "There sits the object, freshly, beautifully created. That's fine. Now, there sits the object beautifully disappeared but still there. Thank you." Get the idea?

"Now, there it sits unsquashed by you. There it sits squashed by you. Thank you." That's what you're getting. And of course, you get continuous, consecutive appearances. Because you get all the appearances coming up that the guy has squashed.

And you get him moving on the time track and you get this cycle of action going. You start him completing cycles of action. We don't care which way he completes them. Some people complete them like, "It is, it isn't," see? And that's a cycle of action. But the other people are completing them, "It isn't, it is." Quite weird. Do you see how this works?

Now, there's only two things can happen to a person is to have nothing appear and have something appear. That's the only two things that can happen to a person, see.

See, even the consequences of having made something appear is just getting something else to appear. So the two conditions of any game are appearance and nonappearance. And we get the anatomy of games, which is where I studied this thing out originally.

I was studying games when I finally calculated down to a level of that. We don't have to know too much about games. We – *Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought* gives you about all there is about that.

But you get down to a more fundamental fundamental and you get down to this fact of that is a game. Something is, something isn't. And there are all kinds of ramifications of, "It is," you see? You don't have to say what *it* is, you know, but you can say, "Put anything in the game in it."

Take the opposite player. All right. He is or he isn't, see? He is behind your goal post or he is in front of your goal post or he is in front of his own goal post or he is in front of you.

You see, that's is-ness by location, which is a via. But now, let's just take the overall purpose of the game. And the overall purpose of the game is you were the catch-alots and he's the sharks. And "Up catch-alots and disappear sharks," see? So totally the end of the game is, "is catch-alots" that you want, you see and "no sharks." And he wants "is sharks, no catch-alots." And you get your basic disagreement which gives you a game.

Now, this, "It is, it isn't" is all that reads on an E-Meter. The middle between is what reads on the meter. The amount of "is" that the person can conceive compared to the amount of "isn't" the person can conceive finds the disagreement between the "isn't" and the "is" which gives you a read.

All the meter reads is disagreement and that is the basic disagreement. A basic disagreement – you're sitting in the room with a Presbyterian and he says an angel has just descended in that rocking chair. And you say there isn't any angel in the rocking chair. And he says there is an angel in the rocking chair and that's a basic disagreement.

Well, if you had two valences in one mind, an atheist and a Presbyterian – let's say these are two valences that have occurred in the Goals Problem Mass, see, there's those two valences – you get a terrific registry when you hit either one.

Well, why do you get a terrific registry when you hit an atheist? Well, that's because of the pressure over here from – the unseen pressure of the Presbyterian. And why do you get

such a tremendous charge whenever you hit Presbyterian? Well, that's because of the unseen atheist. Quite fascinating.

You know, you'll blow just as much charge off by getting the oppterm as you'll get the term. If you list the terminals, if you make a list of pc's terminals – they're giving him pain the whole way – and you get so much tone arm motion, so much charge and so much blowdown and so forth, if you oppterm that right away, you'll get the equal amount, if you get the exact oppterm.

Sometimes you get gradient scales of oppterm. In other words, you get associated oppterm that are out here some distance and gradually walk in and you eventually collide with the actual oppterm. So you can get your hands on one side of the picture and then get your hands distantly on the other side of the picture.

But you will eventually – if you blew a tremendous amount of charge off a case by assessing the case out to atheist, eventually, on some other line, some other time – maybe when you opptermed it – why, you got idol. But somehow or another, you got another thing and you finally wound up and you found out the thing, the package, that put that Goals Problem Mass, you see, the problem versus the problem. You'll all of a sudden find this terrifically *hot* other side, see, the other side. You know when they hit this atheist that it just blew *zooooom*, see? Well, you're doing – this is ten items later and on a totally independent line, you all of a sudden hit this Presbyterian, see? And it all of a sudden goes *squash! boom! crash!* And it's just the same amount of force and power there was in atheist because those things had to be equal to be in balance. And the whole mass goes out of balance when you discharge one, but that one won't discharge totally. It'd discharge the other one, then they all both go. They tend to go out of line when you discharge one and sometimes you don't find the oppterm at once because it's kind of slippery. I'm just giving you examples of the thing.

Now, why are those two valences counter-opposed and why do they get so much charge, one versus the other, on the E-Meter? Well, that's because one is saying certain principles are and the other is saying certain principles aren't. And the second one I just mentioned are saying certain principles are and the first one I just mentioned is saying certain principles aren't. So they're in *violent* disagreement.

And you'll notice this is the common denominator of every opposed Goals Problem Mass package, is the fact that you get the atheist versus the priest or something. You get the virgin and the harlot. You get the child and the mother. You get things that make problems, one's against the other. They'll be opposites in various ways.

So you have a saintly person versus the devil, devilish person, you see? Well, it's the disagreement between these two things. And one stands for certain is-nesses and certain isn't-nesses and the other stands for certain is-nesses and certain isn't-nesses. It isn't that one stands for "is" and one stands for "isn't." But it's practically everything that one conceives is, the other conceives isn't. And then that is reversed the other way, too. So that everything the second one conceives is, the first one conceives isn't.

So you have this *tremendous* number of items. All these is-nesses are opposed by all these not-is-nesses. And then we have all these is-nesses opposed by *these* not-is-nesses. And so it – everything is just *bthah*. And you hit these two, you get a heavily charged mass and of

course, it won't discharge and the person gets somatics and everything goes mad every time you hit the thing in the bank. And it restimulates and has total command over the person, and it's violent. Well, it's simply violent because of all these disagreements.

Well, how could you find it on the meter? Well, it's just because it's full of disagreements, that's all. And that's the "is" and "isn't."

The funny part of this is, is this theory could probably be put into any process. You could probably – I don't say you should – but you could probably prepcheck with this – with this type of a Zero question: "Have you ever considered another didn't exist?" Or "Have you ever insisted another didn't exist?" Use that as a Zero question. Well, it'd be rather hot and very lengthy, but it'd sure run.

I don't recommend it. As it merely would run. "Well, have you ever insisted something was?" You'd get a – you'd get a tremendous number of overts because, of course, every overt he's got either consists of asserting that something was or asserting that something wasn't. And there are only really two classes of overts.

When you damage something, you're trying to insist that it isn't. And when you're creating something, you're trying to assert that it is. And when somebody else is trying to create something, you may be trying to help him create it or trying to keep him from creating it.

And when he's trying to not-is something, you are either trying to assist him not-is it or you're trying to prevent him from not-ising it. And these frames of mind, I'm afraid, are very black and white, Aristotle to the contrary.

Now, Aristotle said that everything was black and white and non-Aristotelian logic is the favorite logic of semantics and modern science. And of course, it insists that they're fantastic numbers of shades of gray. And that there are no positives and no negatives. Well, that sounds to me like an awful big Goals Problem Mass. I admit there are lots of shades of gray. And I admit a lot of gradient scales and I admit a lot of these things, but to say that positives don't exist, from a standpoint of somebody's reality, is going pretty far. That's going pretty far.

You can say *ultimates* are unobtainable. That's a fact. That's a fact. It – course – that's telling you an infinite, an infinite, a total presence or a total absence of zero. These things are – but that would not be maintainable. But to say that merely positives, not ultimates but positives couldn't exist, that would just be pure nonsense. And I'm afraid that is the nonsense on which modern science is making its basic errors.

But you start dealing with positives – after all, you're positive. You're sitting in a chair right this minute, aren't you? Well, you are. It's a good enough positive. We don't say you're the ultimate. But you certainly are, see? And you aren't at home, are you? Right at this moment, you aren't at home, are you?

Male voice: No.

Well, that's fairly positive, isn't it? You're not at home. Now, to the degree that you've left something home or are going to return home, that reduces the ultimate of homeness, not

youness, you see? And to the degree that you're not going to sit here all night, that's no ultimate of hereness.

So what you get is as time drags out, positiveness reduces. The less concept a person has of time, the less concept they have of time, the less positive things seem. Get the idea?

So we get all of our concepts of present time, the hereness and nowness of it. Have you ever had Havingness being run on you and all of a sudden the walls got awfully bright? You know, I mean, common experience.

What you actually did was not having the walls get any solidier or brighter, but you became more aware of the nowness of the instant. That's actually what happened. All you have to be is very aware of the nowness of the instant and you get quite a lot of is-ness. And the odd part of it is you get a lot of not-is-ness.

But your not-is-ness goes from not not-is-ness to nonexistence.

Now, the person is sitting there and he's *surrounded* by these masses. There's just *masses*, *masses*, *masses*. You know, he's just got masses, oh boy, you know, just packed in *bthah*, and so on. Although he's a rather thin person, he has to have a truck move him, you know? And he got masses, masses. Those are all not-is-nesses. Those are all nonexistences.

The first thing he'd say about all of them is they're nonexistence. That's – that's what – his first declaration concerning them: "They don't exist."

So you see, as he came up to present time, the walls got brighter, these things would disappear, see? But when you're running some people on Havingness, it comes from not-is-ness to nonexistence on such a clear-cut track that as you run Havingness on them and make the walls more real, their bank *materializes* and they have people standing in the room, you see?

What you do is run off the not-is-ness by running on the is-ness of the wall, see? The wall gets very real to them and they're getting their time track stretched out, you see, and they're getting more here in this particular instant of nowness, you see, and they keep looking over at the corner and you finally say, "What's the matter with the corner?"

"Well, it's just that my Aunt Agatha seems to be standing there and I know she isn't there, but she's awfully three-dimensional."

A few more commands. "Well, how's Aunt Agatha?"

"Well, she's gone. Why – why are you worried about Aunt Agatha? I wasn't worried about it."

In other words, the not-is-ness which *pushed* this mock-up of Aunt Agatha into invisibility *released* as the person's reality on the wall increased. You ran out the invisibility of the is-ness. Here you understand that a person could actually conceive this – these sheets of paper to not exist while at the same time he was looking straight at them. Well, there's a funny mechanism in the bank where he can go kind of squash with energy, you know? And he makes the mental image picture just disappear. Well, you make the wall get real and of course you make this not-is-ness run out and what do you find the fellow beholding? He beholds this three-dimensional picture, *ulp!* He beholds Aunt Agatha in the middle of the room.

Sometimes in auditing somebody, if you're being very successful in running some process or another, doesn't matter what process – Havingness or bank or Prepchecking or anything else – he might have two or three dead bodies lying in the room at the same time, awfully solid. So solid that he's absolutely sure he can reach out and touch them and they'd be solid. But if the fellow's fairly well adjusted in existence and the auditor is running a smooth session and that sort of thing, you very often aren't told this fact.

He says, "All right," he knows what they are. They – it's a bank manifestation and they'll go away. And they do. And he forgets about it.

What you did is, they've always been there and he had them not-ised so that he never saw them. But my God, did he have to be careful in life. Every time he sat down in a room he'd have to make sure that this body, this body and that body were not-ised. Somebody would say, "Well, how are you, Joe?"

And he'd say, "I was reading the stock exchange papers today and I saw some very interesting things." People wouldn't ever notice that he'd never said it – answered how he was. *Ha-ha*. Well, monkey.

You say, "How about giving you a little auditing, Joe?"

"Well, I don't think I'd... well, actually, we don't have much time, you know."

You're liable to have a materialization of dead body number one, dead body number two and dead body number three. And he just doesn't like to look at them. I mean, after you've killed people, been responsible for their deaths, you don't like to stand around looking at them. Some people don't. They're peculiar.

I know I have at times gloated. Not like you on the track, you've always been social about the thing. I've actually been crass enough to stand there and say, "*Ha-ha*," but it's not the thing to do, you know? So I have to withhold that.

Actually, he knows, because he's learned, that if he sits down in a certain type of room, this thing starts to loosen up and he starts to feel sort of peculiar, so he has to get very interested and he has to get very occupied and he never can sit quietly.

A woman made a funny remark to me one time. I told her – I said, "Well, I think I'll sit down for a while and rest."

And she said, "Well, what are you going to *do*?"

And I said, "Nothing."

"Oh, you're going to read, huh?"

"No, no, no. Just nothing."

"You're going to think about something."

"No, no, no."

"Why?"

All of a sudden she practically spun in, you know? The idea of just sitting down and not doing anything and not thinking about anything and not having your mind occupied – this caused her to get a sensation of spinning in.

What was that sensation? Well, you had to keep yourself distracted. If you didn't keep yourself distracted, something would appear.

Well, the question is what would appear? It's actually a mental image picture that will appear. And that's all that will appear. And they're *deathly* afraid of mental image pictures or the *appearance* of something.

All right. The fellow that you audit and audit and audit and audit and audit and go on and on and on and on and on and on and audit and they never get any pictures – *oooh*, you're dealing with a classic. You got a total suppression. Nothing's going to appear. What's the matter with him? Well, what's he afraid is going to appear? That's a simple question.

You make a list of things, "Who or what would be afraid to find out?" You're asking for appearance, you see? Just to have him list that. *Ahhhhhhh!* That would be the most horrible thing you ever tried to do to that poor fellow. Ruin him. Ruin his case. The odd part of it is, as you went at this and went deeper into it and opptermend the terminals you found and found other analogous lines and so on, you would get appearances. Place gets haunted from time to time, you know, the dead bodies start to show up. Yeah. He's got them all beautifully squashed. And sometimes they bleed green and this is very startling.

Now, sometimes somebody has been in a weakened condition, has suddenly taken his attention off one of these things and it's materialized. *Auggggggg!* Fair slaughtered him, it did. Actually, practically scared him out of his wits.

He'll say he's been blanketed. I know of a case sat down in – well, this case absolutely shattered – sat down in a dentist's office, I think it was, something like that or away in a doctor's office and all of a sudden, this fantastic, terrible, dizzying series of cones turned on over the body.

Case went stark staring mad. Went home and never left home from that year to the next until finally audited on an engram in old Dianetic days. Now, that's not one – just one case, see?

The case for a moment, peculiarly, just didn't not-is this particular mass and it went into action. Case changed its mind in a certain way and got this thing materialized, see?

Well, it was always there except they took their not-is off of it and it went *zzzzzzt*, and then they *stopped* it, see, with a new suppression.

And they said something had happened to them. Yes, that's true. Something had happened to them. They'd stopped not-ising for a moment. Pretty desperate. So this case in being audited, of course, afterwards, would be – very carefully not-is and then answer the auditing question. Not-is and then answer the auditing question. Except they wouldn't do it consciously, so that it'd never wear out. Well, the case wouldn't ever really ever make any progress, would it, at all. *Ha-ha-ha-ha*. Case knew they'd better not let their mind change.

Now, actually, there are some pretty hideous phenomena occur. There are various sensations and motions and sick stomachs and terror stomachs and backs of heads falling off and noses disappearing and all of a sudden the pc looks down and can't see himself from the thighs down; you know, it's just all vanished. You get upset.

Well, the thing to do is to go on through, see, and not let the pc stop on such a thing or be upset about such a thing because you're just running into an "is" and "it isn't" type of manifestation. And if you can get an "it is," you'll certainly sooner or later get an "isn't." And this used to upset auditors once in a while in the old days, when we were running Not-Know – not-knowing people's heads and hats and so forth and "What could you not-know about this one?" And auditors would go mad on this, you know, every once in a while. That'd – you'd never hardly get anybody to run this cleanly because the pc would say, "Well, yes, I did that."

And the auditor would say, oddly enough and mistakenly, say, "Well, did what?"

"Well, I not-knew his head, all right. He's walking down the street with no head."

And the auditor would get so curious at this moment – this was the worst trouble with this process, why we don't use it anymore – the auditor would get so curious that he'd stop and question the pc as to what happened and how it happened and everything else and then walk around in circles and not finish the process and skip the whole thing. Well, of course, this was terribly restimulative on the subject of this "not find out" button, wasn't it? You were running straight into the not-is and the auditor all of a sudden had been running a process – he didn't realize that he was in that much danger but he was running a process which would turn off and turn on not-is-ness. *Oohooohooohoooh, oohoooh*. Maybe it'd all go the other way, you see?

Many people don't have a time track. They have a series of not-is-nesses. Many people don't have any present time at all; they just have a generality of comfortable not-is. They are the calm people, you know? Calm as a whiz-bang on Guy Fawkes, Fourth of July.

Anyhow, the manifestations you see as a result of this particular activity of not-is brings about an is-ness. Because when the not-is-ness disappears, the is-ness materializes. And of course, it can be guaranteed to occasionally scare pcs spitless.

And after it's happened to him once, after that they make sure nothing happens to their case. "Oh, it's not going to happen to me again. No. I want to keep that from happening again," which is a no duplication and nothing happens. You see that?

An is-ness appeared because a not-is-ness ran out. Then you get a manifestation. You get pictures. Actually, solid objects will appear in a room right with the pc. All kinds of wild things will occur.

I know what this is because one time I was running – being run through something and ran into something. And I ran into a European battle where the columns of soldiers and the grass and the soldiers and everything and the guns and the smoke and all perceptions were much more there than present time was there. They were all lined up firing at each other in volleys, you know? It was quite a surprise, do you know? Quite a surprise.

It didn't last very long. I didn't have hardly time to duck before the...[laughs] But it was startling to say the least. Now, much brighter than this room appears at the moment, you see.

Facing up to and exchanging volleys with other company – in company front formations, you see. What bigger overt is there. About twenty paces between the ranks. Slaughter, you know?

Well, there is a lot of is-ness there, man, because, you see, firing the gun is an insistence on beingness, see? Somebody comes along and says, "You're not so much."

And you swell up at once like a frog, you know. *Pooooof*. See? "I is," see? "Here I is. I is. I'm big. I'm big shot. I'm not this thing you're trying to not-is." You see? Get the idea? "Ooooo." See?

Girl immediately puts on more lipstick. [laughter] Men swell up or fire guns. It all depends on what civilization you're living in. Girls adopt bustles and falsies. There's no telling what they'll do in the manifestation. But that's representing an is-ness, see!

Somebody else comes along, says, "They're no good," see. "They shouldn't do that." "Paint's bad. Dresses are bad." These things. "Everybody should be natural." All kinds of campaigns.

"Oh, my dear, what a beautiful hat. I've liked it ever since last year." [laughter]

Various types and degrees and grades, you see, of is-ness and not-is-ness, you know?

Well, of course, where a person in the bank has been asserting is-ness and somebody else has been asserting not-is-ness or somebody else has been asserting is-ness and where he has been asserting not-is-ness, you get – there are various bank phenomena. And they turn on and they turn off and one hardly knows what's happening.

But it's where they get stuck that the pc gets worried. So if he gets into these things, he gets afraid to find out. Things will materialize, you see? Something is liable to materialize. Something is liable to appear. God knows what will happen. He's got somebody talking about his bank, so Lord knows what's going to appear. He's just shocky on the subject of things appearing. That is the only thing wrong with this bad auditor.

He gets leery having things appear. Pc is liable to materialize something. He's liable to get restimulated. No telling what might happen.

Well, the thing to do is get him over being scared of this sort of thing. As I say, you can get him over it educationally. You can get him over it directly with a process. Before we only had education to get him over it. Now we have a direct process to get him over it. You can get a person over not-is-ness in various ways.

"It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't." That's kind of lengthy.

3D Criss Cross, various types of not-is-ness in Prepcheck questions. And more important than these other manifestations at the moment is... you can go ahead and do this and I'll give you a bulletin on it. And if it doesn't work out, why, that's fine. But I know it'll work out because I gave it a little more testing and checking – and that is a change in the Withhold Sys-

tem that gives you this same manifestation. Now, your Withhold System goes What, When, All and Who. Isn't that right?

Audience voices: Mm-hm.

And that's the totality of the Withhold System.

All right. Now, let's buck the Withhold System up and have it take care of suppressors. And I think you will find – although I don't guarantee this; I haven't done as much testing on this as I should have – I think you will find and that you'll be on safe ground, that it will run an engram if you do this. So that you could prepcheck and if you ran into an engram... And that's the primary reason why you shouldn't go whole track with the thing; it might not run an engram, you see? I think with this additive, I think you will find it'll run an engram – that's just a good guesstimate. That's an expert piece of guesstimate by my part – if you add Appear before you add Who...

You've got your Zero question. You get your What question. I've been working on this trying to make Prepchecking a little easier for you. And I have some other little changes in Prepchecking I'll give you later, but you can use this one at once. Now, these are just how you get the subject of your Zero question, so it doesn't influence what I'm talking to you about right now.

And you say When, just as you have been, All, just as you have been, Appear and Who. Now, how do you say Appear? "Well, what might have revealed itself at that point?" Or "What might have appeared at that point?" Or "Is there anything that should have shown up?" Or "Is there anything that didn't show up?"

You see, any variation on this subject of appear. "What might have revealed itself at that moment?" And just run that in before you say Who and What.

You say, "Well, what might have appeared?"

And the pc says, "Well, *ha-ha-ha*, the cops."

"Well, who didn't know about it?"

"Well the *police* of course."

Yeah, here we go. And you took the suppressor off the police. See? So this is just removing suppressors. Just a little mechanism for the removal of a suppressor off of a withhold, which should make the withhold much more rapidly cleanable.

I'm aiming in the direction, however, of using the – this question system of running an engram. I haven't expected it to run engrams. I've just been expecting to run locks of withholds.

But I think beefed up to that degree, there's a possibility that it will *directly* run engrams. Not that you use it directly on an engram, but if your pc got into one, there it'd go.

"What might have appeared?" Do you see?

"Should anything have appeared?" Anything that makes sense and just use the word "reveal" or "appear," (question mark). You get the maybe off of the thing. And just run that

in. It's all right. You can go ahead and make a few mistakes first time, you're getting used to the When, All, Who. Well, it's When, All, Appear, Who.

"Is that all of it? Well, what should have appeared? Okay, and who should have found out about that and didn't?" And I think it'll take the suppressors off.

Well, now there is the constituency and the consistency of the mind as regards to auditing. Talked to you first in the other lecture about the inhibitions of the auditor. This has been more on the basis of what happens with the pc.

And if the pc has something materialize which then mysteriously disappears and the pc sits there comfortably forevermore, *ha-ha*. I think you must have missed. Do you see how it would be?

Pc says, "Awful pain in the – . Well, that's all right now. Go ahead with the next auditing question. It's all right with me."

He just suppressed the living daylights out of that one. Well, how're you going to work around it? Don't. Because if you're running on suppressors, the rest of it will run out. Doesn't require any particular or special handling if you're running an appearance.

So the suppression that you often got – you know on running early sessions – have you noticed that running some early sessions, a person repressed past lives or repressed this or repressed that and so forth? Well, now running withholds, you'll probably pull off those suppressors and the thing shows up.

Now, there are possibly other ways of handling suppressors. There undoubtedly are. There are possibly neater ways of handling this and so forth and they will be developed as they develop. I personally at the present moment consider the ways I've given you completely adequate to your purposes.

All I need to give you now to smooth out your Prepchecking completely is a method of finding the Zero questions and so forth, accurately and instantly on this particular pc and I got that worked out, too. But it's late and I will talk to you about that next time.

Thank you.

TV DEMO: 3D CRISS CROSS ASSESSMENT, PART I

An auditing demonstration given on 20 March 1962

LRH: Okay. Here we are.

PC: I'm not doing that to the tone arm yet.

LRH: No, not yet. It's only at 18. [PC and auditor laugh] Good enough. Pick up the cans, would you?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right with you if I begin this session now?

PC: Yeah!

LRH: All right. Here it is. Start of session. Session started for you all right?

PC: Hm, yes.

LRH: Feel nervous on this proposition or anything?

PC: *Not particularly, so long as I don't get flunked for TR 0.* [PC and auditor laugh]

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. Now, what goals would you like to set for this session?

PC: *Well, I may come out with an inappropriate one if I don't know whether it's going to be 3D Criss Cross or not, you know.*

LRH: 3D Criss Cross.

PC: *It is. Well, I have a nasty one. I think it'd be fun if we found two*

items. Then everybody would have to strain every nerve to try and get two per session. [laughs]

LRH: All right. All right. Well, what goal would you like to set for it?

PC: *I would like that. I think two would be nice if it came in pairs, you know.*

LRH: All right. To get two items, huh?

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: All right. Give me another goal.

PC: *For rudiments not to take forever. Not to have thousands of nasty, little, critical thoughts that read.*

LRH: Ruds not to take forever. All right. You want not to have nasty, critical thoughts?

PC: *Well, that's – that's what takes time on them, it seems.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Any other goal?

PC: *I think that'd do for the se –. Oh, yes, not to get carried away with trying to entertain the audience. This could be a temptation, you know. Put on a good show.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, any goals you'd like to set for life and livingness?

PC: *Well, there is. And it's kind of peculiar.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It comes in steps. If I could just get rid of this body in an honorable fashion, you see, and pick up an English boy.*

LRH: Yes?

PC: *Six years old or older. A good family*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... who would then get sent to a very good prep school ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... enter the Royal Navy at – at least, well, hopefully twelve and not later than fourteen.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Good enough. Twelve or fourteen.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. What other goal would you like to set for life and livingness?

PC: *That'll do it.*

LRH: That'll do?

PC: *Yeah, oh, yes. There is. You're right, there's another one. Uh – I would like to be a high enough state of Release at that point so that I could keep bad vision from keying in on it, and getting put out to pasture and not being accepted.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. All right. Now, look around here. Tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. What Havingness was I running on you last?

PC: *Good old "Look around here and find something you could have." It's been working ever since.*

LRH: All right. Well, let's do that for a couple of minutes.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *You.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *Yeah, that thing.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *Well, that cot.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *The door.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *Yeah, I can have that camera.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *Couch.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *I could very definitely could have that cot. It's the right sort.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That wall.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *The top part of that.*

LRH: Okay. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *Yeah. At least the lid to the meter.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *That shelf.*

LRH: Good enough. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *Well, the – you know – the marble part of the fireplace.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *Your blazer.*

LRH: Okay. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *That wall.*

LRH: All right. I'm going to give you this command just two more times and end this process if that's all right with you.

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *The glass in the doors.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you can have.

PC: *Yeah. The couch.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, look around here and tell us if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. Squeeze the cans. Now there – that's still

way too high. Squeeze the cans. That's fine. Okay. Good enough. All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Good Lord, yes.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Can't find too much wrong with that. Let me ask you again. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Talk to me. Are you willing. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Yeah, all right.

All right. Are you withholding anything?

PC: *Well, I was withholding just then the comment that some of my goals are kind of an overt on you and the subject.*

LRH: All right. All right. Now, I started you out here at about 4.0 and for some reason or other you've come down to about 3.25.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: And...

PC: *I've been living in more civilized regions of the tone arm since those first two items.*

LRH: Yes, isn't that interesting?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: I've been looking at this. All right. Are you withholding anything That's too latent for me to bother with. Okay?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Do you have a present time problem? Now, there's a tick on that. What's the present time problem? Do you have a present time problem that you might have a present time problem?

PC: *Well, it could be that. Yes. Yes.*

LRH: Do you? Could you?

PC: *Just a little bit, yeah.*

LRH: I get a little bang.

PC: *I could certainly round some up.*

LRH: Yeah, we're not trying to push it home.

PC: *No. I know. I know.*

LRH: I did get a fall.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Do you have a present time problem? Yeah. All right. Something going on here?

PC: *I think it's auditing. I'm not really comfortable about it.*

LRH: All right. Well, do you know that the listing we're going to do on 3D Criss Cross tonight is directly in the – aimed in that direction.

PC: *All right. Very good.*

LRH: All right. Now, do you have a present time problem? All right. It's not on the question. Do you have a present time problem? Present time? I'm getting needle behavior but not in response to my question.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Now, do you feel all right about auditing here?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Now, you recognize, don't you ... You do realize that I am not extremely concerned with a demonstration here.

PC: *Uh-huh.*

LRH: I couldn't care less.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: It's merely an opportunity to give you a little bit of auditing. And I'm very interested in this list on revelation. You know, the list on lines, 3D Criss Cross lines here.

PC: *I'm sure I'll be fascinated.*

LRH: And I'm going to do a line assessment on you.

PC: *Mm!*

LRH: I'm going to add one more line. We're going to do a little assessment here, and what I'm going to do is read these things down the line.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: And I want a dial drop proposition.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Would you squeeze the cans? I'm trying to get a dial drop.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Squeeze the cans. Squeeze the cans. That's better. Going to have to have just one more here. Squeeze the cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. That's it. That's fine. That's fine. That ought to read like a bomb.

I got a whole bunch of these things, and I would like to take up a read on them ...

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH:... and see which one of these lines ...

PC: *Is twitchenin'.*

LRH: ...you would like to have listed. Or on this particular type of line ...

PC: *Yes?*

LRH:... what line you would rather not have. [PC and auditor laugh]

PC: *I don't care. I haven't felt so gloriously irresponsible in weeks.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Get this range here so that I can assess them all right.

Now, these are routine 3D Criss Cross lines, and somewhere on this thing we might find one that's a little hotter than others. And that is the one we will list.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: So now I'm simply going to read these lines to you.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: I'm just going to read these lines. And you're going to sit there in a glorious state of irresponsibility. Okay?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Now, who or what would be afraid to find out? All right. One division.

Who or what would prevent a discovery? Thank you.

Who or what would startle someone? ... [PC laughs]

Now, we get about a two division – two division rock slam. I just remembered something. This is your old pal "surprise."

PC: *Yes, yes.*

LRH: I'm going to put that down as an additional line, knowing your case, man.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Who or what ... All right.

Now, who or what would be unsafe for you to reveal? Mm-hm. Who or what

would be dangerous for another to reveal? All right. Who or what would suppress an identity? ... Who or what would suppress an identity? That's about one division.

Who or what would make knowledge scarce? That's two divisions.

Who or what would not want a past? All right.

Who or what would be unconfortable?

Yeah. Who or what would you suppress? All right.

Who or what would you surprise? Oh, you must have run that button out a long time ago. That had the least effect.

PC: *No kidding. Well, "startle" is sort of more so.*

LRH: Yeah. Yeah. It's much more the thing.

Now, who or what would make another realize he or she hadn't won? Okay.

Who or what should be disregarded when you're getting something done? All right.

Who or what would prevent another from winning. Mm-hm.

I think we've got it here on just a one-pass line.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Let me check it, however. I'm not going to do this by elimination.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: This is just a sort out, you know.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Who or what would be afraid to find out? All right.

Who or what would startle someone? That's interesting.

Who or what would make knowledge scarce?

Well, the most reaction I'm getting here: am I getting a reaction on just who or what ...

PC: *I just realized something. I just realized something on at least that last one, one fingernail of one hand was touching the other can. I hadn't noticed it got that close. And I don't know whether they touched or not that time when you were reading. Sorry.*

LRH: I didn't get any reaction on that.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: But I – who or what would startle someone? That's the only – that's the largest R/S that I've gotten. So I'm going to run it.

PC: *That's the most fun I can think of. [laughs]*

LRH: Ah, dear. But we get the same reaction now as "Who or what would be afraid to find out?" Now, who or what would startle someone? That's getting in there quite consistent. And we also got a nice action on "Who or what would make knowledge scarce?" We're not getting a similar reaction now.

All right. We're off to the races. That's what we're going to buy. And, "Who or what would startle someone?"

Yes, page 1, "Who or what would startle someone?"

All right. If I can find where I put your report here. We oddly enough are losing tone arm down the line here, and we only got about 2.6 on this tone arm.

PC: *Hm!*

LRH: Which is quite remarkable.

PC: *Don't tell me I'm going to have to give up my goal of being the only person with a female body ever to go Clear at 3.0. [PC and auditor laugh]*

LRH: That's a good one. All right. And we start listing here at 2.6 at 8:20. All right. And we're all set. Now, now, we're all set.

PC: *Oh, yes, I have the first three answers choked back.*

LRH: All right. All right. Give me number 1.

PC: *U-boat commander, of course.*

LRH: A...

PC: *U-boat commander.*

LRH:... U-boat commander. I'll bet he would.

PC: *Yes. And the "what" is a torpedo.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That's very startling*

LRH: What's the next one?

PC: *Did you get "torpedo?"*

LRH: Oh, I didn't get the torpedo.

PC: *That's the what. That's a what. Yes.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I don't know if there's anything else that's really startling, except a cavalry charge.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But that's not a terminal exactly.*

LRH: It's "what". All right. Here's the question. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *A joker.*

LRH: Okay. Good. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Wild animal.*

LRH: All right. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *This isn't exactly someone. But I'm thinking of a horse and how awfully startled they get by blown paper.*

LRH: All right. What's the answer there?

PC: *I guess it's blown paper.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And the horse isn't exactly a who, but it's almost. It's more of a who than a what. I mean someone.*

LRH: Well, is a horse there, too?

PC: *A sort of a someone. Yes. You know, you're asking here what would startle someone. Someone here would be a horse.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *They get awfully startled by blown paper.*

LRH: All right. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Well, something exploding under them.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *One of the most startling things on Earth is deep, cold water, if you suddenly find yourself in it.*

LRH: Deep, cold water.

PC: *Strictly for the birds.*

LRH: Very good. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Well, a polar bear.*

LRH: Okay. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *A low-flying plane.*

LRH: All right. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *The dog you didn't know was there.*

LRH: Good. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Something falling.*

LRH: All right. Good. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *A car in the wrong place.*

LRH: Okay. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *A burglar could.*

LRH: Okay. All right. I'm getting a little surge here.

PC: *I've got another one sort of sitting here waiting It sort of came up right ...*

LRH: Where?

PC: *... after the burglar. A murderer could be very startling*

LRH: A murderer.

PC: *A murderer.*

LRH: Ah, a murderer. Okay. Good enough. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Well, a spook or ghost.*

LRH: All right. You want both of those or only one?

PC: *Probably both. I'm not sure which seems better.*

LRH: Good. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *These days, anything along the line of a fairy or an elf would be very startling.*

LRH: All right. Which is it?

PC: *Fairy is somewhat preferable.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *An elf would also be startling.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *God knows why, but a brick wall.*

LRH: Okay. Good enough. Now, who or what would startle someone?

PC: *If something dropped on his head.*

LRH: Okay. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *A mouse.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Any more items? Yeah, what did you think of?

PC: *Something else white. Not quite a spook and not quite a polar bear. Oh, an iceberg. Oh, yes.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Okay. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *I've already got one plane, but this isn't a low-flying one. Oh, this is one coming out of a cloud. Like several of them.*

LRH: How do you say it? Plane coming out ...

PC: *Plane coming out of a cloud.*

LRH: All right. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *I don't know if it's called racing car or fast driven car. It's a car going zzzzz right by your nose, you know.*

LRH: All right. I don't mean to be critical...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Are you seeing pictures of these?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Are you picking these up off your pictures?

PC: *I think quite a few of them, yeah.*

LRH: You are.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right, I just wanted to know that.

PC: *Yeah. They kind of pop up. You're looking at me shrewdly.*

LRH: Yes, I'm looking at you shrewdly.

PC: *Hm-mm?*

LRH: I'm not getting enough tone arm action.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: So here's the contest. How do I get more tone arm action ...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH:... without invalidating you or messing you up in some way here. But you're – you're doing something. You're looking at the bank and watching a picture come up and then you're giving me ...

PC: *Yeah, they kind of – they're popping up. They're, you know, kind of like flash answers. I'm not figuring on particularly.*

LRH: Now, this is a terrible thing to show in front of students and that sort of thing, because it's all supposed to go off ...

PC: *If you would like me to figure on them, that's okay.*

LRH: I don't want you to figure on them ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH:... particularly or otherwise.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: But you're calling shots that are appearing.

PC: *Yes, that's right. That's exactly it.*

LRH: Yeah, well, let me tell you something. This list is going to be about eight thousand items long if we continue to do it this way.

PC: *Yes, I imagine it might be. Yes.*

LRH: Because we would just go on and run through this automaticity.

PC: *Ah, yeah.*

LRH: Now, that's perfectly all right.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: That's perfectly all right to call what you're looking at.

PC: *Mm. But it might get more tone arm action if I actually considered what might startle people. You mean, sort of.*

LRH: It just might.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Quite in addition to that, those that are popping up are perfectly safe, aren't they?

PC: *Not all of them.*

LRH: Well, would you be able to confront most of these?

PC: *Most of them, I think. There are some I find hard to confront. Fast cars, icebergs. Well, it'd depend on what situation.*

LRH: Now, this is a terribly bad example ...

PC: *Yes, yes.*

LRH: ... of auditing I'm giving here. And have I invalidated you?

PC: *No.*

LRH: No, I haven't. All right.

PC: *No.*

LRH: That's fine.

PC: *No.*

LRH: But there – I know from the amount of rock slam I gave on that thing that this is charged.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: And I'm not getting a representation of that charge here.

PC: *Oh. In other words, if I looked around me for something that was something really startling, you know, and figured on it a little what would really startle somebody.*

LRH: Yes, that's right.

PC: *All right. Yes, I could do that. Yes. Yes.*

LRH: All right. You go ahead and do that now. Tell me who or what would

startle someone? Yeah, we got a reaction to one there.

PC: *Well, this isn't very violent, but it is what I thought of – if you lean forward and suddenly clap your hands together right near somebody's face, you know.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Usually flinch.*

LRH: All right. Good. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Arresting them when they haven't done anything is very startling.*

LRH: Okay. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Somebody suddenly throwing you into deep water. That was one I do have trouble confronting.*

LRH: Mm. That's right. That's right.

PC: *I find it most unpleasant.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Good heavens, yes.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Shooting someone's horse out from under them is very startling and very unpleasant.*

LRH: You see why I called this shot.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: There's a difference here, isn't there?

PC: *Mm. Yeah. We're really looking for things at the moment.*

LRH: Good. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Cops are very startling if they show up at the wrong time and the wrong place, you know, when you don't expect them.*

LRH: All right. How do you state that?

PC: *How I found them startling was to find them at home one time when I didn't think there'd be any. There were cops in the home or in your home.*

LRH: Is it cops in a home?

PC: *Yes. The cops in your home. It isn't where they belong. They belong out in the street someplace.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Okay. Now who or what would startle someone?

PC: *A kidnapper would startle someone.*

LRH: Yeah, all right. Okay. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Well, a particular sort of prowler who would be somebody who was out in somebody's garden in the dark hiding behind the bushes and shot them in their own house through a window. Prowler would do.*

LRH: A prowler.

PC: *That's a prowler.*

LRH: All right. Good. Now who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Well, somebody who turned out to be totally different from what you expected, you know. You figured they were one kind of person; all of a sudden they turn out to be totally different.*

LRH: All right. How would you call this?

PC: *Yeah. Sort of somebody with a lot of different facets. It's not quite an*

unpredictable person though it comes close to it.

LRH: Well, can we put that down?

PC: *Yeah, yeah.*

LRH: Any other way you'd describe this? Could you say it a little closer?

PC: *Yeah, it'd be somebody you thought you knew through and through, and all of a sudden they were – you found out you were quite wrong. And it's not that they're a hypocrite.*

LRH: Well, just give it a name.

PC: *It's a sort of somebody with unexpected characteristics, you know, or traits.*

LRH: Somebody...

PC: *With unexpected traits.*

LRH:... with unexpected traits. All right. Very good.

PC: *And for some reason, that gives me a very faint pain in the eye.*

LRH: All right. All right. Now, who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Well, it's an awful late one. But a bad auditor, I guess because he's always dropping ashtrays. Bad auditors startle people.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Snakes are startling if they appear suddenly underfoot. Snakes. When they suddenly appear underfoot, you know.*

LRH: Okay, okay. All right. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Hey, that can be really startling. Because if you pick up an animal body, then nobody knows a real person is*

running it. They think it's just an animal. Man, can you startle people.

LRH: How do you call that, now?

PC: *Somebody running an animal body. "A person running an animal body" would about do it, you know.*

LRH: A person running an animal body. All right. Yes, I imagine that would be very startling.

PC: *It was hilarious. I think I've done it from time to time.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *I just started to think of something, and it went away. It started to be something like one of those things you were describing when you take somebody who's drunk and change the furniture all around, you know.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *It's uh – well, sort of a totally changed milieu, you know.*

LRH: A what?

PC: *It's a totally changed milieu, you know. They think they're in one place, and it's – it's – it gets all changed on them.*

LRH: Yeah. All right. Describe it. Give me a word. Give me a descriptive term for it.

PC: *I don't think there is an exact one in the language. Total change of surroundings, but it's – it's – it's predicted. It isn't so startling*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It's your own place that's been all changed around on you. A changed around place, I guess, would do it. It's a place that's been all changed around.*

LRH: All right. A place that's been all changed around.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Okay. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Somebody trying to murder you is often startling. It isn't always.*

LRH: Mm. Well, how would you call that? Just name it.

PC: *Well, we have it as murderer.*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *Attempted murderer, maybe.*

LRH: Attempted.

PC: *Yeah. Attempted murder. Somebody's trying to kill you. And you – particularly if you don't know why.*

LRH: All right. Somebody trying to kill you?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Is that it?

PC: *Especially if you don't quite know why. You know?*

LRH: Somebody trying to kill you, and you don't know why, huh?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Well, all right. Very good. All right. Good.

PC: *Actually, the most startling thing I can think of is somebody who has really evil intention. It always surprises me.*

LRH: An evil intention.

PC: *Yeah. Somebody who has a – simply has an evil intention. They always startle the hell out of me.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It's one of the things I can hardly bear to find out, that somebody really means harm.*

LRH: All right. Is that another one? That – "Somebody who really means harm?"

PC: *Yeah. Sort of outside of agreed-on circumstance. I mean, somebody shooting at you in a war doesn't come under that heading.*

LRH: All right. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *I've gone kind of blank on the subject.*

LRH: Just give me anything that comes to mind.

PC: *Yeah, something – something out of the wrong time stream. You know, like a pterodactyl if you suddenly saw it in a modern bird migration. Something archaic. Something or other – what's the word? Anachronistic.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Good enough. Something out of the wrong time stream?

PC: *Yeah. You know ...*

LRH: Is that how to describe it?

PC: *You went out here in the road and saw something riding along in armor or something You know, you'd be kind of startled.*

LRH: Mm. All right. Okay. Now, who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *An ambush. Meaning sort of the people in it, you know. The people in an ambush. They're very startling.*

LRH: Well, what do you call the people in an ambush?

PC: *I suppose "ambushers" or something like that.*

LRH: All right. Call them anything else?

PC: *Yes, but not printable.* [PC and auditor laugh]

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, are there any more?

PC: [giggles] *It's a little bit startling.*

LRH: What did you think of?

PC: *Civilians.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Civilians. Very startling.*

LRH: Civilians?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Is that all of these? Now, there's a little tick.

PC: *Well, that's – that's – I don't know how to describe it, but somebody that has a viewpoint utterly different from yours.*

LRH: Somebody...

PC: *Actually, it isn't they're so much startling; they're baffling. You know, it isn't a sudden startle. It's just you can't wrap your wits around it.*

LRH: So that – this one wouldn't work.

PC: *Not really. It's not really startling. They're baffling.*

LRH: All right. All right. Who or what would startle someone?

PC: *Well, somebody – if you're being carried, either because you're an infant or are injured, and some other person carrying you drops you, it's very startling. It's somebody who drops you.*

LRH: Is it "somebody who drops you"?

PC: *Somebody who drops you.*

LRH: All right. Okay. All right. Are there any more of these? Are there any more of these? Any more of these? Kind of non-responsive. You got others?

PC: *Not – not on the tip of my tongue, so to speak. I'm sure I could think of other ... Well, I mean the world is full of these. There's hardly a thing in the world you couldn't use for startling somebody.*

LRH: Well, yes, let me tell you – ask you this. Is the item on this list?

PC: *Well, I rather think so, somewhere along the line.*

LRH: You think it might be? Do you have ...

PC: *Well, I don't know which. I'm not really ...*

LRH: All right. Well, have you – do you have a feeling like you've given me an item? Or do you feel like – a feeling like you haven't expressed an item yet?

PC: *No. Right at the moment I feel kind of – kind of blank on the subject. I know I could think of more.*

LRH: Mm. All right. Well, just for kicks ...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Just for kicks ...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH:... we're going to take this now, and I'll ask you just one more time.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Who or what would startle someone? We've had a consistent reaction on Who or What, but it doesn't much matter with what follows it.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: You feel all right about this now? You think – you think this might be on the list?

PC: *Yes, I do.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I did think of one more when you asked then.*

LRH: What is it?

PC: *He's making my fingers twitch, and I've been going on for weeks now. It's somebody who uses a weapon in the other hand than what you expect. A left-handed person would almost do it.*

LRH: Well, what do you call this person?

PC: *I think "a left-handed person" would do it, though there are places where that's a custom – that somebody uses the wrong hand.*

LRH: It's somebody who uses the wrong hand?

PC: *Who uses the wrong hand. Yes.*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *Yes, indeed.*

LRH: Does that make your finger twitch?

PC: *I've been getting this finger twitching in the left hand on being asked withhold questions for weeks now. I don't know what does it.*

LRH: All right. Are there any more on this? It's awful quiet.

PC: *It feels quiet.*

LRH: All right. I'll tell you what we're going to do.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: We didn't get too much tone arm action on this, you see.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: So I'm perfectly willing to skimp it, see.

PC: *Uh-huh, hm.*

LRH: And perfectly happy to do that and carry on through. You had a goal to get a couple, and we might even get somewhere in that direction. Okay?

PC: *Fair enough.*

LRH: If we come along ...

PC: *Yeah, it's not a burning thing with me. It'd be kind of fun to.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, I'm just going to read you this list.

PC: *Uh-huh.*

LRH: And we're not these days differentiating by tearing things off the list.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: You can have all of these.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: But I want you to say "Yes" or "Mmhm," or "Nm."

PC: *Signifying what? That it's appropriate or I changed my mind ...*

LRH: All right. Something of the sort. Just – no, actually, just telling me you considered it.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: I just want to know you considered it, that's all.

PC: *Oh, all right.*

LRH: If you considered it, that's good enough for me.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Would a U-boat commander startle someone?

PC: *For sure.*

LRH: All right. Would a torpedo startle someone?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Good. Would a cavalry charge startle someone?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Good. Would a joker startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: What's this joker thing?

PC: *Well, sort of a practical joker. Somebody who's witty, comes out with something unexpected.*

LRH: All right. Would a wild animal startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Would blown paper startle someone?

PC: *A horse.*

LRH: Yeah. Well, does that answer the question?

PC: *Yes, yes.*

LRH: All right. All right. Would something exploding under them startle someone?

PC: *Yes, indeed.*

LRH: Yeah, all right. Would deep, cold water startle someone?

PC: *Christ, yes.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Would a polar bear startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Would a low-flying plane startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Would a dog you didn't know was there startle someone?

PC: *Someone.*

LRH: All right. Would something falling startle someone?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Would a car on the wrong place startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Okay. Would a burglar startle someone?

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: All right. Would a murderer startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Okay. Would a spook startle someone?

PC: *Hm-mm.*

LRH: All right. Would a ghost startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. You got an ARC break?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Yeah, what's that? You had a little thought? There's some little tick. Somewhere along here.

PC: *Oh, heavens, I was just thinking. I'm still worried about, "officer." I was hoping, "U-boat commander" would stay in because I feel as if we almost got rid of "officer," and I liked it so much.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That kind of train of thought sort of went through fast at some point, yes.*

LRH: All right. Okay. All right. That gave us a little change of line here.

Okay. Would a ghost startle someone?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Would a fairy startle someone?

PC: *Mm. It shouldn't.*

LRH: All right. Would an elf startle someone?

PC: *Hm-mm.*

LRH: Okay. Would a brick wall startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Got any other ARC breaks here? Ah, what's that one?

PC: *I don't know. Body feels kind of peculiar. I feel as though I have kind of a ... It's hard to describe. It's a strange kind of – sort of this tight sensation in the stomach and kind of push in front of the body.*

LRH: Mm. Mm. Well, does this have anything to do with something I've done to you?

PC: *I don't think so.*

LRH: There's a little bang here. I must be doing something here.

PC: *Well, I'm thinking this. I'm not quite pleased with some of the items on it.*

LRH: Oh, yeah, yeah, well, have I done something you didn't like? No. Have you done something you thought I wouldn't like? What's that?

PC: *The closest to that was back there when I was taking them as they popped up.*

LRH: Oh? Do – now, do you consider that's still critical?

PC: *Critical? No. No. You hadn't given me any particular way of doing it.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I did it whatever way seemed natural till you told me ...*

LRH: All right. All right. All right. Did it go better or worse afterwards?

PC: *I don't think it made a great deal of difference. I mean maybe it made a difference in the tone arm, because it didn't seem to make much difference here.*

LRH: Didn't make much difference.

PC: *I worked a little harder. That's all.*

LRH: All right. Now, do you have an ARC break? Do you have an ARC break? Have you got an ARC break with somebody else? Now, who have you got an ARC break with? Not just plowing up the ground needlessly. ARC break?

PC: *I don't feel tremendously ARC break with anybody. I feel an ARC break with the body, but then I usually do.*

LRH: Oh, you do have an ARC break? Yes. Well, who's this ARC break with?

PC: *With the body.*

LRH: All right. Good. Do you have an ARC break with your body? That's the one. All right. Now, the thing I'm trying to isolate here ...

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: What? You just think of something else?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Now, the thing I'm trying to isolate here is, do you have an ARC break with me? No, I don't find anything, unless it's just delaying your session at this point.

PC: *Very mildly. You didn't do anything that's put me at ... oh, I didn't know I was acting out of session when you first inquired about an ARC break.*

LRH: Oh. I see.

PC: *I was wondering sort of what the 1/20th slip out was that you noticed.*

LRH: It just all of a sudden – all of a sudden all of your items went cool.

PC: *Oh, all right. Yeah, all right. Yes, fair enough.*

LRH: All right. All right. I'll go over ...

PC: *Ooh, way back.*

LRH: What's that?

PC: *A slight mystery. At one point you said, "Very interesting," and I*

kind of felt an impulse to say, "What was very interesting," and I didn't.

LRH: Oh, I see. All right.

PC: *I don't deeply care but it just kind of popped up as a little unknown back there. I never did find out. I presume it was the needle reaction.*

LRH: All right. All right. All right.

PC: *That was a long time ago.*

LRH: Okay. Well, good enough. Do you have an ARC break? No. Good.

PC: *That feels colder. Cooler. Next time I'll ask.*

LRH: Okay. Well, let's carry on with this. Now, we got it at – third yawn here. Here we go. A brick wall. Would that startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Would something dropped on his head startle someone?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Would a mouse startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Would an iceberg startle someone?

PC: *God, yes.*

LRH: Just reading about the *Titanic*.

All right. A plane coming out of the cloud. Would that startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Would clapping hands together in front of somebody's face startle someone?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Would arresting them when they haven't done anything startle someone?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Would somebody suddenly throwing you into deep water be startling?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Would shooting someone's horse out from under him startle someone?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. All right. Would cops in your own home startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Would a kidnapper startle someone?

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: All right. Would a prowler startle someone?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Good. Would an unpredictable person startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Good. Would somebody with unexpected traits startle someone?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Would a bad auditor startle someone?

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: Good. Would a snake startle someone?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Would a person running an animal body startle someone?

PC: *Yes, indeed.*

LRH: All right. Would a place that's been all changed around startle someone?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Would somebody trying to kill you and you didn't know why be startling?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Would an evil intention startle someone?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That's sort of "an evil-intentioned person."*

LRH: You want to change that to an evil ...

PC: *I don't – I didn't intend it as just an evil intention. It'd be somebody with an evil intention, an evil-intentioned person.*

LRH: Well, you'd say an evil-intentioned ...

PC: *Yeah per – per ... Yeah. An evil-intentioned person.*

LRH:... person.

PC: *Or person with an evil intention.*

LRH: All right. Very good. That somebody really means harm?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Would something out of the wrong time stream startle someone?

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: All right. Would somebody suddenly springing out of hiding startle someone?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Would ambushers startle someone?

PC: *Yes, they would.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Would a civilian startle someone?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Would somebody who drops you startle?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. And somebody who uses the wrong hand startle?

PC: *Kind of.*

LRH: Yeah. Okay. So far, so good. Now we will proceed on to null this list, if that's all right with you?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Hm? All right. Let's set this up. Okay. See if we can get someplace with it.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Here we are.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Anything you'd care to ask or say before I start in on the nulling?

PC: *No, it's just that it feels like I expected something very exciting to happen. Like rockets to shoot off out of my ears or something.*

LRH: All right. Okay. All right.

A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. Thank you. That's in.

Torpedo. Torpedo. Torpedo. Thank you. That's in.

Cavalry charge. Cavalry charge. Cavalry charge. Thank you. That's in by the grace of its bits. All right.

A joker. A joker. A joker. Thank you. That is out.

A wild animal. A wild animal. A wild animal. Thank you. That is in.

Blown paper. Blown paper. Blown paper. Thank you. That is in.

Something exploding under them. Something exploding under them. Something exploding under them. Something exploding under them. And that is out.

Deep, cold water. Deep, cold water. Deep cold water. Thank you. That is in.

A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. Thank you. That is in.

A low-flying plane. A low-flying plane. A low-flying plane. Thank you. A low-flying plane. And that is out.

A dog you didn't know was there. I'm afraid that's in. [PC and auditor laugh]

PC: *Well, at least you haven't got tugmate – tugboat – mate back.*

LRH: What's that? Is that ...

PC: *That was the one that wouldn't go away on a list once.*

LRH: Oh, yeah. All right.

Something falling. Something falling. Something falling. Something falling. Yeah, that's in. Thank you.

A car in the wrong place. That's in. [PC coughs]

All right. Give the cans a squeeze, would you? Ah, that's fine. That's looser. Everything's fine.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: A burglar. A burglar. A burglar. Thank you. That is in.

A murderer. A murderer. A murderer. Thank you. That is in.

A spook. A spook. A spook. A spook. That is questionable. A spook. Ah, that's in. Thank you.

A ghost. A ghost. A ghost. Thank you. That is in.

A fairy. A fairy. A fairy. Thank you. That is in.

An elf. An elf. An elf. Thank you. That is in.

A brick wall. A brick wall. A brick wall. Thank you. That is in. [PC coughs] Okay.

That's all right. Don't worry about coughing. Are you trying to restrain yourself from coughing so it won't show on the E-meter?

PC: *Well, so as not to put a peculiar read only in the middle of one.*

LRH: Oh, I can read through that.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Go ahead and cough if you've got to. All right. Have you got an ARC break? Are you upset about anything? Got a present time problem? Got a present time problem? What's your present time problem?

PC: *I guess just whether I do feel all right about coughing or not.*

LRH: Yeah?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Well, is there a withhold on the subject?

PC: *Yes. I have an overt and a withhold. In lectures last night, I was coughing like mad in the first one. I managed to get it turned off in the second.*

LRH: Yeah, well, all right.

PC: *A long string of coughing in your lectures.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Well, what is this now? How about coughing? All right. Are you withholding anything? All right. Thank you.

Something dropped on his head. Something dropped on his head. Something dropped on his head. Thank you. That's in.

A mouse. A mouse. A mouse. A mouse. Thank you. That is out.

An iceberg. An iceberg. An iceberg. Thank you. That is in.

A plane coming out of a cloud. Thank you. That is in.

Clapping hands together in somebody's face. Boy, that is so undetectable. However, we'll leave it in.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right.

Arresting them when they haven't done anything. Arresting them when they haven't done anything. Arresting them when they haven't done anything.

Thank you. Arresting them when they haven't done anything. That is out. Thank you.

Somebody suddenly throwing you into deep water. Somebody suddenly throwing you into deep water. Somebody suddenly throwing you into deep water. And that is in. Thank you.

Shooting someone's horse out from under him. Shooting someone's horse out from under him. Shooting someone's horse out from under him. Thank you. That is in.

Cops in your own home. Thank you. That is in.

A kidnapper. A kidnapper. A kidnapper. Thank you. That is in.

A prowler. A prowler. A prowler. Thank you. That is in.

An unpredictable person. An unpredictable person. An unpredictable person. Thank you. That is in.

Somebody with unexpected traits. Somebody with unexpected traits. Somebody with unexpected traits. Thank you. That is in.

A bad auditor. A bad auditor. A bad auditor. Thank you. That is out.

PC: *Bye-bye.*

LRH: A snake. A snake. A snake. A snake. A snake. That's in. Thank you.

Okay. A person running an animal body. A person running an animal body. A person running an animal body. Thank you. That is in.

A place that's been all changed around. A place that's been all changed

around. A place that's been all changed around. Thank you. That is in.

Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Thank you. That is in.

An evil-intentioned person. An evil-intentioned person. An evil-intentioned person. Thank you. That is in.

That somebody really means harm. That's out.

Something out of the wrong time stream. Something out of the wrong time stream. Something out of the wrong time stream. Thank you. That is in.

Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding. Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding. Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding. Thank you. That is in.

Ambushers. Ambushers. Ambushers. Thank you. That is in.

A civilian. A civilian. A civilian. Thank you. That is in.

Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Thank you. That is in.

Somebody who uses the wrong hand. Somebody who uses the wrong hand. Thank you. That is in.

Okay. Well, we got a few off of the list. The list shows every sign of not being complete.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: But we're just going to bull it through.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Because we didn't have the tone arm action there we ought to have.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: we only had about 2.9 to 3.1 tone arm action. Just ...

PC: *Mm. Seems that something might be missing.*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *Seems as something might be missing?*

LRH: No, it's just that – it's just that – it probably has some kind of a – of a shallow dial on this sort of thing.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: And I'll turn around and get another list ...

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH:... that was almost a companion to this list.

PC: *Hm-mm.*

LRH: And get the other list and get it functioning. And between the two of them, oppterming them, we should shake it up.

PC: *Should I kind of keep an eye out for anything else that might pop up on this as you're doing it?*

LRH: Oh, you can at all times. It's perfectly all right with me.

PC: *There's one thing I thought of perhaps adding in place of a mouse which is a rat. Rats are startling*

LRH: All right. Okay. We're going to bull this one through.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: We don't have too many active terminals. There are not too many.

PC: *The only thing I don't know about is should I tell you when I get a sensation? Or doesn't that matter particularly?*

LRH: No. We already know what type of terminal you have.

PC: *Do we?*

LRH: We do. We know what types of terms and oppters.

PC: *Oh.*

LRH: That's the only reason you do that.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: We can spot that some other ... But let's get something that's – that's hotter than a pistol.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: This one is not particularly hot.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Okay. Do you have an ARC break? Present time problem? Are you mad at anybody? Are you mad at anybody? Are you mad at anybody? Hey, what do you know. Who are you mad at?

PC: *I think it's sort of modern English.*

LRH: Modern English.

PC: *They've changed some. They've changed the place around too much. That's what I was just thinking of when we hit that "changed around places."*

LRH: Yeah, yeah. All right. You mad at somebody? I still get a tick. Who else are you mad at? That took some of it off. Now, what's the rest of it?

PC: *I don't feel particularly mad.*

LRH: Nobody said you were. I just asked you a question at random ...

PC: *All right.*

LRH:... and got a reaction. Are you mad at somebody? Now, are you mad at somebody? Now I get no reaction.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. That was interesting.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Are you withholding anything? Should I found – should have – should I have found out about something? What should I have found out about? Anything? Should I have found out about something in this session? What should I have found out in this session?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: You know something I should have found out in this session?

PC: *Yes. Yes. I'd do almost anything to get "officer" back in somewhere along the line.*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *I don't care if I assess from millions of years on 3D Criss Cross. If it doesn't end up back at "officer" again, I won't be happy.*

LRH: You consider this an invalidation of a terminal?

PC: *No, not really.*

LRH: Do you or don't you?

PC: *It's not that it's invalidating. It's just there's some question.*

LRH: What's the question?

PC: *Well, is it the proper one to run, for example. Is it the most central one? I just hope it is.*

LRH: All right. All right. Well, now, how do you feel about this now? Anything else that I should have found out about? What should – else should I have found out about?

PC: *Well, I got left with that, and a part of the Prehav Scale is kind of awkward, is "Failed Endures" has never been flattened on that terminal.*

LRH: Oh, "officer"?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: "Officer" has never been flattened on "Failed Endure"?

PC: *It's the most – the most shameful item on the entire Prehav Scale from my point of view. It's never been flattened.*

LRH: Oh, dear. Oh, my. All right. All right. What else should I have found out? Nothing much. Anything else I should have found out?

PC: *I don't think so.*

LRH: No. Have I missed a withhold on you? I got a clink. Is that withhold? Yes. Have I missed a withhold on you? Have I missed ... a withhold ... on you?

You know, you bang on "you"?

PC: *I'm not surprised.*

LRH: Yeah, you. You. You.

All right. Have I missed a withhold? Latent. All right. Have I missed a withhold? What do you think about afterwards?

PC: *Oh! A whole slew of unexecuted auditing commands I never mentioned to you.*

LRH: Oh, yeah. When was that?

PC: *Union Station. I could never do that process. I was on it for several days. And I – they were all either half-truths or untruths. Every answer.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *And I couldn't do it. And I had to give the auditor something, and it – and it just ...*

LRH: Who was auditing you?

PC: *Carol Hadley and Lydia Silvenstein.*

LRH: Mm. Okay. All right. Well, have I missed a withhold on you? Have I missed a withhold on you? ... Do you think of anything I'm not necessarily ...

PC: *I'm kind of blank at the moment.*

LRH: All right. Well, have I missed ... ? What have I missed?

PC: *What have you missed ?*

LRH: Not a withhold. What have I missed?

PC: *Going to sea, I guess.*

LRH: All right. All right. Good.

PC: *This is something I've always found difficult to comprehend.*

LRH: What?

PC: *How you could stop going to sea.*

LRH: All right. Well, have I missed a withhold on you? I don't get any reaction on this now.

PC: *Uh-huh.*

LRH: All right?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Here we go. Plowing on down the line. Is it all right with you if I continue this now?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. What's the tick? You waited too long to continue it?

PC: *I guess I was wondering whether I'd taken too long or something, you know. I'm getting this same sort of doubt ...*

LRH: Do you feel guilty about anything

PC: *... that I'd get a wrong question.*

LRH: Well, do you?

PC: *I suppose I could go on for hours on the subject. Yes.*

LRH: oh, I see. All right. Is that going to interfere with us nulling this list? No. Thank you.

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Do you feel all right now though, really?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: You more or less relaxed?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Here we go.

A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. All right. A U-boat commander.

Having to make up my mind whether or not these things are actually falling on the item ...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: ... or falling on a little random pattern I got here.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: That's what I'm hunting through.

PC: *Fair enough.*

LRH: So it's fine. We're doing all right.

A torpedo. A torpedo. A torpedo. A torpedo. Yeah, man, that's in. Thank you.

A cavalry charge. A cavalry charge. A cavalry charge. A cavalry charge. Yeah, that's in. Thank you.

A wild animal. A wild animal. A wild animal. A wild animal. Well, that's a nice, calm, wild animal. That is out. Thank you, all right.

Okay. Blown paper. Blown paper. Blown paper. Thank you. That is in.

Something exploding under them. Something exploding under them. Something exploding under them. Something exploding under them. Seems to be awfully undisturbed here. Something exploding under them. Something exploding under them. Something exploding under them. Ah, isn't that funny? That was out already. So our needle was ...

PC: *I thought it had been, yeah.*

LRH: Yeah, well, our needle is very ... oh, that's what you fell on in the middle of it.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: I'm just crosschecking.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: We're doing fine. Not to give you any mystery on the thing.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: I didn't particularly notice I had or hadn't, but I was glad to see that it was already null.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right.

Deep, cold water. Deep, cold water. Deep, cold water. And that is in. Thank you.

A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. Thank you. A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. Polar bear. Thank you. That is in.

A dog you didn't know was there. Thank you. That is in.

Something falling. Something falling.

Did you move your finger on the can?

PC: *Not that I felt.*

LRH: All right.

Something falling. Something falling. Something falling. Something falling. Something falling. Something. Something. Something. Something. Something falling. Something falling. Oh, that's in.

A car in the wrong place. A car in the wrong place. A car in the wrong place. Thank you. That is in.

A burglar. A burglar. A burglar. Thank you. That is in.

A murderer. A murderer. A murderer. Thank you. That is in.

A spook. A spook. A spook. Thank you. That is out.

A ghost. A ghost. A ghost. A ghost. A ghost. Thank you. That is in.

A fairy. A fairy. A fairy. A fairy. Peculiar. Latent tick on "a fairy."

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: A fairy. It's in.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Thank you.

An elf. An elf. An elf. Thank you. That is in.

A brick wall. A brick wall. A brick wall. Thank you. That is out.

Something dropped on his head. Something dropped on his head. Something dropped on his head. Thank you. That is in.

An iceberg. An iceberg. An iceberg. An iceberg.

Just looking at this needle pattern here. An iceberg. An iceberg. An iceberg. Thank you. That is in.

A plane coming out of a cloud. A plane coming out of a cloud. A plane coming out of a cloud. Thank you. That is in.

Clapping hands together in front of somebody's face. Clapping hands together in front of somebody's face. Clapping hands together in front of somebody's face. Thank you. That is in.

Arresting them when they haven't done anything. That is out.

Somebody suddenly throwing you into deep water. Somebody suddenly throwing you into deep water. Somebody

suddenly throwing you into deep water. Thank you. That is in.

Shooting somebody's horse out from under him. Shooting somebody's horse out from under him. Shooting somebody's horse out from under him. Thank you. That is in.

Cops in your own home. Cops in your own home. Cops in your own home. Thank you. That is in.

A kidnapper. A kidnapper. A kidnapper. Thank you, that is in.

A prowler. A prowler. A prowler. Thank you. That is in.

An unpredictable person. That is out, thank you.

Somebody with unexpected traits. Somebody with unexpected traits. Somebody with unexpected traits. Thank you, that is in.

A snake. A snake. A snake. A snake. A snake. Thank you. That is in.

A person running an animal body. A person running an animal body. A person running an animal body. Thank you. That is in.

A place that's been all changed around. A place that's been all changed around. A place that's been all changed around. Thank you. That is in.

Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Thank you. That is in.

An evil-intentioned person. An evil-intentioned person. An evil-intentioned person. Thank you, that is in.

Something out of the wrong time stream. Thank you. That is in.

Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding. Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding. Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding. Thank you. That is in.

Ambushers. Ambushers. Ambushers. Thank you. That is in.

A civilian. A civilian. A civilian. Thank you. That is in.

Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Thank you. That is in.

Somebody who uses the wrong hand. That's out.

A rat. A rat. A rat. Thank you. That is in.

Okay. Now, you know what I'm going to do with you? I'm going to give you a couple of minutes' break.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: As a matter of fact, I'm going to give you exactly ten minutes' break till 9:30. All right.

PC: *It would be very pleasant.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I can have a cigarette.*

LRH: Good. Good. Take a break.

TV DEMO: 3D CRISS CROSS ASSESSMENT, PART II

An auditing demonstration given on 20 March 1962

LRH: All right. And anything happen in this break that upset you in any way?

PC: *I don't think so.*

LRH: Anything happen in this break that upset you in any way? What are we getting a fall on here? You? Yes. What – what are you doing here? It keeps falling on "you." There it is.

PC: *If I knew, it wouldn't fall. [laughs] No responsibility, no responsibility, no responsibility. I'm not fond of my current identity.*

LRH: All right. All right. Good. Now, is it all right with you if I be – continue with this session now, huh?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: We continue with the session? Anything wrong with the session?

PC: *We haven't got down the terminal I told you about yet.*

LRH: Well, all right. Now, that terminal is "being somebody famous."

PC: *Yeah, it's being a famous person incognito and then revealing yourself you know, some – having them find out who you were. It's letting an incognito slip. Something like that.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Is there anything else? Hm?

PC: *I don't think so.*

LRH: All right. All right. Let's get back to see if we can do some of this nulling.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Anyway, we're grinding this thing out the hard way. Now, did anything happen in the middle of the session during the break that you shouldn't have done? That we've got a tone arm rise here almost.

PC: *I used some toilet paper on a roll that was down rather low, and I always feel like a swine when I do. [laughs]*

LRH: Okay. All right. Anything else? Are you withholding anything else? No. Anything else? All right. Okay. Yeah, let's get back to this list. Okay?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Squeeze the cans. All right, that's a little much. Squeeze the cans. All right. Well, whatever it's doing, it's loosened up your tone arm.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Squeeze the cans. Oh, fine. That brought your tone arm down considerably. It just ...

PC: *Oh yeah, I sort of feel like I'm gettin' back in session.*

LRH: Oh, I see. And in addition to that, we've got your sensitivity well down for a one dial drop. Okay?

PC: Mm.

LRH: All right. Here we go. Here we go. All right. A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. Now, I'm going through this list and sort these out.

PC: Mm.

LRH: A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. Going to have to assume that is null. Thank you. All right. Torpedo. Torpedo. Torpedo. And that is null. Thank you.

A cavalry charge. A cavalry charge. A cavalry charge. All right.

Have you got an ARC break?

PC: *It sounds as if all the interesting ones are going.* [laughs]

LRH: All right. Are you losing something here? Is that what you're losing? Is it because you're losing something. All right. Let me check it again.

PC: Mm.

LRH: A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. Oh, yes.

Well, you did have an ARC break there, didn't you? Any other ARC break? Yeah, what's that?

PC: *I guess anybody thinking anything else about me.*

LRH: Any ... what?

PC: *I guess anybody who thinks of me anything else.* [laughs]

LRH: Oh, I see. All right.

PC: *Small variations.*

LRH: All right. All right. You got any other ARC break here? I'm getting a little rock slam on an ARC break. What's this?

PC: *Well, there are things, I guess, on it that I would feel it was dis-creditable to be.*

LRH: And what's that?

PC: *Sort of to be an elf.*

LRH: Yeah?

PC: *Or a kidnapper or burglar. I'd rather be a murderer if I'm going to be something along that line.*

LRH: All right. Well, what's the upset here? Any upset?

PC: *No, just on those first three or the first couple of ones, I was sorry to see them go. I thought, well, I don't feel too much interested in the rest. I don't care what it turns out to be, much.*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *It won't be anything very interesting anymore.*

LRH: All right. A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. Now, we get one out of three here on this.

PC: *Well, if it's going null, it's going null. That's the way it is.*

LRH: Well...

PC: *It can't always be what you want.*

LRH: Have you invalidated it? Yeah, well, when did you invalidate it?

PC: *After checking with the German Dienststelle to see if I had my records straight for the First World War, and I didn't. I've got the name wrong. The*

guy I thought I was didn't exist. I may have been somebody else ...

LRH: Yes.

PC: ... *but it was kind of a maybe on the subject.*

LRH: Oh, I see. I see. All right. Well, let's continue on with it here.

PC: *Mm. Mm.*

LRH: All right? Cavalry charge. Cavalry charge. Cavalry charge.

Okay. There's something going on here. I'm going to run this at a higher sensitivity.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Okay? See if we can't pick this out of the hat a little bit better and ignore this big sweep.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. A U-boat commander. And that is out. Thank you. Torpedo. Torpedo. Torpedo. Thank you. That is out.

Cavalry charge. Cavalry charge. Cavalry charge. Thank you. That is out.

Blown paper. Blown paper. Blown paper. Blown paper. Thank you. That is out.

Deep, cold water. Deep, cold water. Deep, cold water. Thank you. That is out.

A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. And that is in.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: And there's my R/S. And I said I would pick it all up with an R/S.

PC: *You're kidding.*

LRH: And I will.

PC: *You know, I bought an Eskimo carved polar bear in a Washington book shop once, and I almost fainted while buying it. I wanted it very much – I started to buy it, and I almost passed out cold.*

LRH: All right. All right. All right. Now, here we go. Here we go. Doing a little bit better now.

PC: *I'm glad to see some of them nulling even if they're ones I like.*

LRH: No, it isn't, it isn't whether they're nulling or not. Frankly, frankly, I'm rather sorry, when I just don't pick this out on the R/S, and I think I will.

PC: *Mm. Mm-hm.*

LRH: Because I've got – only got R/S on about three or four items, but I haven't ...

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: I haven't actually noted them previously, but that's just me.

PC: *Mm. Mm.*

LRH: I haven't noted them down.

A dog you didn't know was there. A dog you didn't know was there. A dog you didn't know was there. Thank you. That is in.

Something falling. Something falling. Something falling. Let's get that. Something falling. That's out. Thank you.

A car in the wrong place. Thank you. That is out.

A burglar. A burglar. A burglar. Thank you. That is out. It's not a burglar. Feel better now?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. A murderer. And that is out. Thank you.

A ghost. A ghost. A ghost. Thank you. That is out.

A fairy. A fairy. A fairy. A fairy. Thank you. That is in.

An elf. An elf. An elf. Thank you. That is in.

Something dropped on his head. Something dropped on his head. Something dropped on his head. Thank you. That is out.

An iceberg. An iceberg. An iceberg. An iceberg. Thank you. That is out.

A plane coming out of a cloud. A plane coming out of a cloud. A plane coming out of a cloud. Thank you. That is out.

Clapping hands together in front of somebody's face. Clapping hands together in front of somebody's face. Clapping hands together in front of somebody's face. Thank you. That is out.

Arresting them when they haven't done anything. That is out.

Somebody suddenly throwing you into deep water. Somebody suddenly throwing you into deep water. Somebody suddenly throwing you into deep water. Thank you. That is out.

Shooting someone's horse out from underneath him. Shooting someone's horse out from underneath him. Shooting somebody's horse out from underneath him. And I think I could develop that into an R/S with the greatest of ease. That is in.

Cops in your own home. Cops in your own home. Cops in your own home. Thank you. That is in.

A kidnapper. A kidnapper. A kidnapper. A kidnapper. Thank you. That is out.

A prowler. A prowler. A prowler. A prowler. A prowler. Thank you. That is in.

Somebody with unexpected traits. I'm going to leave it in.

A snake. Thank you. That is in. All right.

Have you invalidated anything? Bang. What's that?

PC: *Just I was thinking it was a weird combination. Fairies and polar bears, for God's sakes.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *I don't know why it should be sensible, but it seems remarkably miscellaneous.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Any other invalidation there? All right. Thank you. All right.

A person running an animal body. A person running an animal body. A person running an animal body. Thank you. That is out.

A place that's been all changed around. A place that's been all changed around. A place that's been all changed around. Thank you. That is out.

Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Some-

body trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Thank you. That is in.

An evil-intentioned person. An evil-intentioned person. An evil-intentioned person. Thank you. That is out.

Something out of the wrong time stream. Something out of the wrong time stream. Something out of the wrong time stream. Thank you. That is out.

Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding. Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding. Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding. Thank you. Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding. What do you think about that?

PC: *I was thinking it was mean – I gave you a tongue twister on that one, like "Peter Piper picked," you know.*

LRH: Is that so ... is that's ... we ware having ... I would rather ... I rather thought so.

PC: *Yes. It was a mild version.*

LRH: All right. I thought that was probably what that was banging on.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Because I wasn't getting a read on it, but I was getting a read.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding. Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding. Somebody suddenly springing out of hiding. Thank you. That is out.

Ambushers. Ambushers. Ambushers. Thank you. That is out.

A civilian. A civilian. A civilian. Thank you. That is in. Somebody ... [pc laughs]

PC: *Fairies, civilians and polar bears – too much!*

LRH: That's a little bit rock slummy, that one, by the way, "civilian."

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Mm. I mean, it was when I hit it previously. All right.

Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Thank you. That is in.

A rat. A rat. A rat. Thank you. That is in.

Being a famous person incognito and letting somebody find who you are. Being a famous person incognito and letting somebody find who you are. Thank you. That is out.

Well, we're getting there, madam. We're getting there very nicely.

PC: *Good. Civilian one's funny.*

LRH: Haven't got too many of them. I haven't got too many left here.

PC: *Well...*

LRH: All right. Just let me – let me count them for you.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: All right. Let us carry on.

PC: *Let's roll.*

LRH: Have you thought of anything?

PC: *No, just the great hilarity of about last week – Herzog was coaching me, and suddenly in the middle of it I realized he was a civilian, and I got the giggles.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *And what I was giggling about – and I said, "You're a civilian." And then for about a half an hour, all he would do was point to himself and say, "I'm a civilian," and I'd almost fall off the chair.*

LRH: Oh, yeah. All right. Okay. All right. Now are you withholding anything? Thank you. All right. Here we go. All set?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. I'm going to jack this up just a little bit on sensitivity.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. Well, that's still an agitaty sort of thing, so we're going to leave that in. Okay?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. A dog you didn't know was there. A dog you didn't know was there. A dog you didn't know was there. All right. And that is in.

A fairy. A fairy. A fairy. A fairy. A fairy. So, we'll leave it in. Thank you.

An elf. An elf. An elf. Thank you. And that's in.

All right. What did you just think of so hard?

PC: *Polar bears. You know, they're white on white. They can be very*

startling because they're so well camouflaged, you know.

LRH: Oh, yeah, all right. Yep. All right. Very good. Shooting somebody's horse out from under him. Shooting somebody's horse out from under him. Shooting somebody's horse out from under him. Thank you. That is out.

Cops in your own home. That's in. Thank you.

A prowler. A prowler. A prowler. Thank you. That is in.

Somebody with unexpected traits. Somebody with unexpected traits. Somebody with unexpected traits. Somebody with unexpected traits. That's out. Thank you.

A snake. A snake. A snake. Thank you. That is in.

Something wrong?

PC: *I itched. I scratched.*

LRH: All right. You okay?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. That's in.

What did you just think of?

PC: *I guess I was wondering whether you looked tired or not.*

LRH: Oh, dear no.

PC: *Getting busy again.*

LRH: Oh, dear. you got a nice big rock slam on it. All right. A civilian. A civilian. A civilian. A civilian.

PC: *Mm?*

LRH: A civilian. A civilian. A civilian. All right. That's in.

Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. That's an interesting latent read. Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. That's in. All right.

A rat. A rat. A rat. A rat. That's in.

All right. How you doing?

PC: *Fine. Goddamnedest collection.*

LRH: Yes, it's quite a collection, isn't it?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Here we go again. Here we go. A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. There's something weird about this polar bear. It reads, and then it rock slams, sort of. A polar bear. A polar bear. Yeah, that's in. Thank you.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: A dog you didn't know was there. A dog. A dog.

All right. Very sporadic read. A dog you didn't know was there. Did you invalidate that?

PC: *Just that I don't like the ones that are long so much.*

LRH: Oh, you trying to get rid of the ones that are long?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Well, thank you for ... [pc laughs]

PC: *They always seem so untidy.*

LRH: Yes. All right.

PC: *Also a long string of overts: I'm always stumbling over dogs that I didn't know were there and treading on their paws and tail.*

LRH: Okay. A dog you didn't know was there. A dog you didn't know was there. A dog you didn't know was there. And that is knocking. Thank you. It's in. All right.

A fairy. Well, I can still get a rack on that.

An elf. An elf. An elf. An elf.

Which would be the most startling, a fairy or an elf?

PC: *I would be more startled by an elf. I would rather expect a fairy. I've always been surprised I haven't seen any this life.*

LRH: Well, they're two different types of surprises.

PC: *A bit.*

LRH: I see. All right. Let's take a look at this. A fairy. A fairy. A fairy. Thank you. That is out.

An elf. An elf. An elf. An elf. An elf. An elf. That is out. Thank you.

All right. This shooting somebody's horse out from under him.

PC: *Yeah, I was wondering what we did with something like that that isn't a terminal. You know, if it stayed in. I was wondering what happened to it.*

LRH: All right. You wondered what had happened to it.

PC: *No, I wondered what would – what you would do with it if it were the last one in on account of it's expressed as a doingness and not as a terminal.*

LRH: Mm. Mm. Well, it's out.

PC: *I know it is. Now I guess I'll never find out what happens unless I have a doingness that stays in.*

LRH: All right. All right. And what's this about cops in your own home, huh?

PC: *Well, that was very simple. That's a "this life" one.*

LRH: Oh, you got an incident that goes with this.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Cops in your own home. You got an incident that goes with this, when you were quite startled.

PC: *Yes. Would you like to hear it? Is that an apropos at the moment?*

LRH: No. I'm not ...

PC: *All right, just ...*

LRH: ... particularly interested about it. But you did, did have one.

PC: *I certainly did. And it was very startling.*

LRH: Oh. All right. Cops in your own home. Thank you. That is out.

PC: *Ha-ha-ha. Goodbye to the Elmhurst police force.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Goodbye to the Elmhurst police force.*

LRH: Right. All right. A prowler. A prowler. A prowler. A prowler. A prowler. Thank you. That is out.

A snake. A snake. A snake. A snake. A snake. All right, he's latent but he's in. Thank you.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Yeah, poor little snakes at the moment. All right. Now, what's this about somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. What is about this? Give me some more data on this.

PC: *It is ... it is startling.*

LRH: Mm. Well, what's

PC: *...[pc laughs] There doesn't seem to be very much more to say about it, you know. I can probably dream something up.*

LRH: All right. But is it startling?

PC: *It certainly is.*

LRH: Mm. Where would this take place?

PC: *I should think a dark alley would be an entirely appropriate spot for this.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *Although it would be more startling if it were sort of an ordinary place. You know, like the hall of a public building or something of the sort.*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *You know.*

LRH: All right. Here we go. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why.

Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why.

Now I'm getting a fall on "Somebody trying to kill you." Somebody trying to kill you. Somebody trying to kill you. Which is it? I'm getting a sporadic fall on one half of it, for some reason or the other.

PC: *I don't see why they both wouldn't read. It seems like a very reasonable thing to have read.*

LRH: Okay. You think – you think that's very reasonable.

PC: *Mm. It seems very reasonable it should react.*

LRH: All right. All right. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. That is in. All right.

A civilian. A civilian. A civilian. Thank you. That is in.

Somebody who drops you. Latent. We will leave it in. All right.

A rat. A rat. A rat. A rat. Thank you. That is out.

All right. We got a few left in here.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Let's chew them up.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: All right. Do you have any ARC breaks? Yeah, what's that? What's the ARC break?

PC: *Nothing in mind. Oh, I guess ... well, I didn't volunteer what I thought the latent was on on being dropped.*

LRH: What was?

PC: *A half a round ago.*

LRH: What was it?

PC: *"Stonewall" Jackson got dropped. And it kept going between "Stonewall" Jackson and babies.*

LRH: Oh, I see. Oh yeah. All right. All right. Here we go.

Got an ARC break? No. Okay. Fine. All right.

A dog you didn't know was there. A dog you didn't know was there. A dog you didn't know was there. All right. That is in. Thank you.

Okay. A snake. A snake. A snake. What's this with the snake?

PC: *Gee, I sure haven't had much this life. I keep expecting to have one turn up in the woods, but they never do.*

LRH: They never do.

PC: *I keep walking around leaves, something – the most reasonable thing on earth that sooner or later I'd step on a snake. But I never do.*

LRH: All right. A snake. A snake. A snake. A snake. Well, that's in. All right. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Thank you. That is in.

A civilian. A civilian. A civilian. A civilian. Thank you. That is in. Okay.

Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Thank you. That is in. Okay.

You know, we've still got this polar bear here.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: What's the matter?

PC: *I don't know. Seems ... It seems very reasonable it should be there, too.*

LRH: All right. Here we go. A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. Well now, he's doing something weird here. A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. Well, he's still in. Okay.

A dog you didn't know was there. A dog you didn't know was there. A dog you didn't know was there. That is out. Thank you.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: It began to fall on a dog you hadn't been introduced to. [pc and auditor laugh]

PC: *Please, yes.*

LRH: All right. Let's see what else we got here. Eh, here we are. A snake. A snake. A snake. And that is in. Thank you.

All right. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. And that is in.

A civilian. A civilian. A civilian. A civilian. A civilian. A civilian.

PC: [pc laughs] *I'm sorry. I feel really silly about ...*

LRH: We will have to assume that that is in. All right. All right.

Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Is this reading on this? All right. Somebody who drops you. Aw, it's still reading on that. Okay. That's in.

And now we are back to our old friend. A polar bear. Well, he isn't rocking. It's not on that.

PC: *I just got the silliest thought. I wonder whether polar bears are civilians or not.*

LRH: Are what?

PC: *I just wondered whether polar bears are civilians.*

LRH: Oh, dear. All right. Well, all right. All right. All right. All right. You got an ARC break? Yeah, what's that?

PC: *I was just wondering whether I had been trying to sell you on civilian because it's so beautifully opposed to officer and I'd like officer to come back in.*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *Perfect pair.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Let the chips fall where they may.*

LRH: All right. A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. All right. He's still with us. All right.

A snake. A snake. A snake. Thank you. That's in.

PC: *Sounds like the bloody Bronx Zoo.*

LRH: All right. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't

know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Suppose I have to pass that one up. Somebody trying to kill you and you don't know why. Yeah. It's latent, sporadic, want me to grind it out?

PC: *I've never been very fond of it. It's one of those wordy ones.*

LRH: All right. I've got a terminal here that's rapping, and I'll just get rid of the rest of these things. I already got a terminal that goes bang, bang, bang. And we're not interested.

PC: *Mm. Will I wait and find out for dessert what it is?*

LRH: You'll get it for dessert. All right. A civilian. A civilian. A civilian. And that is out.

And somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. Somebody who drops you. And that is out.

Well, we still have a polar bear.

PC: *And also a snake, don't we?*

LRH: Mm-hm. Now, you must have been a very good three-card monte player. You can keep them in your ... All right. Here we go. Got an ARC break?

PC: *Wrong card game. The only card game I like is five-card stud.*

LRH: Okay. A polar bear. Oh, he is leaving these parts, man. He is not there very much. We'll try and keep him around for a pet. We got it here. We got it here. He's an instantaneous reading ... leaving. A snake. A snake. A snake. Now, what have you just invalidated?

PC: *I'm wondering about the Brothers of the Snake, but I've never been passionately fond of or passionately afraid of snakes. I'm more neutral to them than most people.*

LRH: All right. All right. You got an ARC break?

PC: *No, I'm baffled.*

LRH: About what?

PC: *I don't quite see where it fits. I mean, I know how a snake is startling*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *But that it's very significant surprises me.*

LRH: All right. All right. You got an ARC break? Have you invalidated anything? All right. Thank you. A snake. A snake. A snake. A snake. Every time that ...

PC: *Is that right!*

LRH: But we will check him against a polar bear.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: We have actually had an item. But we still got an item registering here. A polar bear. Sporadically. A polar bear. We still got a polar bear. Still got a polar bear. He's in.

A snake. A snake. A snake. And he's in.

A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear.

A snake. A snake. A snake. All right.

Which is the most startling, polar bear or a snake?

PC: *I think a polar bear, sometimes. You know, they're bigger, and you're going to bump into them suddenly in the dark. My God ! It's startling*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But then I'm prejudiced. I like polar bears better than snakes. They make more sense to me.*

LRH: I see. I see.

PC: *But I have no idea whether that has anything to do with it. The fact that I dislike the other more might be more pertinent.*

LRH: Mm. All right. Well, you like ... dislike snakes more.

PC: *I wouldn't care to be closely associated one way or another, you know. I don't mind being neutral about them. I have an open mind on the subject.*

LRH: All right. All right. Let's check her out here again. Not that we're checking out at this time.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: A polar bear. Okay. A snake. A snake. A snake. Man, we've got both of these.

PC: *You know, I'm just wondering if there's one missing ...*

LRH: Such as?

PC: *... which I didn't have down. Just a horse.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *A horse can do some awful goddamned startling things sometimes.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *A lot of the time they don't, you know.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *But I won't say I haven't been awful startled by them at one time or another.*

LRH: All right. All right. We'll check him out. A horse. A horse. A horse. And we will cross him out.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: A polar bear. A polar bear. A polar bear. And he is out.

Now, would you tell me what a horse has in common with a polar bear?

PC: *A horse? Fur.*

LRH: You just discharged something here.

PC: *Oh. All right.*

LRH: All right. Here we go. Let's see what we got here now. A snake. Hey, you got an ARC break? Yes.

PC: *Well, just the thing, you know, one doesn't ... I mean, the Brothers of the Snake, all these weird snake priestesses and things. One doesn't ... I don't quite ... I don't quite see where this fits, and it's something I would rather not have too closely associated with me. But if it is, it is.*

LRH: Yes, go on. Would it be more gentlemanly to have ... [pc laughs]

PC: *Much more gentlemanly.*

LRH: Okay. All right. All right. You got an ARC break? All right. Fine.

A snake. A snake. A snake. You got another invalidation on him? Yes, what is it? What's the invalidation on a snake?

PC: *Just sort of ...*

LRH: In this session have you invalidated this snake? Bang.

PC: *Sort of like trying to make other ones more interesting and sort of hoping they would stay in more.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *I know every time it came around, I was sort of hoping it would go away.*

LRH: All right. All right. All right. A snake. A snake. A snake. All right. Is there another invalidation on a snake?

PC: *Well, mostly it's a feeling that anybody who knew that was it would get the wrong idea about me.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *I'm not tremendously afraid of ... and I'm not sort of vvvvvvv! about the subject so far as I know, you know?*

LRH: Yeah ... Yeah.

PC: *They are snakes.*

LRH: Yeah. Okay. Well, that's what we've got left.

PC: *Mm. We have a ...*

LRH: We're going to check this item out.

PC: *Fine.*

LRH: But we don't intend to tonight.

PC: *Very well.*

LRH: But that is what we got left.

PC: *They're certainly startling at times. I'll not deny that.*

LRH: That's right. I get a nice regular bang on it. So we will check this some other time. All right?

PC: *Very well.*

LRH: Okay. Now, as far as end rudiments are concerned, we're overtime here.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: And so forth, and I know you of old. Would you ... And I'm going to ask you, do you have an ARC break in this session? Good. Have you withheld anything in this session? Thank you. All right. All right. Should I have found out something in this session that I didn't find out. What's that?

PC: *I guess maybe an explanation of what does a snake have to do with me. There's kind of a gap there, you know. There it is. And what's it got to do with me? I don't know.*

LRH: All right. All right. All right. Get it. Is there something else I should have found out? Thank you. Thank you very much. All right. Now, give the cans a squeeze.

PC: *Yeah. I didn't quite have a normal grip on them then when I squeezed them.*

LRH: All right. Squeeze them again. That's fine. That's fine. All right. How do you feel?

PC: *I feel rather good. A little pressed in on. A lot of this stuff, you know, kind of scrunched masses in.*

LRH: Mm. Mm. Understandable.

PC: *I mean, don't hurt or anything ...*

LRH: All right. Now how do you feel about your goals for this session?

PC: *Well, we got one.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *Which is, I mean, was a ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Oh, and, oh yes, we were marvellous on rudiments.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *We were marvellous on rudiments.*

LRH: Mm. Mm. Mm. We got that one.

PC: *I had some other one, it seems to me, but I can't ...*

LRH: Not to get carried away with entertaining the students.

PC: *Yes, I don't think I did.*

LRH: No? All right. Did you make that one?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. That-a-girl. All right. Now, is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session? Yes. What?

PC: *I'm glad I got picked.*

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

PC: *It is.*

LRH: All right. Here it is. End of session. Has this session ended for you?

PC: *Yes. Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Tell me I'm not now auditing you.

PC: *You're not now auditing me.*

LRH: Thank you. Very good.

OBJECT OF PREPCHECKING

A lecture given on 21 March 1962

How you doing tonight?

Audience: Good. All right. Okay.

All right.

Male voice: How you doing?

Bad.

Okay. This is the vernal equinox of AD 12. March the 21st for those who are un-Chaldean. If you've never had a past life in Chaldea, it's March the 21st. And if you've never had a past life in England ... You ever had a past life in England?

Audience: Yes.

Every time an American goes down to the Tower to sightsee, I always like to see them as they come out. They're always going like this, you know. [laughter]

I never knew they had that many executioners at the Tower. [laughter, laughs]

Okay. Now, you saw a demonstration last night. I'll make a comment on that before we get into the lecture. That was a very neat demonstration. Very neat. You saw the pc trying to give me a lose. [laughter] I – didn't even faze me, you know. That was fine. And I think the class thanks you, too. We're going to find the other item you wanted.

But let me call to your attention a phenomenon which is very interesting here. And if you don't mind my making a comment, it's just that a pc's attention on the Goals Problem Mass can become so tied up and so concentrated on some portion of the Goals Problem Mass that they don't recognize that it has forty or fifty combinations in it.

And trying to get the pc's attention off of the last combination you found and on to the next combination you found, sometimes has to be done with building jacks. And you saw that particular phenomenon. The pc did not like letting go of some units that belonged to the last part of the GPM we found. Don't you see?

Well remember, this is a characteristic of the GPM. It's areas of stuck attention upon identities. And the pc ordinarily runs through this cycle: They didn't want it, and then they think it's fine. See? Now, they're sometimes thunderstruck and delighted with the horror of it all, but it takes them a little time for their attention to settle down into these. But sometimes some items you get are hotter than others. Sometimes they explain more to the pc than others. But you have a tremendous number of items before you get down to the middle of the Goals Problem Mass. And that, of course, is the last one – the last ones that the pc finds.

And they will be twenty or thirty combinations deep. You see, 3D Criss Cross bypasses and cuts through the running of items and it simply goes on selecting items, finding items; and by the process of finding them, getting the bank down to the point of what's holding the bank together.

And that is a rather difficult proposition because it's sometimes almost over the pc's dead body. You see? In fact, I would go so far as to say it is over his last few hundred thousand dead bodies. [laughter, laughs]

Fortunately, there are only a few of these items which are remarkable. The pc has probably been, in actuality, any item he has – he ever puts on a list. Do you realize that? We're only trying to find the items he's stuck with. And by the fact of listing, you get rid of fifty or a hundred items at a crack, you see. Because they key out easily. But then you get the one that doesn't key out. Well, that's the Goals Problem Mass item, see? All these others are simply locks on that. Now, of course, what's holding the one in that's going tick-tick-tick-tick consistently? Well, that'll be a deeper, more basic combination.

So you can go elsewhere in the Goals Problem Mass, and you pull out a few more pins and hinges, and don't be too surprised if items that checked out, when you go to run them, haven't got a twitch in them. See?

Don't be too surprised. They're not going to go on ticking forever. Some of them are. Only when you run the central package are you going to get rid of some of them. But the most horrifying ones that the pc finds early on are liable to blow as locks. Oh, man, they really explain his whole case and he's right there, and everything is fine, and the masses move around, and the chills turn on; and if you were to run them, they would run quite satisfactorily.

And then you move on a little bit deeper in the case and these others cease to be that important. And you go on deeper, and you get these earlier items that were so important, deintensifying as importance.

But it's an interesting thing that the reason an auditor trying to do Routine 3 was trying to do it and failing so often, and that it was so difficult to do – sometimes getting thirteen-hundred goals and things of this character, you know – was because Routine 3 is a much better – in terms of quality but not in terms of length of time of running or accuracy or easy on the pc, and it certainly guarantees no accuracy. If you can't supervise the auditing and cross-check it and get the rudiments checked, and oh, my. It's a very difficult and complicated action to get a Routine 3 goal and then get its terminal.

But what do you know. If you get a Routine 3 goal that is really a goal and sticks there, and then the terminal and it really sticks there; do you know that after you've run or found ten or twelve items of Routine 3D Criss Cross, that you'll start colliding with the original Routine 3 package? That was how deep Routine 3 went into the bank.

In other words, Routine 3, if it could be done, was a very accurate method and reached very deeply into the Goals Problem Mass and reached very significantly deeply into the case.

Well, Routine 3D Criss Cross exists because auditors found this very hard to do, and if it was done inaccurately, it was absolute suicide for the pc to run it. It was deadly. It was

worse than taking arsenic. You get the wrong terminal, man, oh, wow! And then run it. *Wooh!*

Well, in Routine 3D Criss Cross, you can sort it out and sort it out. What I did actually – I won't go into detail because this isn't a lecture on this subject – but I just found about forty doors where we only had one door. There were several reasons – as you can learn in earlier lectures – there were several reasons why we stopped doing Routine 3. And Routine 3D Criss Cross, of course, keeps affording all these doors. I don't wish to discourage your accuracy, but frankly, if you're only indifferently accurate, why, you will eventually wind up in the middle of the Goals Problem Mass by just the law of averages, see.

And when you really got it all the way down, of course, it'll run like a startled deer and everything is fine, you see? It's a much handier one to use, much better to use and the pc shows continuous progress all the way through running it.

They're a bit different, they – but they oddly enough wound up with the same goal. I merely wanted to make this comment on old Routine 3. It was auditor accuracy or inaccuracy that defeated it, rather than it wasn't arriving. Because, man, that really "arrove" when it "arrove"!

Okay. So you take somebody who was done on Routine 3, and then you take Routine 3D Criss Cross, and they're always just a little bit dissatisfied with some of their items coming up. They haven't quite got the punch that their original Routine 3 package had. And that was to some degree what you were looking at last night in that session because, of course, we were in contest with a Routine 3 item which is much more fundamental on the case than the item we found, don't you see?

But by finding more and more items, we will eventually find one which is much more fundamental than the Routine 3 item that we found. We'll go that much further. See, just as in Routine 3, you had to do another assessment, you know, and find more items. Well, Routine 3D Criss Cross, you just keep on finding items, of course, and you get much more fundamental items than the original Routine 3 item just as you did in Routine 3. Okay? Help you to understand that?

I know you probably disagreed, most of you, with my meter reading. [laughter] But did you – I want to make a comment on that: If you'll watch me reading meters, you should be – notice one thing – that I'm not reading a meter on the basis of a bulletin. I'm being very careful of the pc. Have you noticed that?

Audience: Yes. Um-hm.

I'm very, very careful of the pc. And you should notice, too, that on a Routine 3D Criss Cross set of rudiments, and so on, I'm only looking for the instantaneous read. And if I don't get an instantaneous read on that rudiment, I don't fool with it. That's mostly for the newcomers. Yeah, don't fool with it, man. Because when you're doing Routine 3D Criss Cross, you're supposed to be doing Routine 3D Criss Cross. You're not supposed to be straightening out withholds and everything else.

Now, a way to defeat auditing is while doing a Routine 3D Criss Cross session, do nothing but prepcheck under the guise of getting in the rudiments. See? And then the other

way to defeat it, which is what we get to tonight's lecture is, when doing Prepchecking, don't ever find any withholds.

Now, if you can just manage this, nothing will happen with the pc. And nothing will ever be revealed. But if you – just as a further comment on that session – you should notice that I just don't take any chances with the pc from the standpoint of meter reading. If it *bings* 1 and 3, why I leave it in. And if I've got a question about it, I'm not so tied to the ritual that I don't find out whether or not it's still in or not. I go on and find out if it's in. You notice that? And you notice when we really found the item itself, it was going *pop-pop-pop*. This is nice. Wasn't that – wasn't that beautiful? *Pop-pop-pop*. And the pc saying, "Well, I don't know. It doesn't have anything to do with me, and so forth." *Pop-pop-pop*. Nothing else around there was going *pop-pop-pop*. Well, remember the horse came up and knocked out the griz – the polar bear. Thought that was interesting. We had a rock slam on polar bear up to the moment the horse came up.

Pc said, "I think there's another item. It's a horse."

Fine. That was the end of the polar bear. [laughter]

And it's just puzzled me ever since. The dramatic scene which I can pick up about horses and polar bears. [laughter] They don't quite mix up, you know. But anyway, that was the way it went.

All right. Enough of that.

This in essence is a lecture on... I could be very smoothly – and finish this off, you see, as a lecture on Goals Problem Mass, you see, and then do the other one on Prepchecking. But my mind right now is on you and the sins and crimes which you were committing under the heading of Prepchecking and I want to set you right in a hurry. So this is actually a lecture about Prepchecking, and I want to give you some data on the subject of Prepchecking which you probably do not have yet.

And one is: the object of Prepchecking is to find chains of withholds and release them on the pc's case. Now, I want you to get that datum, and so on. I don't think it's been in any bulletins or anything. I probably omitted giving you this datum. But the object of Prepchecking, you see, is to find chains of withholds and relieve them on the pc's case, you see. You got that? You got that? It's a new datum. A new datum.

Because when I look over your What questions or when I looked them over last night, after the air was no longer blue, I sat there and held my head in my hands for a few minutes, sighed deeply, and then threw it all overboard and audited Herbie. [laughter] That was after the session, you see. That was a good session. You missed the real good session last night. [laughter, laughs] That was the good one.

Anyhow, the datum which you're missing about Prepchecking is that you don't ask a What question until you have a specific withhold delivered into your lap by the pc. Your What questions are all your Zero A questions. Now, the way you're Prepchecking is your What questions – what you're listing as What questions – are actually Zero A questions or Zero B questions.

And in any folder I picked up last night, I did not find a single What question. I found nothing but Zero A – Zero B questions. Isn't that interesting?

And on a little further inquiry, I understood what was wrong, and that is: you're not waiting till you get a crashing, smashing, nice withhold right on the button before you ask the What question. Now, the Zero A – the Zero question gives you a huge generality. Your Zero A, why, it gives you slightly less generality. You could have a Zero B that gave you a little less generality, but I'll give you an example:

"I says to this girl once, I says – I says, 'I don't think you're beautiful,' so I've damaged the beauty of women and so on. And I think I did that, and so forth."

"All right. Well, what about damaging the beauty of women?"

Well, we probably don't even look at that first withhold he just gave us anymore, but go racing and call that a What question. "What about damaging the beauty of women?"

"1." With great triumph, you see, the auditor puts down, "1. What about damaging the beauty of women?" Oh, thank you.

No, no, that's a Zero question. A Zero A or a Zero B, don't you see?

Now from that, you get this generality. Let me give you a better example, more definite.

Well, the fellow says, "I've often disconcerted women." See? "I've often disconcerted women."

And the auditor hastily puts down, "1. What about disconcerting women?" See, these are all wrong ways of doing it.

"Well, I just did. I just disconcerted them, I did."

"That's good. Oh, you disconcerted them, huh?"

"Yeah."

"Well, all right. That's fine. When did you disconcert them?"

"Oh, the last few lifetimes."

"All right. That's good. Think that's flat now? All right. That's fine. That's null."

It isn't registering anymore. Wasn't registering in the first place. So we finally cleaned up that withhold, didn't we. *Heh-heh-heh*.

Well, now, I just wish to tell you: that is wrong. And I wish to plead with you, plead with you, to see the error of your ways and repent because the kingdom of heaven is not at hand for any pc that you do that to.

You haven't even really gone so far as to miss a withhold. [laughter] And you know, I think that's wading pretty shallow in the pc's bank. Now, let me show you this.

Through chitter-chatter, metering, analysis, assessment – anything of that sort; through anything of that kind – we find out that this person has been making a habit of disconcerting women. So that's a Zero A. "What about hating sex?" was the Zero from which we came out,

or something of this sort. Or "What about sex?" or "Why haven't you liked sex?" Well, we don't care what it is, but it had something to do with a *whole* dynamic, you know. And we pulled it down to the fact that he was disconcerting women. Well, that is just a Zero A. And you're going to have lots of those, and you could put that down by any way that you arrived at it; we don't care.

You can go ahead and do it just the way you've been doing it, but don't think you're yet into withholds of the bank. You're *not*. See, you're just at some high generality of some kind or another.

Because what you've got to do now is go ahead and get the pc into a specific overt: a specific, clawing, screaming, acting overt. Not a "I thought an unkind thought about God." No, we don't buy this sort of thing. No. Disconcerting women. All right. You've got to go at it this way.

This is not a What question even though it begins with what. "What's this – what's this about disconcerting women? You ever disconcert one?"

And the pc says, "Oh, I don't know. Lots of them, you know. I, just – thousands of them. And so on, over, the last few lifetimes, I've been disconcerting an awful lot of women, as a matter of fact."

And you say, "Well, good. Well, just – just one, just one now, just one, see, one – one time when you did."

"Oh, well, one time when I did it. There's lots of times when I did it, you see."

"That's fine. Yeah. Good. Well, just – just one time. Just how – well, how would you go about con – disconcerting one?"

"Oh, I don't know, scratching her eyes out or something like that." And so on.

"Oh, really?"

Now, you see now, there you'd go with a wrong What, you see? "Oh, well, this person, you see ..." You've got a suspicious What, you know. You've got just a suspicion there might be a What there, so you say, "What about scratching women's eyes?" You know, just because you've had tick on it. Oh, no, no, no, no. Lay off of it. Just – just put your paper aside until you've done some work! Then, then you can write it all up and brag to me about how good you are at this sort of thing, but only after you've done it, you see. Your paper – you haven't got anything to do with your paper or anything. You're just – you and the pc. We don't even really care whether we're doing too much with the meter at this stage, you know.

And he says, "Well, oh, well, that's just metaphorically speaking. I, as a matter of fact, probably never have scratched any, any women's eyes. That's just, you know, you know, that's the old cliché, 'Scratch your eyes out.' I could scratch her eyes out. I suppose I've said that a time or two. Or women have said it to me, and so forth."

You just leave that paper alone and leave your ballpoint alone. Don't come in close to this now. You haven't got a What question yet. You understand me now? And we finally say, "Well, now, scratching women's eyes," and it goes *clang*, you see. You say, "Any time when you have ever done this? Any time when you have ever done this?"

"Well, I've – some past lives somewhere."

"No. Now, any time you've ever done this? You know, scratching women's eyes. Any time you ever really have done that?"

"No. Well, I hit a women – I hit a woman in the eye once. I – I *hit* her in the eye."

"All right."

See, you weren't quite on, see, you weren't quite on with scratching eyes out or something like that. But *hitting* a woman in the eye. *Ah, ha-ha*, that was something else, see?

And you can still make a little notation. Well, if you're going to make any notations or you can't remember it, put it over here in the margin someplace that you did get a reaction on scratching eyes, but the only overt you can find on this, to which the pc will stand up before the judge and plead guilty, is: "punching a woman in the eye." But we want to find out if he can remember it and if it happened, and so forth.

So he finally said, "Well, yes, she was instructing in the Academy, and I punched her in the eye, and that's – that's right. That's right."

Now, "What about punching a woman in the eye?" *Now* you have your What question, and you write it down there: "1. What about punching women in the eye?" Which – which is probably the best phrasing for it, see. You're going to get a knock on that, too.

Now, you want to know *when* it was, and you want to know if that's *all*, and you want to know if – what might have *appeared* at that moment. (Your new 4.)

You want to know who didn't find out about it, who failed to discover it, so forth, who he was hiding it from. Any way you want to phrase it, and so forth. And then you ask him when was it. This thing is knocking like mad, you see. It's taming down now. And was that *all* of it? And what *didn't* appear at the time, see? Run your plus and minus "is-not-is," see. What didn't appear at the time? And then who failed to find out about it? And so on and ...

You know, this thing isn't cooling off worth a nickel. Now, this is how you *tell*, see. This thing is just not cooling off. Well, there's several ways to handle it. The more – most accusative way and probably the most needless, early on, is to find out if the pc is telling you a half-truth or an untruth about the thing. But that's relatively needless.

No, look. The anatomy of change demonstrates that if that thing didn't cool off on a couple of rounds of When, All, Appear, Who, *he has done it before*.

Now, get the idea of dramatization and habit pattern. If last year somebody socked a woman in the eye, you can absolutely guarantee that year before last he socked a woman in the eye. And you can also guarantee that it'll go clean back to kindygarten, because that's what you do. You see? That's natural and normal. And that's why that withhold won't free.

And now, you just put your *ballpoint* aside and leave your auditor's report over there as far as any What questions are concerned. You can put down all of your tone arm reads and your times and so forth, but don't you do anything to that "1" question, because you *haven't run it yet*.

You found one withhold before you got it, see. You found one overt and a withhold right there, bang. Now you're going to ask for an *earlier* one. Now, that's the magic word. You want an *earlier* incident when he socked a woman in the eye. And you're going to run that one back, and you're going to find that there's an *earlier* one, and so forth.

And he says, "Well, no. I really never socked a woman in the eye" – the needle is falling off the pin – "but I kicked one in the shins once."

Now, I will permit you at that time to pick up your overt, and if it's not working very well – ballpoint pens and overts. Have you noticed that they don't write on greasy auditor's reports and so forth? They're always letting you down.

So you can go over here on the margin and you can write "Kick woman in shin." Understand? "Kick woman in shin." You can write that down here over in the margin someplace. We don't care where you wrote it. It's just a notation to you. It has nothing to do with your Withhold System, because that's a Q and A to leave that What question you got because, look, you didn't *free* it. And I guarantee to you ladies and gentlemen, that if it falls on, "Hitting a woman in the eye," and you can't free it by finding, "1. Sock a woman in the eye," there is an earlier one last year when he socked a woman in the eye, and there's one earlier than that when he socked a woman in the eye. You got the idea?

And I don't care if there were five hundred and seventy-five times when he socked a woman in the eye, you're going to run them all under that What question. You're not going to put it down – any more Whats. You're going to run a whole chain, and that chain is going to consist of a hundred percent doing just exactly what you put down, which described a specific overt – on the ... Because look, if it only happened that once in this lifetime, it will *free* on two runs around. And if it doesn't free on two runs around of the "When, All, Appear, Who" – if it doesn't free – you got an earlier incident on the chain which is *exactly* the same incident. It's not some other incident. It's not kicking somebody in the shins, it's bopping somebody in the eye. That's all there is to it, see. And nothing more to it than that. You've just got to find that earlier one.

Now, true enough, pcs can all be mixed up and they try to get off this, and they try to get off that and they dodge this, but you actually can stand in there because every time you run a "When, All, Appear, Who," you've shaken up that chain a little bit and he can remember earlier, you see? And he all of a sudden will give you an earlier one and he'll give you an earlier one – that's all on the same What. See? He'll give you an earlier one, "pop a woman in the eye," earlier "pop a woman in the eye," earlier "pop a woman in the eye," earlier ... And we find this one in kindygarten. He forgot all about it.

What you haven't learned is that a chain can't stand there in any one lifetime unless it has a hidden beginning. And it will wash out at once on your "When, All, Appear, Who," if it has no hidden beginning. It'll wash!

You ask him, "When was that? Is that all there is to it? What might have appeared then? Who didn't find out about it? What about popping a woman in the eye?" That's your test question. You don't get a quiver. There was only one incident; there is no chain. You get a quiver, you don't get a substantial reduction of that needle read, *ah-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha*, you've got an earlier incident. And that earlier incident is going to be part of a chain which

has its anchor point in the hidden unknown of his forgetfulness. Actually, not really out of this lifetime. And that's the only reason it's stuck!

Now, please get the anatomy of how a chain becomes a chain and how it gets stuck in the mind and how it gets charged up. And that is *because the first part of the chain is suppressed and forgotten*. It is totally out of view and therefore you get a chain. And you don't have a chain that will react consistently or go on reacting, unless it's a repetitive series of incidents which have the first incident this lifetime out of view. And *that makes a chain!* And nothing will hang up as a chain unless that is its anatomy.

Don't look at it in reverse. See, you're not putting these engrams in the pc's mind. You might think you are sometimes but you're not. He's done these things. And it's that earliest lineup that is missing. And if you're really running hot as a prepchecker, you're running on actual incidents only. Generalities, never! And you're running back down the same chain of the same dramatization, because remember, that dramatization, if only done once, will wash.

My God, you've just taken an eight-gauge shotgun and an eighty-eight-millimeter anti-tank cannon – put it up against its temples and blown its brains out. I mean, this is no light thing you're doing to this withhold, you see.

Well, do you realize that major engrams will key out on the early track by just finding exactly when they occurred? Fellow blew up a planet and right afterwards they put him in a box and squashed him slowly, and then they held him in a trap for a thousand years and... Do you know that on lots of cases you find this engram, you see, and you say, "When did it happen?" And you date it down to eight trillion, seven hundred and sixty-five million, nine hundred and fifty-five – you know – *zzaa-zzaa*, at two o'clock in the afternoon. And all of a sudden goes *phssst*.

So you're not doing any light thing when you're asking "When." And then you are asking him to confide in you, *all* of it, you see. That gets any hidden scraps out of the incident itself, and "Appear," well, and "Not Appear," that's going to get the suppressor out of the incident, too. And "Who didn't find out about it," and you can do a – you know, you can do a whole Sec Check on "not-know"! You know, "not-know" is one of the most powerful Sec Check weapons there ever was because it's the whole constituency of individuation. This fellow knows about it and the rest of the human race doesn't – you've got a disagreement on the subject of knowingness.

Now, two or three of these – any one of them – well, if you said all about it and then ran it as an engram a few times, it would erase. So any one of these things in the past – any one of that four has been powerful enough to take care of major incidents.

And you're leveling all of this, for God's sakes against one little, tiny pebble that's sitting there, you know. Thing is totally capable of sweeping a whole mountain away, you see? So you take this little pebble and you put it up there, and you range the eight thousand-ton gravel crusher above it, you see. And then you put fifteen, twenty sticks of dynamite underneath the thing, saturate it completely in nitroglycerine, you know, wire it up to electrocute it and then charge it with treason so it can be hung, drawn and quartered. And you go back over and you push the master button and there's a large explosion of one kind or another – it's gone.

You're using all the weapons necessary to shoot down a B-52 to hit a baby sparrow. And there it is. And look, ladies and gentlemen, if it only happened once, one pass through will find no charge on it. But if it happened before, *ah-ha*, we've got an earlier withhold. That's the only thing that can keep that thing reacting. So we get the earlier withhold. And we get the earlier withhold, and we get the earlier withhold. Well, if it's this much of a chain, it must have its tail – like a scorpion's tail – well hooked into the root in the sand. You see?

And the fellow says, "I don't know."

This is typical of your recurring withholds.

Every time this fellow sits down, he says, "Well, I had a – an unkind thought about Ron," see?

And he goes to the next auditor, "Had an unkind thought about Ron," you know.

Next auditor, gets off this withhold, "Had an unkind thought about Ron, you know."

Next auditor, "Had an unkind thought about Ron."

Sooner or later, somebody ought to get the idea that he must have done something to Ron at some time or another. Somebody might get that idea. See? And say, "What have you done to Ron?"

And then he – then he'd say, "Well, I didn't answer a despatch he sent me once."

And you say, "Well, fine. That's good. That's good. That's good. That's fine. What about not answering despatches from Ron?" That auditor was working hard, wasn't he? You could just see the sweat pouring off him. [laughter]

Now, let's not wade so shallowly. Let's find out some blood. And oddly enough, if you search hard for blood – this is another mechanism you should appreciate – if you search very hard for blood and you want to know about this, and so forth; the tiniest "what the pc has done" very often explodes in the face of he didn't do anything like that, you know. I have sat and asked a pc samples just to give them a horrible comparison, see.

Pc's saying, "Well, I ..."

Keep getting a fall on women, see. I'm trying to find out what he's done to a woman or something of this sort, you know. Anything, but I've got to have a specific one.

"Well, have you knifed any women? Have you strangled any for just kicks? Have you thrown any bodies in culverts? Have you stood by and seen a woman raped by four or five people?"

And the pc's going, "Oh-oh, n-n-nothing, nothing, nothing, nothing like th-th-tha-a-a-a-t. I lied about one once, and she got, got a divorce as a consequence. That's all."

"Oh," you say, "well, thank you. Now, let's see. When was that?"

In other words, we scare it out by order of noncomparable magnitude. [laughter, laughs] Blood running all over the place. You see. And the pc surrenders. Begins to look like a mighty small thing he's done there by comparable magnitude. Get the trick?

Audience: Yes.

So anyhow, if you're going to get a chain, the chain is all the same action and that is what a chain consists of. And a chain is not a similar generality; a chain is a similar action. In fact, it's not really similar. It's an identical action. And that's what makes it a chain.

There's a chain of scratching your head on the left side, and there's another chain of scratching your head on the right side. You get the idea? See?

And on some bruisers, there's a chain of kicking women in the left shin and a chain of kicking them in the right shin, you see? But ordinarily, we will simply accept "kicking a woman in the shin" as a chain.

And if you find one incident of kicking them in the shin, if there's a lot of earlier overts on the same woman, you'll have a little difficulty erasing it. The kick – the incident of kicking them in the shin – unless you go and Q-and-A with it and get off into Robin Hood's left field and forget to pay the rent, and so forth – just kicking them in the shin is going to desensitize. But that woman's name is not going to desensitize. See? Or beating her up isn't going to desensitize or something like that, but kicking in the shins, you're going to lose that.

All right. Now, after we've gotten all of the chain up, and we've gotten finally his sitting astride the little girl in kindergarten and pounding her repeatedly in the left eye – after we got this one up, which he had totally forgotten about – you'll find that that whole chain of hitting the women – woman in the eye is now gone and will erase clear to present time, because it's identical actions.

And then the pc is feeling so good, and he's all straight, and he's – everything is fine, and way back here, you found "kicking a woman in the shin." And you didn't take it up.

You then say, "What about kicking a woman in the shin, now?" See, he's all – everything's erased, you've got it all fine, and he's all straight, and he knows he's leveled with you, and will never have to take up being brutal to the female sex again, and you haul up this dead rat.

"So what – what about – what about kicking a woman in the shins?"

"Well, there was such an incident."

"All right. Well, all right. Give. Give." See, you're trying to make sure. You're not writing anything down yet. You're trying to make sure that there is an actual incident.

"Well I, 19 – 1952. Well, Josie Ann Marie. I kicked her in the shins, all right."

"Good. Now, what about kicking women in the shins?" See, there's a What question.

You haven't changed your Zero A, and you've gotten rid of that first What question, see? Now, you're going to find out they not only kicked Josie Ann Marie in the shins in 1952, but there's some earlier instance of this thing occurring and you're going to get a whole chain going on this thing. But, if this thing fell and then you ran your "When, All, Apppear, Who," questions, and asked the question again and it's gone, there's nothing earlier. There's nothing earlier.

You can take a little chapter out of my book and be very careful and ask that What question before you leave it, ask if *nyah-yah* and then ask if you've missed a withhold on the pc; and then don't buy anything he gives you because you're prepchecking him.

And they say, "Well, yeah, you – you – you missed the fact that I – I beat up my mother. *Ha-ha-ha-ha.*" Well, you don't sail in on this. You're trying to clear up this other chain.

You say, "All right. Well, do I know about it now? That's fine. Thank you very much. All right. Now, kicking woman in the shins. All right. That's very good. All right. Got that settled. All right. *N-U-L*, null, *L*. Now, is there an actual incident of your beating up a mother? I mean, you – you did beat up your mother?"

"Well, I think I did."

Keep that ballpoint off the paper, man. Get an idea of an electric shield getting in between that paper and the ballpoint. Don't you write any What question.

"Well, I actually didn't beat her up. She beat me up."

Ah, that's getting to be an awful sure sign, isn't it. *Ho-ho-ho*. Oh well, all right. We don't do anything with that yet. We don't write a word yet.

And you say, "You did beat up your mother? Well, how old were you?"

"About seven."

"All right. You did beat her up?"

"*Yup.*" *Clang*, you see.

"Well, what about beating up your mother?" *Heh-heh*. See, write your What question and you'll get a nice chain of it. Last time he beat her up, she was seventy-two... [laughs]

You can run a whole flock of withholds off that What. And I don't care what you write in to refresh your memory or keep yourself picked up, but look over your Prepchecking questions. And I look over this "I disconcerted my mother," not as a What question, if you please; if you please.

This – didn't have any incident. You see, it's only after you've got blood that you go down to the "1" question. There's already blood dripping on the floor at the moment when you go into that.

Until that happens, you're in the broad generalities of Zeros. And you can just call Zeros the world of generality. And I don't care how many Zero As, Zero Bs, Zero Cs, Zero Ds – I don't care how many Zeros you've got sitting up there. You're in the world of generalities. You have not yet found an incident. You're still in the field of assessment. You're still in the field of grope. I don't care what you write up there particularly.

But before you *leave* that area, may I please lay down the law on the subject of, "Don't you *dare* ever write a What question until you have an actual incident of the pc doing something. And don't ever leave that type of incident until it's freed up." And then you'll stop missing withholds and you'll get the benefit out of Prepchecking.

But you keep wading around in that little duck pond that you think is the pc's reactive bank, you see – here's this little duck pond up here on the beach, and you're going around there, and it's just damp on the bottom, you know, it wouldn't even support a goldfish. And you're wading around there very carefully, and you're being very happy because you found a leaf floating in it, you see.

I ask you to look over your shoulder because as you're wading around in this duck pond, that roaring, screaming, typhoon-ridden, surging, limitless ocean, that is just behind you, is the reactive bank you should be swimming around in. And I will state that it sometimes looks like that to you, and you think you'd better not go swimming under those conditions.

Sharks darting up in all directions, you see. Typhoons and waterspouts coming in from every horizon, you see. Wreckage strewn about, dead bodies, half-eaten women, you know. The thing is untidy. And you say, "Well, I shouldn't be swimming in there. My mother wouldn't like it." [laughter]

Now, if you're going to get the full benefits out of Prepchecking, why, you're going to find something the pc did, and then you're going to write a What question based on that something he did. And then you're going to clean up that whole chain before you leave that.

Now, this is sometimes hard to do and sometimes your luck is out. Now, I will add this: sometimes you're just – your luck is out.

You hit a chain just like you used to sometimes hit an engram that wouldn't erase. You will sometimes hit a chain that just seems to go forever and disappears into the Stygian deep of past lives and it just goes forever. Unfortunately, you probably have hit something related to the Goals Problem Mass, and it's just going to go forever. But that's no excuse not to run it because you could still run it all the way, but you might find yourself prepchecking the same question for three or four sessions.

And sometimes your pc throws you an awful red herring. Now, this is the other lesson I must teach you. The pc goes into control of the session with present time problems and missed withholdings and things of this character in the beginning rudiments. And you've got a nice chain running, of some kind, from yesterday's session. You walk into today's session and here are all these damned red fish lying all over the ground.

And you try to get into the Prepcheck session, and you can't because you keep slipping on these kippered herrings, see. So, you try to clean up the present time problem or the missed withhold or something of the sort and you find yourself on an entirely new chain that had nothing to do with yesterday's session.

All right. Tomorrow, you come in – it's now tomorrow. And you come in and you want to get this question – day before yesterday's question and yesterday's question flat – and so you go into the rudiments on this third day and the pc has an entirely different missed withhold or a present time problem and you find yourself now on a third chain.

Now, the fourth day of the week comes around and you try to get into it and the pc has a present time problem about something else. You now have four chains alive. Nothing is settled. And on the fifth day, of course, either you or the pc blow out your brains.

You see how the pc moves into control of what is being run. A pc almost does this knowingly. See? He's just gotten up to the point where he has to confess that he went to Leavenworth for five years for stealing automobiles, you know. He's almost there, you know.

And he says, "If this just goes any further, this one question that we keep running here about, 'Have you ever stolen anything,' goes any further, we'll – we'll get into that area."

He says this reactively. He hardly says it actively at all, see. He has a present time problem. *Ha-ha*. Has a present time – best thing to do then is have a present time problem about your wife, isn't it? *Ha-ha*. Nice and distant from the subject. It's a way to miss withholds, isn't it? And it's also a way to steer checking.

Now listen, aside from the fact that you must keep up – your pc has to be in-session, you do a minimal in-sessionness. You do a minimal requirement here of the rudiments. And if it looks like these rudiments are going to throw you over into the next county and on to a new chain and you've got to finish up yesterday's chain, and that sort of thing – you know somebody saw me do it in a demonstration one day.

"Do you have a present time problem?" *Clang!* Instant read, see. "All right. What's that?"

"Well, my girlfriend left me last night."

We're prepchecking "making saddles," see. "My girl left me last night."

We'll say, "Good. Do you have a present time problem?" It goes *clang!*

And you say, "Well, what's that?"

"Well, it's my girl. She left me last night."

You, fellow auditor, standeth there alone on a vast and limitless plain; a solitary intelligence with a large signpost. And on this signpost there are two pointers. And one says "right" on it and the other says "wrong" on it. [laughter]

Now, we know that you cannot run a successful session with a present time problem in full restimulation. We can prove it time and time again, that this is the case. And we can also prove that cases blow up and go *blooey* if you continue to leave Prepcheck questions – What question chains, you know – unflat. And the only thing wrong with that right and wrong crossroad sign above your head is, because you're straight under it, you can't read what either one says.

Actually, that is the end of the lecture. [laughter] Because you won't always win. Sometimes you're going to be wrong. Just try to be right as often as possible. [laughter] Don't be deluded or dragged out of prepchecking by a brand-new chain of some kind or another that the pc keeps presenting; otherwise you're going to go too far afield.

Sometimes it is better to ignore the out-rudiment and sometimes it is fatal to ignore the out-rudiment. And that's what I mean. But the best datum I can give you about this, that you'll find the most valuable, is don't use withholds to solve any of your rudiments.

"Are you withholding anything *since yesterday's session?*" And you get *clang!* You know – *clang! Ha-ha*.

"Now look. Since yesterday's session, yesterday's session – you remember when we ended the session yesterday? From that time until now, have you done anything that you're withholding?" Not a motion. "*Ha-ha. Grrrrrrw. That's it. Ha-ha. Good.*"

Because that's the only thing that can louse up your session. That withhold he's given you, if it occurred earlier, also existed in yesterday's session, too, and it didn't get in your road in yesterday's session, so it's not going to get in your road in today's session.

And when you do the present time problem, if you have to run it, Responsibility or something of that sort, or even Unknown, old Unknown – one of the older students here commented on to me that possibly it could be used in running a present time problem – the old Unknown method. And don't try to run it by withholds. Keep withholds out of those rudiments and you'll be all right in a Prepchecking session.

Now, a 3D Criss Cross session which has its rudiments out, once more you have the same thing, because the pc can continuously throw a 3D Criss Cross session into a Prepcheck session. And you just don't get any 3D Criss Cross done. And the rule is when you're doing 3D Criss Cross, do 3D Criss Cross. And when you're doing Prepchecking, do Prepchecking

And if you've had consistent trouble with the rudiments, then take off a couple of sessions and do *nothing* but rudiments – beginning rudiments, end rudiments, beginning rudiments, end rudiments. You know, just do nothing but rudiments. Just long, drawn-out proposition, you see. Just bang the rudiments in one way or the other. Take them all up and keep your Prepchecking sessions for prepchecking and your 3D Criss Cross sessions for 3D Criss Cross. And don't let the pc steer these things without rudiments, because it's been happening. *Hmm?*

When I see a 3D Criss Cross session of two hours narrowed down to thirty minutes of 3D Criss Cross and one and one-half hours of trying to get the rudiments straight, well, I say somebody is having trouble. That's what I say. I don't say they're doing wrong or something of this sort, but they're certainly having trouble. And I can always say this with great truth: They're going to have *far more trouble tomorrow*. And if they do it tomorrow, they're going to have *five times* as much trouble than they had today, day after tomorrow. And if they do it a third day, they're not going to have any pc at all, because it comes under the heading of no auditing. The pc's sitting there quivering, you know. He's gotta get that item, and one more thing, it's quivering, you know. And you start prepchecking him. Comes under the heading of no auditing. And the more you try to put the rudiments in, the further you go out.

The longer it takes to do and get a 3D Criss Cross item, the more difficult it is to get. The third day is the borderline. You go over to the fourth day, and you're in trouble, and you'll be in trouble from there on out. If you go four days trying to get a 3D Criss Cross item, at two-hour sessions per day, I can guarantee you won't get it on the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, or eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth or fifteenth day. You've thrown the pc out of session by just not delivering an item. The longer it takes, the harder it is to get.

When you're real slippy, you get one per session. That's really – that's really moting – one per session. *Poppeta-poppeta-poppeta-pop*. See, you won't get in any trouble at one per session. You actually won't get in any real trouble, one every two sessions. That's pretty easy. Now, you're getting – that's awful easy – one every two sessions. One every, see – three ses-

sions – oh, I don't know. You'd have to spend half your time sound asleep in the auditor's chair to do it that slow. But from there on, in actual fact, you're not going to get anything. See, the rudiments are going to go further and further out.

Now, I've handled a pc this way with some success. The pc says, "All right. I've had present time problem, *agraaa-agraaa*, missed withhold, and so forth. And I'm all ARC broken. I'm very upset with you," and so forth.

I've said, "Good. We happen to be doing a 3D Criss Cross session, and I'm going to get a list here, and we're going to carry on with this. How is that with you?"

Pc says, "*Huh?* Oh, you are?"

And I say, "Yes, that's right. That's what we're going to do."

And the pc said, "Well, that's fine."

In actual fact, if I at that moment asked the pc "Do you have a present time problem?" "Do you have a withhold?" or do you have anything else, I wouldn't have anything at all. I'd have a blank meter. See what the mystery of it is?

Because I've said very forcefully, "All right. Now we're going to give you some auditing." The pc then drops all of his excuses why he shouldn't have any. Do you see? There's more to this than simply the crude slug.

I have been known to make some rather interesting remarks in sessions.

You – on some of these you would have held your breath. But the funny part of it is, the pc never seems to get ARC broke. You saw me make a funny remark last night. Didn't you?

I said, "Come on, now. How are you getting these things? Well, that's for the birds. Get them some other way."

So I thought, "For sure, that would ARC break the pc." I asked for one right afterwards and I didn't have any reading. Did you notice that? The pc thought that was perfectly reasonable. Because if you're being truthful and factual, you could never ARC break the pc. It doesn't matter how mean or cross or otherwise you sound.

I've boxed with a pc sometimes for five, ten minutes, fifteen minutes trying to get them to get uncoy on the subject of withhold and finally said, "Goddamnit! Listen here. There you are. Here I am. I can sit here all night. Can you? Because we're going to until you tell me."

Funny part of it is the pc doesn't ARC break. It's maybe never warranted. Maybe that type of approach never does any good at all. You understand? Well, it keeps me from doing a withhold.

Thank you. Take a break.

PREPCHECKING, ZERO QUEST- TION

A lecture given on 21 March 1962

Vernal Equinox, Earth Colony of the Marcab Confederacy, Space Command, Planet 5. Let's be factual; stop this nonsense. Year of the Fox. Time tracks and time tracks.

Okay. 21 March – for those earthlings that don't understand – [laughter, laughs] AD 12.

All right. I'm going to give you a talk right now on the subject of an experimental method of establishing Zero questions in Prepchecking.

The first value of this particular method is that it relieves you from a lot of fish-around, at the beginning of a case and it also removes you out of those zones and areas which you're liable to be in, which the pc doesn't consider overts but which you do.

In other words, it takes you out of the zones of Sec Checking which, although you think they should be getting someplace, aren't really getting anyplace and the pc isn't really getting any big gains, and so forth.

In other words, if – you can prepcheck, you understand, on standard social aberrations that you consider social aberrations that the pc doesn't, and get a lot of withholds on this subject, which doesn't do the pc any good at all. Do you understand?

Audience: Yes.

Now, you are entitled to a tremendous amount of win and a tremendous amount of gain in any Prepcheck session. And I ask you first and foremost to put your sights up on the subject of what ought to happen to a pc in any one Prepcheck session.

Now, true enough, under training your sessions go two hours. In actual, professional practice they are much more likely to go five-and-a-half or thereabouts. Now on a five-hour-and-a-half session, on a Prepcheck, if you don't wind up with a tremendous resurgence on the part of the pc by reason of Prepchecking and so forth, you just don't know your business.

Now, of course, you can't always win. Don't expect to win always. But what do I mean by a win? You understand the pc better. You know more about the mind. This is from the auditor's point of view.

The pc has made some part of his goals and has made some progress. Now, that's your minimal expectancy, and if you've made that inspect- expectancy, fine, dandy. Call it a win.

The pc got some cognitions and knows more about himself and knows more about life and is better in-session. Yeah, that's a nice win. That's nice. The pc's gotten over something which he's always had around. That's a little bit phenomenal. That's a big-win-type thing. You don't expect those every session.

But you expect one of these minimal wins, certainly, every session. And it ought to look pretty good. And you – after a week's prepchecking of five hours and a half a day on a pc, you ought to be sitting there looking at almost a different being. You know, this pc should look different to you.

I can generally prepcheck up to changing the color of their eyes in a five-and-a-half-hour session – generally.

But how do you know whether a Prepcheck session is running? The tone arm moves. Just like any other process, Ollie. Just like any other process. If the tone arm, it then move, you makes progress. Ya. And if she don't move – I don't care how juicy the quality is; I don't care how marvelous this would sound from the pen of Lawrence or how forbidden and banned it would be in Boston – you're not making any progress.

Just as in any activity, the movement of the tone arm gives you the degree of change on the pc.

Now, you saw a tone arm moving last night in a demonstration session on the subject of 3D Criss Cross. And you saw that tone arm flicking about, but only going from about 2.8 to about 3.25 or something like that. There was an out of – between-session-break rise to 4.0, but that didn't have anything to do with the processing. See? And that was only about a quarter of a division.

And you saw the old man choke it down to a point where he could get one read, that there weren't any more, and you saw him get out of there, man, like hurry, and say, "That was the end of the list. And now we're going to null this list."

And the pc's still saying, "But there are some more items."

And then the old man says, "That's good. I know there are. Thank you very much. *Ha-ha*. Well, you can give me those in due course."

All this a part of understanding, "We're going on and null this list," crash! Why?

Pc's giving you a list that only moves that much, you're not on a very hot list. Now, the next list along this line is going to be hotter. The opptersms are maybe going to be hotter, and so forth. But that list wasn't hot. Did you see that? Yeah.

And you saw me bail out of there, man. I'll actually leave questions unflat if in the process of a – four, five hours or something like that we've got no TA motion on the pc. It isn't moving. He's given us data. It isn't moving. Get out of there. Skip it. Don't argue with yourself that you've restimulated anything. You couldn't have; no TA motion. See? See how simple that is?

And when you're prepchecking, if you don't get a – well, let's take the minimum amount – a half a division, from 3 to 3.5 to 3 type of swing, back and forth, half a division

swing ... Well, I'd say that would be absolute minimum that you would tolerate in a Prepcheck session.

You couldn't be mining anything very hot if you weren't getting a tone arm motion – couldn't be. That's no excuse to go off and leave it because it's only moving a quarter of a dial. But after you've been at it for two hours and it has only moved a quarter of a division on the dial, *ah-oh*, come off of it. We must be mining asphalt from a solid bank of asphalt which has nothing to do with anything the pc ever found out about. That's for sure.

The amount of case progress is directly proportional to the amount of tone arm motion.

Now, a two-division motion in the course of a two-hour session – that's a lot of motion: 3.5 to 4.5 to 4 to 3 to 5 to 4 – oh, my God. Wow! See? We're mining with both hands all day and all night, you see; up to our necks in the roaring stream, you see. Breakers busting all around us, you know. Four – comes in at 4 – goes down to 3.75 during the beginning rudiments, goes to 3.9, goes to 3.8, goes to 4, goes to 3.8, goes to 3.9, goes to 3.75, goes to 3.9, and this goes on for two hours. Well, that doesn't have anything to do with us. Well, does it? Couldn't have.

Pc isn't getting anything off that has anything to do with his case. He couldn't because it's not changing any mass.

Now, there isn't any interval of time specified for which you ought to look for this motion because sometimes it goes on like this for an hour and then all of a sudden you start to get tone arm motion. Don't you see? Well, that's fine. Well, I'd say if you went on for the whole session and there was no tone arm motion – there at the end of the session – I mean the next time you picked this thing up, you would – ah, I don't know – I'd do something else.

You couldn't have restimulated the case. That's for sure. It's on any – no line that he has anything to do with.

You see, this – all comes under the heading – this is brand-new; this is brand-new. This is auditing ... This is a brand-new way to audit: auditing by the Auditor's Code. You run a process only so long as it produces change and no longer.

Therefore, you're guilty of running a process which is producing no change and you shouldn't do that. Well, that's how you judge it. That's how you know whether it is going or not going as the case may be.

So, is there any remedy? Because the amount of tone arm motion in Prepchecking is directly proportional to the auditor hitting the chain the pc is trying to avoid. Isn't that interesting?

So if the amount of tone arm motion is directly proportional to what the pc is trying to avoid, if the auditor hasn't got any directional bearings – assistance toward what the pc is trying to avoid, they'll both sit there and avoid, won't they?

And then we find the auditor walking around in this little duck pond I was talking about. You know? Oh, he really found something – he saw a goldfish.

Therefore, many methods of assessment could be expected. Many methods of assessment could be expected to be developed which would orient what Prepcheck question to ask and what Prepcheck question not to ask. And the one which I'm giving you is just one of these methods.

You've got the scale already. It's the Secondary Prehav Scale for overts. Overts; Secondary Prehav Scale. I'll edit it and publish it again but it's right now available. It exists. You've probably got it. Scale for overts.

And what you do is take your ballpoint in hand and run a standard Prehav-type assessment on that Secondary Scale. You do an Assessment by Elimination on that Secondary Scale. And you'll find you're left there with one that is ticking faintly or banging largely. Very simple, hm? All right. Well, you've got that item now.

Now, the funny part of it is that you ... This is not necessarily the way this thing goes together, but I'll just give you a rundown on it. You do a Dynamic Assessment now on the pc. That gives you a terminal of sorts.

Now, you take that overt and that terminal and combine them into a Zero question and it's hot the whole way. Won't make any sense to you. For a while it might not make any sense at all to the pc, but that's why. See? That's what the pc is trying to avoid. It's "dusting." The overt – let's be corny about it – the overt we find is dusting and the Dynamic Assessment that we do on the thing; we get fences. Sixth dynamic, and it falls out to be fences. "Dusting fences." And I guarantee that the pc will consider that about the most awful overt he can do. Why we care not. But every time he's dusted a fence, he's practically plowed himself in and he's always dusting fences.

Now, what this has got to do with the price of overts – Lord knows what this goes back to! But it'll steer into some wild concatenation of events of some kind or another that will be quite aberrative and will give you quite a lot of tone arm motion. Well, you'll find out he dusted a fence day before yesterday, you see. You run this. This is the actual one. You've still got to get this What question, see? "Have you ever dusted any fences?" you know. That's your Zero.

Now, you've fished around and found an actual fence, see, and so forth. Your What question can almost repeat the Zero questions when this goes, but you didn't put it down until you found the actual incident. It's "What about dusting small fences?" is your What question. Now, you got the idea? You didn't put that down till you actually found him dusting a fence. It was day before yesterday and he did dust a fence, you know?

And you'll find that tone arm will rock around, and it looks like Big Ben – round and round, man. Quite amazing. Well, you pan that thing out, it's liable to go backtrack on you. So what?

The reason I redesigned the Withhold System with "Appear" in it was so that it would run a backtrack incident if you ran into it. I didn't want you to be running the backtrack incidents when you might stick the pc in them, but this Appear, particularly if you also run it as Not Appear, alternately ... You know, you go When, All, Appear, Who, When, All, Didn't Appear, Who, see. It'll knock out engrams. It'll blast them out of existence. So that's fine. You

won't get the pc stuck anyplace on the track. And you'll find the pc will scoot all around, and it sounds pretty wacky.

Now, that it can be – this has a liability – that it can be wacky, will sometimes wind you up in some kind of a situation where you've done a bad assessment. That has happened, you see. A poor Prehav Assessment and poor Prehavs Assessment are more frequent than you would ordinarily suspect. They're quite frequent. They're accidentals.

Because a Prehav Assessment is a very precisely done action and lately we haven't been doing very many of them, and you don't get much practice in doing one. And of course the way you do this is just to read the items over to the pc. He just sits there, and you don't put the rudiments in halfway down the list. You don't run Havingness halfway down the list. (God, what I've seen lately on some of these cases.) You don't do anything. If the pc fell out of the chair and snored, you'd still go on doing it because it'll still register on the meter oddly enough. You're not auditing a body; you're auditing a thetan.

All right. You go right on down the thing, and you just read each item once. *Pow! pow! pow! pow! pow!* And you don't read the item: Helped... Controlled. No, it's *Controlled*, then look at your E-Meter a minute or so later, and you don't do it that way. You don't look at the pc at all.

You just do, "*Bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark.*" It only – if that thing isn't reacting, you see, it isn't reacting. And you're going to be able to tell that in a quarter of a second, so the devil with it. It – actually, saying "*and*" between them is too long! "*Helped and controlled.*" That's too long to wait between those things.

You just go right down; you read the whole list, "*Bark, bark, bark,*" one each. And you mark in every one that it looked like it reacted. Instantaneous reaction. You mark that in. Put a mark after it. You only mark those that reacted. You leave the rest of them out and then you go down those you marked only. And you only mark those that *now* react. And then you go over the remaining ones. There's only maybe three reacted and you go over those three.

Sometimes you're left with two, and one reacts and then the other one reacts and it takes a moment or two reading one and then reading the other and so on and you're left with it. And then you check nothing; you don't do another thing. And that is why you can get a lousy mess, because sometimes you check it and become unsure of it or you don't know or your last two readings were bad or something and you start quivering. And the only reason you ever do a bad Prehav Assessment is because you quiver and doubt somewhere along the line. You have to do those assessments boldly, brashly and come what may. And maybe the pc got some incidental reads on something else. He thought of something else and you got a read and that made it look like one of them read, don't you see.

Well, that's all right; you'll get it by elimination anyway. And you usually are down to two and you have to read one against the other and you could see that they're both reacting. There's not much question in your mind. And one of them drops out and leaves the last one and you only read it once. Well, you can read it, maybe, two more times and see if it reacts, but it wouldn't matter because if it stopped *reacting* on those two more times, doesn't mean you've got it wrong.

The primary cause of a bad Prehav Assessment is the auditor's doubt of what he's seeing on the meter; the lack of boldness and brashness.

This is one of those slap-happy, go-to-hell, flat-out sort of actions. You know, this one you do. There's nothing to one. But you start hunting around and being a little bit doubtful and trying to keep the pc awake while you're doing it and being superchecking and supercareful about the whole thing, and you wind up in the soup every time. The pc kind of goes out of session.

It's a remarkable thing how a pc will stay in-session at a brisk, machine gun, Prehav Assessment. You see, auditors that get all kinds of things and the pc will all of a sudden pop up and say, "You know, I'm still thinking about 'startle.'"

And the auditor – he's liable to do something about it or something like that. The auditor is liable to say, "Well, thank you," and go on with the assessment. Well, that's perfectly all right. I don't usually say – I just say, "Shut up!" [laughter] He isn't supposed to be talking "What you talking for? Now, let's see, where were we?"

But he only starts to help you if you look helpless. And if you want to get an auditor that gets pcs wildly out of session, why, always train the auditor to believe that the pc should help him, and then of course, the auditor will look helpless. You know. That auditor doesn't even have to exist in the level of Help as far as operating helpfully or something of this sort. If an auditor just operated briskly and interestedly, you'll find out the rudiments will stay in. You can almost take Help out of the soup.

Pc says, "Let me see. I don't know. Let me see. What date ... ?"

"Oh, come off of it. What date is it?"

You don't help him. But tell him to give you what date it is, you know.

"Well, let's see if you can find out what date that is. Let's see." Let's help him out and so forth, of course. And then this immediately is liable to go into being helpless, you know? Like, "Well, let's see, now if you think about it there I'll read on the meter here, and you think about it while I read on the meter and then we'll find out, and so forth, *da-da-da*. You help me out here." I never act helpless when I'm auditing a pc. Because he's the one that wants the help – I don't.

And there's where Prehav Assessments go completely by the boards – is the auditor acts unsure. And that's actually the only reason Prehav Assessments ever turn up as very wrong. It's just the auditor's monkey, you know, and he hasn't got much practice in doing it.

Well, you can always do a Prehav Assessment on somebody. See, you can always practice this thing. Now, you do this secondary overt list. You do that as you would do any other Prehav Scale. But you have to do it briskly, surely, snappily, on-the-bally. Then the pc sits there and he doesn't go out of session. He knows. Yes, that's right. *Bang!* You got it, see? That's the way you handle it.

But you start going, "Well, let's see, now. Is it kill? *Blah-blah, reow*. How's your hav-ingness?" [laughter]

You see, you're not assessing the pc's analytical mind anyhow. That's why you tell him to shut up and you get along much better. You're not assessing him analytically. You're assessing him reactively and, of course, he hasn't any control over the reactive mind or he wouldn't have one. So the more monkey business occurs around there, why, the more analytical mind gets dragged into the setup, you see, and the further out that assessment can go.

Well, that's – that would be one of the reasons it failed, and the other one would be a bad Dynamic Assessment or going too esoteric on the thing. The way you do Dynamic Assessment, of course, just read the dynamics to the person and see what – which one changes the needle pattern. If you got two, put down two, and assess two items. Then assess the two items one against each other.

All right. So you get second dynamic. Dandy. "What would represent the second dynamic to you?" And he gives you a few items, and you put those down. Well, assess them. Simple.

"What represents the second dynamic to me? Oh, coffins."

"Good." That's a very – that would be an almost usual response.

If that's really a nutty dynamic, the guy will give you something that hasn't anything to do with it, every time.

"Give me something on the sixth dynamic."

"Girls."

A person who assesses out on the first dynamic – oh, boy, that really leaves you in the soup. "What represents the first dynamic?"

"Me."

Well, you can always say immediately afterwards, "Well, who are you?"

And put down what he says. You can – it almost gets to be a 3D Criss Cross action if you let it go too far. But get something in that zone.

Now, you say, "All right..." You don't say, "How do you feel about – ?" *ever*, on these types of assessments. You just say the item. It's like in flows, assessing flows.

Somebody who took forever and ever and ever here – I won't mention any names – to get an item on a flows assessment. Well, the flows assessment was wrong. Must have been. Doesn't take you forever to get an item on a flows assessment. Pc doesn't have any difficulty giving you items for a flows assessment, for heaven's sakes – couldn't have. Because if you got the right flow, it's all on automatic.

"Who or what would enforce inflow?" See?

"Cheese, cats, kings, coal heavers, *da-da, da-da-da, da-da-da, da-da-da, da-da-da, da-da-da, da-da-da, da-da-da, Whada – what.* I don't know what's talking – something. *Da-da-da-da-da-da.*" [laughter]

Tone arm flies around and you say, "Is that all?"

"Well, *da-da-da-da-da.*"

"All right. Is that it?"

"Da-da."

"Any more?"

"La-da-da." [laughter]

"All right. That's fine. All right. Now, let's differentiate this list."

You've got it. That's the easiest one in the world to do if you got it right. But if you were to say to somebody, "Now, how do you feel... about uh – um – let's see, it says here 'enforcing inflow on self.' – and how do you feel about enforcing inflow on self?" Latent read. "Well, we got *that* one."

I mean, you could get just crazy, you know.

You just say, "Enforce inflow on self," you know? And read it, you know? *Bang*, the next one. *Bang, bang*. Just like Prehav Assessment. And the more rapidly you do it, the more accurate it is. And the more competent you sound and look, the more accurate it is. And the more helpless and stupid you look about it, the more stupid and inaccurate the thing is going to be. Works the same way in 3D Criss Cross.

You want to get a wrong item? Take four days to do it. Every time. I mean, it will be off somehow. The pc's out of session. You're boxing around somehow. It just means the auditor doesn't sound positive. That's all. Long time to get the item? Incorrect Prehav Assessment? Incorrect Dynamic Assessment? Auditor doesn't sound like he knows what he's doing. Period. To that pc he doesn't sound like he knows what he's doing.

That's why you find me punching you along to speed you up, because sometimes you don't notice that you have ceased to look helpless. You see? And you speed up, and you all of a sudden look calm, and you get it done, and you feel competent, and that makes you competent, you see. And so I just keep booting you in that direction, without giving you much mechanics about it.

I don't keep saying to you, "Look competent." Because, I tell you, that is susceptible to many interpretations. [laughter] But you have to be competent in order to be fast. So you can just stress speed, and you'll eventually get an appearance of competence.

So the faster you do one of these things, the more accurate it is. Now, it takes about twenty minutes to do the Auxiliary Pre-Have Scale all the way down the line and find the item and nail it on the button, not moving very fast, but not moving slowly either. That is a sort of an easy action. I mean, it still looks competent at that. It is not much of a rush. It can be done much faster than that. But if it's done any slower than that, you're in trouble.

You find yourself taking forty-five minutes to do an Auxiliary Pre-Have, *Oh-oh-oh-oh-oh. Mm-mm-mm-mm*. Probably is incorrect. Same way with the Dynamic Assessments. Same way with this Secondary proposition.

Now, the bark-bark-bark system of assessment is sometimes very hard to do through a scratchy needle. The needle is going *bzzzzt-n-bzzzzzt-n-bzzzzzt-n-bzzzzzt*, and the pc's thinking random thoughts, and the flow terminal that you haven't found is still going off and is like a

sparkler, and so forth. Dirty needle proposition, you know, and so on. And reading through that is very, very hard to do sometimes. But you'll find out that a Dynamic Assessment can still be done through it because it doesn't go *bzzz-bzzz-bzzz* when you hit the item. It goes *bthuth*. [laughter, laughs]

And you get a Prehav Assessment through a dirty needle. Ah, that's rough, that's all. You're looking for the change of needle pattern; that's all. You're looking for the change, whatever changed it.

If the item didn't change it, it hasn't got any charge on it. It's obvious. Pc is always reading at 1,000 ohms, and there it is. He's reading at 1,000 ohms and something makes him read all of a sudden at 1,500 ohms for an instant.

Well, it doesn't matter if the reading of 1,000 ohms is *bzzz-bzzz-bzzz-bzzz-bzzzt*. At the moment it reads 1,500 ohms, it'll be *thilllllop*. And it'll go on saying *bzzz-bzzz-bzzz-bzzz* again. So when you're doing these assessments, just make up your mind that's the way the needle reads and stop worrying about it and swearing at the pc and yourself because it's a dirty needle. Just say, "Well, that's the way his needle looks," and read it occasionally.

You saw a needle pattern last night. Every time the auditor spoke, you got a one to two division fall on the first session. On the first session it occurred on the first time the auditor spoke. And on the second session it occurred on the second time the auditor spoke, which then had nothing whatsoever to do with the assessment. So you just avoided them, ignored them.

You had to get something else than that before you had a read. It – actually, it didn't require any judgment. It's much less difficult than you would have imagined because after all you were reading the item three times. And if any one of the three had fell, you left it in and if you weren't sure you left it in – so what judgment was involved?

Your only – the only time you took it out is when you were sure it wasn't reacting. And you kind of occasionally made sure that it wasn't reacting by asking it a couple of more times.

Well, you don't have a chance to do that in a Dynamic Assessment or a Prehav Assessment. There's no verification, see, beyond the fact that you're going to cover the item again if it fell, so you see? So the more rapidly you do it, why, the less chance the pc has to dream up something between reads. That's about what this amounts to.

It's something like soldiers getting across an open field. The slower you move across, the more likely you are to get shot. And of course, the optimum way of getting across the field is to get across in instant time. And so that would be the ideal or optimum speed at which to do a Prehav Assessment.

See, the faster it's done, the less trouble. You know, that pervades all of auditing. You recognize that. The faster it's done, why, the less difficulty – the less MEST universe difficulty you get into while it is being done. See? So that is very true of a 3D Criss Cross item. If it takes you three days, your neck is way out, man.

How many present time problems can this pc get in three days? How much trouble can he get into with his girlfriend in three days, see? How many arguments can he get into in three days? Oh, wow!

Get it in one day – he didn't get a chance to get into any arguments at all, see, from the beginning to the end of the item. He didn't have a chance to get into a fight with anybody, to have a – meet a bill collector, to get sued, to pick up a missed withhold, to pick up a missed withhold. He didn't have a chance to do anything, see, except the way that he was.

See, so that's the optimum period in which to get an item. Well, the optimum period in which to get a – the absolute optimum in which to get a Prehav or a Secondary Overt Scale item, of course, is in zero seconds. Because this assessment can be interfered with by the strains and vagaries of the fellow's mind during a session. See, it can be interfered with to this degree.

Because if it took you thirty minutes to do the thing, he's got time to pick up some invalidations. He's got time to think some thoughts. He's got time to think his usual critical thoughts of you, the auditor, see. And if you did it in fifteen minutes, he's got only *half* the time allowed to do this. [laughter] See what I mean?

Now, therefore, you just put the throttle on the floorboard and go through that one. And you go real quick, and the quicker you go, of course, the more accurate it is. That's – it's no kidding I mean, you can frankly start with a clean needle, if you did it in an hour and a half – let's do an Auxiliary Pre-Have Assessment in an hour and a half. You can start at the beginning of the session – I mean start at the beginning of the assessment with a perfectly clean needle, and wind up with a very dirty one if it took you an hour and a half.

The pc has just accumulated and – *nyah* and *nyah*. See, you're auditing the pc plus the MEST universe. And of course, the less time there is in it, the less MEST universe gets into the session.

So your accuracy has everything to do with your speed where it comes to this. And the only place you get into trouble working this system in Prepchecking is making a *bad* assessment – completely unapplicable, in some way or another.

So therefore, we lay down the rule that if you can't find, after you've done an aux – a Secondary – a Prehav Scale Overt Assessment – that little section there on the Secondary Scale that's devoted to overts – after you've done that, and let's say, do a Dynamic Assessment, and after you've done that, and these two things add up, you put it down as a test Zero question and the pc can find no overt of any kind whatsoever – why, scrap the lot, get your rudiments in and do it again. That's for you, because the probability is your assessment is way out. But that's after you honestly tried and you can't get responses on the needle for any overts in that direction. Because if he's got overts on the subject, he's going to get needle responses when you ask for them.

In other words, if you wind up with one of these and you've got a dead needle – there's nothing happening and he can't give you anything about it and he doesn't understand it and he can't get anywhere near it and all that sort of thing – well, scrub it. Get the rudiments in and

do it again. That's your best answer. Do both of them again. Don't use either one of them. And then you're liable to land straight up.

If you're doing a 3D Criss Cross list on flows and it just doesn't go all *brrrrr-brrrrr-boom-bang-thud*, and there's your list – oh man, you didn't get the right flow; that's all. I mean, there's no answering to that. I mean if it didn't just – you know, pc saying, "I wonder what's giving you these items?" – you know, that kind of action. It's not going well. It's not going easily. You're having a struggle to get on with it and it's taking quite a while and all that sort of thing – you just must have had a bad flows assessment.

Well, similarly, you just have a bad overt scale assessment and maybe a bad Dynamic Assessment in order to make this thing go wrong. But expect that it will, occasionally. Don't worry about it if it does.

Don't keep arguing at the pc for an hour and a half to find the overt when you're not even getting a knock on the needle. You found out "strangling," "strangling God." [laughter] And the pc can't remember any time when he ever strangled God and you get no fall on the needle on the subject, I think that you'd better leave it and get another assessment.

Now, this is as experimental as it goes. It's mainly experimental because you haven't done it yet. And I don't ... [laughter, laughs]

There are probably many systems which would turn up types of withholds, but this is a particularly promising one which is pretty well set on the rock of experience. And if you can do the accuracy of it all, why, you can probably arrive with a type of overts that are really overts.

You might find out that "injuring cars"... You don't consider this as particular – you've been at it your whole life, [laughter] and it's never done anything to you. And you'll find out the reason the pc is always clearing his throat – *rrrrrrm-rrrrrrm-rrrrrrm-rrrrrrm...* [laughter] All of a sudden he has a hell of a cognition, "*Rrrrrrm*. That's a car, you know! Heh – *Zoooom*. Yeah. I didn't think I was getting into that when I took that hammer to that fan blade. See, adjusting the fan, you see, and I was adjusting the ..." It's fantastic overts. It's a whole channel of overts. You don't consider them overts. He does. If he considers them overts, you'll get TA motion. If he doesn't consider them overts, you won't. And that is all there is to that.

The pc very often runs along like this, and he says, "Oh, well, yes. Yes, I ..." This girl says, "Oh, I committed adultery with my first husband, second husband seven times, and so forth, and the third husband four times, and so forth. And uh... well, as a matter of fact, I was a prostitute down on the San Francisco docks for a little while between marriages, and so forth. And uh – let's see now. And uh – the specific overts you're looking for there is actually getting a man in an alley while I was pretending to be a frail girl, hitting him over the head with a blackjack and taking all the money out of his pockets. And then the police came along and picked him up and took him to the hospital. That's the one you want." you go All – When, All, Who.

And you take that specific overt and you work that thing over, and you say, "Boy, I'm really getting someplace," you know, and that tone arm has just been sitting here at 3.6.

And you say, "Have you told me any half-truths? Untruths? Tried to damage anyone?"

"No." There isn't any motion to that. It's 3.6. It's moved down here to 3.4, and it's gone to 3.6, and it's gone to 3.4, it's gone to 3.6, it's gone to 3... I don't care what good material it is for books. It's not doing a thing for the case. Do you see that? You'll get fooled this way, because every once in a while you'll buy that, and you'll say, "Boy, we're really cooking with gas," you know? You're not. Tone arm tells you so.

And then you get onto this chain – this chain: "Well, I shut off the water on the hot water tap and I kept on turning it off and the handle came off." One dial drop; [laughter] one division tone arm change.

And you say – you're liable to say, "Well, that's so ordinary and so stupid that we don't even work that over. It's not an overt, you know. Let's pick up something else."

No, no. You got a nice What question, you see and you say, "Well, *what about* turning off hot water taps so they break?" That's what it added up to.

He's got a whole chain of it. He's been at it ever since he was two. [laughter]

Find out he's had trouble with his kidneys and had trouble with his liver and had trouble... And it's a real series of overts. And if that's the case, then your tone arm is going to be moving, man. It's going to be flying. It's going to be moving, moving, moving, moving – back and forth, back and forth. That's your only test.

There'll probably be other systems developed as you come along the line. It all depends on what turns up, but I think we'd better give this one a whirl, and you better direct them in. And, for my sake, and just to save my disposition – you have an interest in keeping my disposition mild and calm, the way it always is – and just to save – just to save my disposition, why, please stop getting the – your big toe wet in a duck pond on Prepchecking. Let's find something the pc really considers an overt, and let's really plow on down the line on that and that, you will find, is what really moves the tone arm. And if you don't find a real tone arm ...

Now, I'll give you this. That for two, three, four sessions, learning a case and stumbling around on a case, and so forth, you may not get much tone arm motion, you know, and so forth and you can't really connect with anything. You don't quite know what makes this case tick. And all of a sudden, swing in on it, and you all of a sudden find it and it goes like an express train.

But if you didn't learn anything from – enough about the pc to finally make it go like an express train, it becomes unforgivable. Okay?

Audience: Yes. Okay.

All right. Well, I wish you luck with this particular one, and I would invite your attention to the fact that it's an actual overt before you write the What. And it is what moves the tone arm not what you consider antisocial or what you're particularly trying to cure in the human race that makes it an overt to the pc. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you. Good night.

PREPCHECKING DATA

A lecture given on 27 March 1962

Thank you.

I know that's all for Mary Sue. I know that's all for Mary Sue. Well, thank you, I won't throw away your applause.

Well, here we are at the what?

Audience: 27th of March.

It's the 27th of March, and the vernal equinox is five days, six days behind us, and it's as cold as ever! [laughter]

All right. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, AD 12.

All right. This is a little longer lecture. We're going to finish a little earlier this evening. I'm just going to carry straight on here.

I'm going to talk to you about Prepchecking. It's just about time somebody talked to you about Prepchecking. And this is the inevitable lecture which follows the pleasant lectures. This is the lecture that goes after the lectures which tell you how to do something.

Now, you've had several lectures on Prepchecking, an awful lot of lectures on Sec Checking, which is quite a different proposition, and this is the "Oh my God how could you" lecture. The horrors of war sort of thing, you know? And you'll find this lecture is complemented by the HCO Bulletin of March the 21st, 1962, "Prepchecking Data".

There's some additive data in this bulletin. Inevitably when a technique is handed out, we find that there are holes in its use. And the primary hole that was found in Prepchecking was succinctly and definitely this: You do not ask a What question until you have found a specific and actual overt. Engrave that in letters of fire back of your prefrontal lobes no matter how uncomfortable it is, because that is an absolute necessity. You won't ever get any Prepchecking done unless you do that and nearly everybody missed that.

Now, here's what was going on. We had a Zero Question: "Have you ever stolen any white cross buns?" you see, or some good broad general question. "Have you ever been mean?" or "Is it all right for you to tell somebody else my difficulties?" Any – any Zero Question. These are generality questions. They are broad, broad generality questions. And what you have been doing is coming off of the Zero too fast. You have forgotten that there is a Zero, that there is a Zero A and a Zero B and there could be a Zero C and a Zero D and a Zero E and a Zero F. We don't care how many Zeros there are. You've been using Zero Questions for What questions.

Now, you've already gotten the word on this because you've had this bulletin for a day or two. But listen, looking over your folders, one stands his hair on end! And that is very rough because you've routinely been using this – the questions that should be in the Zeros for your What questions. And of course this tells us adequately that you are not finding a specific overt to write your What question; you are buying a generality. You can't run a series, a chain, from a generality. Let me assure you of this.

Oh, a number of chains can come out of a generality. But until you have found a specific and actual overt, you cannot, absolutely cannot, run a chain. And, of course, you've been coming up against the bumper in the railroad station and thinking the tracks went that-a-way. And all you did was keep hitting the bumper in the railroad station, hitting the bumper in the railroad station, and of course you got nowhere. Because you weren't on a chain, you were on a generality, and that generality belongs to the Zero Question.

Let's take a – let's take an example of this: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Zero.

Pc says, "Well, I wouldn't really like to talk to you about my difficulties with my mother."

Previously this is what you were doing; the What question, "What about your difficulties with your mother?"

And the pc said, "Well, I had some difficulties with my mother."

So you say, "Good. Well, when were those? Oh yeah, this lifetime. Very good." [laughter] "Is that all there is to that?"

And the pc says, "Yes."

And then the next inevitable question, "Well, who didn't find out about it?"

And – "Well, you didn't," would be the only possible answer.

And that's not Prepchecking. No.

That's a Zero A. See, that's a Zero A. You don't – it doesn't matter how it's worded. You could even word it with a "What," but it's a Zero A. And it is – that's all it is. And your Zero A would inevitably be – if the pc said that – would be, "Well, how about these difficulties with your mother?" You write it down Zero A.

This doesn't delude you into thinking you have run into anything, because you haven't. You haven't connected with anything but a generality. You've got to have a specific incident, specific incident. And it may take you five or ten minutes of steering and yammering and running into holes and getting out of them again, and so forth. And the pc is liable at this time to just steer all over the football field. I mean, there's nothing going on here. It's just they're just, "There you go," you know?

I mean, it's liable to go something like this, I'll give you an approximation of it, see. Well, you say, "Well, how about these difficulties with your mother?"

And he says, "Well, she was always beating me. And she hit me over the head. And she did this ..."

And you say, "Yes, yes, we know that. Well, now, did you ever do anything to her to give her any difficulties or anything like that?"

"No, no, I didn't. I was always as good as gold. The neighbors always used to say that I was a model child."

And you say, "Well, that's fine."

Your meter, you see, wouldn't – you wouldn't be on this if your meter hadn't fallen at the time you ran into these difficulties with Mother, you see. You wouldn't have written it down as a Zero A in the first place.

And you say, "Well, did you ever mess her up in any particular way? Something like that?"

"No, no, never did. Never did. Uh – always tried to be kind and thoughtful and she just used to kept – keep beating me all the time. Just beating me, beating me, beating me day and night."

Well, you say, "Well, that's good. Now, now, let's get on to this now. Do you remember your mother at all?" [laughter]

Well, the pc says, "Yeah, well, sort of vaguely."

"All right. Well, now, did you ever do anything to her?"

"Oh, maybe some little things. Something like that. Embarrassing her. Embarrassing her in front of guests. Little things. Didn't amount to anything."

"Well, did you ever embarrass her in front of any guests?" You haven't written another thing about any What question yet because you haven't got an overt yet, do you see? Do you get the idea?

"Well embarrassing her in front of guests. Yes, I – yes, I remember one time there was a tea party at my mother's house, and I came in and held up a dirty diaper in front of her, and so forth, and bragged to her about the fact that I had done a good job. I remember that was my... so on and so on. Yeah."

And you say, "Well good. Do you remember this or were you told about it?"

"Oh. I was told about it. It was one of the family stories, you know. I just always was told about it."

"All right. Well now, *ahem*, now do you remember ever doing anything to your mother at all?"

"No. Never did a thing to her." The thing is still falling off the pin and so forth.

"Well, now, do you recall ever doing anything that embarrassed her?"

"Oh, well yes. Yes, yes, there was one time, when I was in high school. I remember there was a girl in high school I was going with and her parents got very mad at me because of Mother, and so forth."

You say, "Good. Now, what's the extent of that?"

"Well, it's just the fact that I sure did embarrass her. I – I sure did embarrass her, because this girl, you see, I mean, we'd been fooling around you know, and she got pregnant."

"Ahhhhh. Oh, well, all right, now. What about embarrassing your mother about girls, or with girls?" And you write that down! And now you go, "When was it?" "Is that all of it?" "What might have appeared?" "What didn't appear?" "Who didn't find out about it?" and so forth. Let's get this thing pounded out, see?

Then, by George, you'll find that if that didn't clear up by the time you've gone through it twice, there's an earlier time that he did something like this. So you ask, "When's that earlier one?"

"What earlier one?"

"Well, is there another time when you did that?"

"Well ..."

Now that he's got that other one softened up a little bit, yeah, he'll give you the earlier one. All right.

Then you'll play that one and maybe you'll get four and maybe you'll get six. You haven't written another thing on your sheet yet, see. If you want to do any writing for your own benefit, write over here on the edge someplace, something. We don't care what you write, but it has nothing to do with these questions.

And "Oh yes," he says all of a sudden – this other series isn't clear yet. And you've now hit the third one. And you're working over the third one. And all of a sudden he says, "Yes. I beat my mother up once."

"Oh, all right. Thank you." And you go right on plowing the chain you're plowing, you hear me? I'm warning you. I'm warning you. I will materialize over your left shoulder. You put it over here in the margin – "Beat up his mother." And you go right on working the What chain that you are on and getting new withholds until it is clear.

In other words, you do not – for every overt on a chain you don't get a new What question. For every overt on the chain you'll get charge, and eventually that chain will discharge, and it is a chain, specific, and it itself will discharge if you get the earliest part of it. And it's the only thing that will hold that chain down.

Now, a chain is a series of similar incidents. There is a chain of hitting people with the left hand and a chain of hitting people with the right hand. You got the idea? There is a chain of being mean to Mother in the morning and there is a chain of being mean to Mother in the evening. You get the idea? These chains are very specific.

Now, you actually are working, maybe, two or three little chains, but they are very minor little chains. And these little chains will interweave. Well, embarrassing Mother about girls and so forth, there's probably embarrassing her about big girls and embarrassing her about small girls, you see? That's two chains. But it's definitely embarrassing Mother about girls. And that chain will discharge if you get the underpinnings of the chain. If you get the earliest incident on this, you're going to have a flat chain.

And you can actually work overt after overt after overt all on the same channel, providing you stay with that channel – providing you stay with the channel and don't go wandering all over the place about it, see?

The difficulties of handling a Prepcheck question are what you make them, or what the pc makes them and you flub on. But there are no real difficulties of getting the Prepcheck What question, as long as you remember you have to have a specific overt, and as long as you recognize that that specific overt is going to be a chain. And it mustn't be a very broad chain, it must be a pretty narrow chain. "What about being mean to women?" is of course a major chain, but "Being mean to Mother" is definitely a part of that chain, but is itself and would ordinarily clear by itself.

Now, a chain is going to clear if you get tone arm action. Now, let's go to this next one. Do you dig this first thing that I've been giving you here?

Audience: Yes.

Listen, I don't care how much *boz-woz* and yap-yap you go into with a pc. I don't care if you argue with him, sit there and argue with him for half an hour. They've given you a generality that gave you needle action. Now, it's your job to find one overt within the perimeter of that generality.

And that's the step where all Prepchecking has been breaking down. It's just right there. It's as simple as that. And the rest of it will work out on the basis that continuing to get off overts on the subject of that What question, earlier and earlier, will eventually plow up enough unknowns on it that it will desensitize on the meter. And that is all you're trying to do. And then you get the next What question.

You got that now? That – it's actually pretty easy. But it was just this little thing we were missing. All right.

Now, in steering down one of these chains, if you do not get tone arm action, you might as well just skip the whole subject, because it is buried in the land of never-never, or you're on top of a terminal that if you ran it on a 3D-type process would simply beef up the whole Prehav Scale on the bank. There's something wrong here or the pc – which is the basic thing – doesn't even vaguely consider it an overt. It sounds awfully juicy to you, but to the pc it is not an overt, whatever you're working.

This is the sin of auditing somebody against the Auditor's Code. You only audit a process as long as it produces change and no longer. You don't audit a process if it does not produce change.

Now, believe me, you can desert that thing in an hour or half an hour or ten minutes – it doesn't matter how long you have worked this with no change of the tone arm; it does not matter how long you have worked this – it is equally a breach of the Auditor's Code to work it ten minutes with no change, two hours with no change or ten sessions without any change. Do you follow me?

Now, ten minutes – this is cutting it a little bit fine, so we get a twenty-minute rule. If you're working a channel, and you work that channel for twenty-minutes – now, you under-

stand, you haven't been working the channel with tone arm action and then hit a twenty minute flat period, that's not what we're talking about, see. Well, you've been working this Prepcheck overt the pc has given you. You've worked the thing for twenty minutes and you haven't had any slightest – well, you haven't had any significant action on the part of the tone arm, call it a breach of the Auditor's Code if you continue it.

The way to get out of it is to ask if you've missed a withhold on the pc, clean up any missed withhold which turns up and drop it like a hot potato.

Several things could be wrong. You've gone through, you've found out that he has innumerable overts on his mother. And you go through and for twenty minutes you are running along with this What question. And he's telling you that he used to up-end the cookie jar over his mother's head and kick her out the back door, and right now why she's starving to death in a poorhouse someplace. And you haven't gotten any tone arm action of any kind no matter how juicy this sounds to you – no matter how much *you* think it ought to produce reaction, no matter how desperately you believe that this is a violation of the social mores which must be upheld.

You know, if you just stop upholding all these social mores, nobody would need any auditing. You realize that.

You've got an Auditor's Code breach staring you in the face if you continue it. But you *must*, if you're going to come off of this thing ... oh, you're going up and down the line, up and down the line, up and down the line. You're trying to get off overts. The person's actually giving you overts. You're running When and, you know, everything. No TA action. You do make sure the meter is connected. [laughter] And there's no TA action – the thing to do with it is to ask the pc if you have missed a withhold, and clean up any reaction you get on *that* question and get the hell out of there and find another subject. You're just going to waste *more time* prepchecking things that the pc doesn't consider an overt. That's the other thing which you're doing.

Now, maybe someday he will consider this an overt and maybe he won't. But remember, a pc does not prepcheck – I'll just extend this a little further now – remember a pc doesn't prepcheck all the way to the bottom of the deck. I don't mean by that, that – he does go back-track. But remember, not all levels of pc prepcheck. Prepcheck is not as broadly good an approach to all cases, no matter how low toned, as the CCHs or even 3D Criss Cross.

Both 3D Criss Cross and the CCHs go much further south than Prepchecking. Prepchecking takes a bit of responsibility for thinkingness. 3D Criss Cross takes a bit of responsibility for existingness. And CCHs take a bit of responsibility for mass and repetitive action. And you'll find out, responsibility for beingness and responsibility for mass or repetitive action equally go further south than responsibility for doingness.

And, of course, you've got three processes here and if you'll look it over again in the light of what I've just said, you've got a be, do and have breakdown of auditing, see. 3D Criss Cross, that's direct beingness. Prepchecking, that's direct doingness. And CCHs are what they always have been designed to be – they're direct havingness. And by some odd freak, the beingness processes go further south than the doingness processes. Why? We wouldn't care, but they just happen to by actual experience.

You can do 3D Criss Cross items on somebody who's practically rave, stark staring mad. You can do them pretty low. But not as low as the CCHs.

To admit to doingness... All right. We get some boy and he's sitting there – I'll give you why, see – sitting there and he's half way around the bend in the local spinbin, you see? And you say to this fellow – you say to this fellow, "Did you walk down the hall?"

And he will say, "Oh, *goo-goo, ga-ga, blah,*" you see?

And you'll say, "Well, are you Joe?"

And he will say, "Yes."

That get more real to you right there? Now, he'll identify himself, but he won't – he won't admit to doingness. Doingness is the main punishment factor in this universe.

Now, that's probably just a specialization of this quarter of the universe and maybe someplace else this might not add up this way. But it sure adds up this way here.

Now therefore, when you are running into trouble in Prepchecking, and that trouble is excessive, and you do not seem to be able to get any tone arm action out of Prepchecking, there is one place where you should send the pc – to the CCH room. That's for sure. That's the easiest thing to run on this pc, and that's the thing this pc's going to get the most gain on, per unit of auditing time.

Supposing under no circumstances could you find any type or line of action or overts on any dynamic, on any subject that would get you tone arm action on the pc. Let's say you fooled around with this for a couple of sessions. You could fool around with it for two or three sessions, but I certainly wouldn't go any further than that. And you have not yet produced a tone arm motion, a reasonable tone arm motion – a quarter of a division or more for every twenty minutes of auditing – you have no business wasting your time and wasting the pc's time.

CCHs, brother. CCHs. And you'll find out that that will work out much better. It's not particularly a comment on the pc, it might also be a comment on the auditor. Do you see that? The auditor, for some reason or other can't pick the lock and combination to this safe. Maybe another auditor could come along and pick this lock or combination, see? Maybe something else could be done here, some extraordinary solution entered in on the thing. I'm talking about the sensible thing to do. Instead of going on endlessly trying to pick a tricky lock to a tricky safe, don't you think you would get in more auditing by just running him into the CCHs?

I can tell you this by experience, if a pc is going to prepcheck easily, they will prepcheck within the first two sessions well. And you all of a sudden will have the pc flying in a couple of sessions. I'm talking now about two-hour sessions. And if the pc isn't flying in a couple of two hour sessions – ah, no. We don't care if it's wrong with the pc. We don't care if it's wrong with the auditor. We don't care if it's wrong with the environment you're auditing this pc in. We don't care what it's wrong with or what we're blaming it on to. Let's just recognize the practical fact that if you haven't done it in a couple of sessions, and you haven't got that TA wiggling in a couple of sessions, that you are now taking a gamble with your auditing time, and the pc's auditing time, and the much safer bet is just to run the pc into the CCHs.

Any number of things could be wrong, rather than case level, don't you see? Let's just take them all into action.

Number 1. The auditor may not feel he has sufficient altitude with the pc and is therefore a bit timid.

Number 2. Well, actually, it – a subdivision of 1. Part of this could be the pc is new and the auditor doesn't want to charge in there too hard and upset the pc and embarrass the pc or something of this sort. He wants the pc to keep on getting processed and therefore is hitting it with a feather, you see? And actually doesn't want to ask any embarrassing questions that will upset anybody. This – these factors all enter in to it, besides case.

The pc may have some God-awful PTP of long duration that the pc is just sitting right in the middle of, and the auditor hasn't gotten near it, and hasn't had anything to do with it. And an undisclosed PTP of long duration will discharge with the CCHs, even when undisclosed. So you could – pc wouldn't own up to it or something will happen to it. Those things, you see, could all be off, completely aside from case.

Or – now we move into case – the pc has an overt put-together which is entirely foreign to the social code of the auditor and the two just can't embrace each other's zones of action. In other words, the auditor just can't wrap his head around what would be the overts of a fireman or something, you know? And we just don't ever seem to be able to pick up any overts, and the pc is out of this world. We're talking about case now, because this would only be true if it were wrong with the case. The pc is running an out-of-this-world social mores. What are overts to this particular pc have nothing to do with the social code on which we're running. See, a lot of things. These are all little things.

Now, as we get down the line further from this, we could get into a situation where the pc just has no confidence in this particular auditor on Prepchecking.

And then let's go a little bit further than this and get the extreme case – the pc has inadequate and insufficient responsibility to respond to any doingness. That would be the extreme. CCHs will still work on this pc.

Now, under any of those conditions you can see that, rather than beat your brains out, it'd probably be much more successful for you to simply move over into the CCHs. That isn't saying that you can't do some extraordinary things. That isn't saying you can't get around most of these things. That is saying, however, I don't expect you to be able to in all cases, because that would be, to my way of thinking, an unreasonable demand. Because I've already run into a case or two where I wasn't getting tone arm action, see? I just wasn't getting tone arm action and I just slated the case for CCHs. Then we'll come on to it later.

The odd part of it is, the very things that you're prepchecking the pc on before the pc has CCHs – the very thing – after an intensive of CCHs will produce tone arm action. That's what's curious, and I think you'll find that borne out.

This pc's got overts, overts, overts. He keeps giving them to you and the tone arm is just sitting here. The tone arm just – just sits here statuesquely there. That's it. I don't care how much the needle is knocking around. That is to say the needle is – is twitching, you know? And the needle twitches. And you keep it very closely centered, however, and you'd

move it just that much, see, to keep your – keep your needle centered. You're getting falls on these things, you know? You're getting little rises and little falls, and it all adds up to less than two-tenths of a division on the TA arm. You're not going anywhere. You're wasting your time. Because whatever you're working at this particular time, you might be working the wrong channels, there might be a lot of things you could do about it, but let's just face up to it, nothing is happening!

You see, regardless of why nothing is happening, to separate these things, you see, separate the whyness that nothing is happening from the fact that just nothing is happening! Don't go on puzzling yourself about it till the end of time. Go on and do something where something happens.

If you feel embarrassed on some outside pc or something, let me assure you that starting in on CCH 2 is often less embarrassing. You know, old 8-C. Almost anybody could be run on old 8-C. Start 2 instead of 1. It'll seem to make more sense to them, and by the time you've run them a little bit on that and run 2 and 3, why 1 won't seem silly to them. It'll seem quite natural that they should sit here sticking their hand at you. Get the idea?

But it's a better approach, just between ourselves. It's a better approach. Because you're getting something done. The only thing that breaks an auditor's heart is getting nothing done! So you have some responsibility for yourself, as well as the pc. And you frankly just mustn't run things that get nothing done. You just mustn't do that, that's all.

One, you owe yourself training so that you yourself feel competent when you're doing something, you see? All right. That's for the pc, but that's for you, too, you see? And then applying what you know, you owe it to yourself to get some results completely aside from the pc. Because the only thing that can happen to you is a long concatenation of failures. You audit ten pcs in a row and get no results on any of those ten pcs, and somebody will be scraping you off the boards. You know that.

Oh, we could probably audit you up in – in theory, you see – we could audit you up to a point where it wouldn't matter to you at all whether you got results or not, and therefore we would beat this whole thing. Then the probability is, you wouldn't be auditing! So we better give this a more sensible approach.

Now, I frankly don't care what you run on a pc. I really don't care what you run on a pc as long as you get some results. That's an interesting statement. I don't care what you run on a pc. And as long as you *flatten it!* It's all I ask of you. I don't care if you say, "Get the idea – or mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner. Thank you. Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner. Thank you. Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner. Thank you. Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner. Thank you." Thank you."

And somebody will come along and say, "What the hell are you trying to do?"

"Oh, I'm trying to cure his alcoholism, of course." "Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner," and so on.

You see, it isn't anybody's opinion, if, while you were giving him these commands – "Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner" – you get *clank*. "Thank you.

Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner" – *clank*. "Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner" – *clank*. "Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner." Man, if you were getting wild tone arm action of that character, man, that case is going places, I don't care what you're running on the case. The answer lies in the tone arm, not in anybody's opinion. And actually not in the zone and area of what you've been told to run.

And the only kickback you would ever get from me, if you didn't run it finally to where it stopped at 2.3 – at 2.75 or at 5.5, or wherever it stopped, it stopped! And you went for twenty minutes and you didn't get a quiver out of that thing. I don't care where it stopped. You can say at that moment, "That is flat."

So you're justified in running any process that produces tone arm action. And you're justified in running it until the tone arm action ceases. And we don't care where the tone arm action wound up. And we don't care where the tone arm action went while it was moving, or stopped where it stopped. See, we haven't any argument with these things. These things are not as significant as you make them. You know? You make these things a lot more significant than they are.

This bird has been sitting over here at 2. He's been sitting over here at 2 forever, and you do ARC Process '61, see? And you finally park him up here at 6. And he said, "I've got a terrible headache, and I feel totally packed in and I can't move and I can't wiggle and life is horrible."

And you've run this process, and you've run it flat and it finally stuck at 6. I assure you the case is better off than the case at a dead 2. See? It's if you produced reaction and if you ran it until you no longer produced reaction.

The only weird thing you'd – adventurous thing which you do when you go off into the blue with a process is, you don't know whether it's going to produce action or not. And if it does produce wild action, it's liable not to be flattenable in any finite lifetime. That's about the only thing. You might be – you might run twenty-five, thirty... Not a lifetime – you might run twenty-five, thirty hours on this confounded thing. Having run twenty-five or thirty hours on the confounded thing, however, you would have produced more gain on the part of the case than any other thing that you could have run at the time if that was what you were running and it did produce tone arm action and it finally came to a stop.

But picking up these wild processes and offbeat processes and running them, you sometimes dedicate yourself to a longer period of processing than you actually should be administering.

Most of your errors, by the way, are just in not flattening processes, not running processes right or wrong. You know that. Your errors are in not flattening processes. And the brakes that I have put on you on processes, you very often will run a limited process when you pick them out of the hat, you very often run a limited process which will all of a sudden stack up fast. A backwards process.

"What effect have others had on you? Thank you. What effect have others had on you? Thank you. What effect have others had on you? Thank you."

Oddly enough it would – if it produced tone arm action, why, that's fine. But you only dare run it to the moment that it stops producing tone arm action. That will be fairly soon. It will probably leave the pc as gnawed out as a battlefield tank, but nevertheless you must have gotten rid of something if you produced tone arm action. Unbalanced processes are not all bad. But if you're going to do things like that, watch that tone arm.

Now, it's awfully interesting to watch the *True Romances* or *True Story* or "This is – Was Your Life Mabel" unrolling off ... Isn't that the famous program? "This is – This Was Your Life Mabel." I think it's given from Hollywood. They bring in the submarine commander she was in love with when she was two and then they fly in the native that he – who tied up his foot when he was five, and they fly them all in. And then the fellow comes on the stage and they furnish glycerin so that he has lots of tears as he faces all these fellows. And he's all overcome. Have you ever seen this program? "This Was Your Life Mabel." Well, you know, it's very engrossing. I'm told that people sit in front of TV and just watch it with great fixation. I'm told they even listen to it. [laughter] That's a fact. Fact! Actually people have not only sat and watched it but have actually turned the sound on.

And an auditor can get in that state. [laughter] He can! And completely overlook this TA motion. It just goes on and on and on. It's very engrossing, very engrossing, but no TA action. So engrossment has nothing to do with it whatsoever. In fact auditor engrossment has nothing to do with auditing. I know you won't believe me when I say that, but it happens to be true. It's just TA action. You get tone arm action while you're prepchecking, fine. If you don't get it while you're prepchecking, get off of that handcar, man. Unload into that ditch.

I know we've carried that guy on down until he's five and now he's spitting in the face of his big brother, and we got incident after incident where he spits in the face of his big brother, and where they tie him to a stake and roast him and that's why they withered his hand and that's how come it's all so horrible. And it's just going on and on and on and on and on and on, and you've just got it all fixed and you're down there to the age of five now, you see? And you know there's some earlier stuff.

Wake up to the fact the tone arm hasn't moved for the last half-hour, would you please? And let the pc run on a little bit further so as not to make it too abrupt and then ask if he's missed – if you've missed any withholds on him. And pick it up, square it up.

Now, frankly, if you picked up an awful lot of missed withholds, you might get the TA action back and you might even be justified in pursuing the chain. You understand there's that liability, too. But the final test even of that is tone arm action. Ah, just bail out of there. Unload off that handcar, because you want nothing but the *Twentieth Century Limited*, if you please. You don't want any of this handcar stuff. Pc sometimes will give you a bunch of lies, too. They feel so much better, they feel so relieved. Well, that's because you never got near any of their overts. [laughter, laughs] Tone arm action tells you the lot.

Now, there's a gag here about mores, that you should know how to crack a mores. I'll tell you now how to crack a mores. This is rather new to you. Let us say that we have isolated an item. We have isolated an item and that item is an elephant – that's 3D Criss Cross. And it is a nice big crash-banging item. And it's just got nice action, and the oppterm of it got nice action. The oppterm was "native." "Elephant" and "native." And we have isolated – because

native produced so much sensation while we were doing the list – we have isolated the fact already that "elephant" happens to be the pc's terminal, and "native" is the oppterm.

Now, you know that you could handle this in this weird way: You establish which is the terminal and which is the oppterm. While you were doing the opposition terminal list, which will give you the... You know there's – oppterm has a double entendre. You *oppterm* something is a verb which merely means you get the opposite's item. But an *oppterm* is something the pc ain't.

A pc becomes a terminal. In a loose phraseology you never find terminals with 3D Criss Cross. You always find *items*. You never find terminals, because a terminal is a specific type of item, and an oppterm is a specific type of item. And the terminal is what the pc is and the oppterm is what the pc isn't.

And the oppterm, when discussed, will give him sensation – grief, dizziness, staggerishness, that sort of thing. And the terminal, while you were listing the terminal, he had pn – pain. He got a little pain here or there. You got pains when you were doing the terminal list. So you know when you've finished it up that the pc is the elephant and the native is what opposes the pc.

Now, to be very, very precise, you could – I'll show you how to do a social mores on all this. You get the social mores of an elephant and just ask the pc – I was going to do this the other night and the pc acted up on me. I was going to get this item and show you how to do this. A piece of my planning went by the boards and so on. It's all right. It's not the pc's fault – exactly. [laughter, laughs] Actually, it was her Prepcheck auditor's fault. Anyhow, the thing about this is the elephant, you'd say, "Now, what – what would be considered antisocial amongst elephants?"

Make a list of it. At that moment, by simply reversing all of those, we get a tremendous number of Zero Questions. It's just as simple as that. "Well, what – what's social? What's social?"

Well, "Eating grass. Uh – eating – eat – eating leaves off trees. Uh – not picking up a wounded uh – failing to pick up a wounded – well, you're supposed to pick up a wounded fellow member of the herd and carry him along. And you're supposed to do this."

All right. You get out of this: "When haven't you eaten grass?" Sounds fantastic, doesn't it? That you – you ask this pc, well, you've got all of these – you ask this pc, "When haven't you eaten grass?" There you go. You'll get tone arm action.

"When haven't I eaten grass? Well, I'm not supposed to eat grass. I'm a human being now."

"Well, that's good. All right." You'd think you'd get that kind of response. But not this pc. "When haven't you eaten grass?"

"Well, that's – yeah, that's right. I haven't been eating any grass lately." [laughter]

And you can get over and clean up the Zero Question, "Well, when haven't you eaten the leaves off tall trees?" see? And, "When haven't you picked up a wounded teammate with your trunk?" And do you know all these things will register?

Now, after you've gotten the list, it's a good thing to survey the list for the biggest needle action and you've got the overt that he's carrying forward into present time. You might wind up with twenty of these things, don't you see? And you can kind of do a little assessment across these things, watching the tone arm action for each one. You could actually do Assessment by Elimination; find out which one he's sitting in. You'll finally wind up with one of these that you select out. Actually, you could just start at the beginning on number one. But you'll get more powerful action if you do an assessment of all of these things.

And you're liable to get this kind of a – of a thing on it, see? Because, remember, you do have an oppterm for this package. You've just – so far you've just ignored the oppterm. Pc's liable to come up with this oppterm himself: "Well, let's see, what would be antisocial for an elephant? Well, to fail to slay any natives."

And you're liable to find out it works out that *that* one – of course, because it's the dead center of the terminal/oppterm package – that one just sits right there, *clang!*

Now, this bird in this lifetime has been down in Arabia and Syria and Berkshire, and by God he hasn't slain any natives! And every time he has not slain a native was an overt! See, that's how you disentangle your social mores. Every time he has not slain a native. And you'll find out this will react beautifully on the tone arm. Do wonders for the case.

And you say, "Well, good heavens! The obvious overt is slaying a native."

Has he slain a native in this lifetime? No, he hasn't slain a native in this lifetime. Well, therefore, he doesn't have an overt. No, that's according to your mores. That's according to McCloud's mores. That's according to somebody else's mores. It had nothing to do with this pc's mores. Failing to slay one! You follow me on this? It's *failing* to slay the native that is the horrible thing.

You see how that's a direct reverse, and then how you could miss it utterly. That type of approach requires a 3D Criss Cross item. But sometimes you can smell these things out without the 3D Criss Cross item. You're watching the thing as you're discussing life, with a capital "L" with this pc and you notice it's sort of banging around on the subject of – well, let's say it's banging around on the subject of haircuts. Well, you see, by social mores you would assume that his failure to get haircuts would be the overt, or something like this, you know. That might be it. You make up your mind when you see the thing bang, and then you ask him a question and this is a big mistake. You don't search this thing out on both sides of it before you take your plunge.

What type of an overt are you looking for? Because it could be a plus overt and a minus overt. And if you take what you consider the overt would be, you will be fifty percent of the time wrong. Because it's getting a haircut that is an overt. This girl has a past life as Delilah, and cutting any hair ever since has been very restimulative. See? Something stupid like that is sitting in the lineup.

You see, these overts are formed on old now-I'm-supposed-to's and they have nothing to do with good sense, otherwise it wouldn't be this universe. It just strictly, entirely and only has to do with the – which side of the fence the fellow was on. Duck hunting. Well, what's an

overt for the duck in duck hunting is not the overt for the hunter, don't you see? That's – it's liable to be totally reverse.

So when you find a subject don't be so ruddy fast in plunging off the springboard. Let's find out what side of this thing is an overt.

Fellow says, "Oh, I've – I've made a lot of propositions to girls in my time. I used to stand down by the drugstore and I used to proposition girls."

And you say, "Good. That's – in my upbringing, that was always an overt to proposition all these girls. Good." All right. Use that as a Zero question, "Have you ever propositioned any girls?" and now we're going to get the What. "All right. Now, recall a time there you – you got a specific time when you propositioned a girl."

Now, the fellow says, "Oh, yes, yes, yes. Last Saturday night propositioned Amy Glutz."

You say, "Good. What about propositioning girls in front of the drugstore? All right." [laughter]

And after you've been working about fifteen minutes, why, what I've told you about the tone arm motion, you all of a sudden said, "You know I haven't looked at that lately. I'm going to look at it." ... [laughter] It's up the spout, you see?

The overt is "*Not* propositioning girls"! Your Zero Question... This is the way the thing really put together. The Zero Question is "How about doing bad things to women?" see? And your What question, after you've fished it around and so forth, is you find "What about not propositioning girls in stores?" And this thing falls off the pin on the tone arm action, you know? Well, he didn't proposition this girl and he didn't proposition that girl and he didn't proposition some other girl. And he's totally – he's totally mired into just this one fact – that it is a terrible insult to a woman not to proposition her.

I'll give you an example. I think I was thrown out of an English inn a few hundred years ago; I'd failed to kiss the landlady! Insult! I don't know what was wrong with me that day. I must have had my mind on something else. But that gives you an idea. They considered it an insult. Upset them!

Now, if you don't think this is general – I'll let you in on something. You girls needn't listen to this, but listen, fellas. The only time I have ever gotten in trouble with women was when I – well, you know! [laughter, laughs] Boy, I've been in trouble then. Wow! Grim.

So you see this thing isn't quite as obtuse as it looks. Maybe it might even go so far as to say that the social mores we are brought up in and taught, aren't the social mores on which we are actually operating at all. So I just plead your attention closely to just this one little interesting fact. Plow around awhile, and try the thing on both sides and scout it out a little bit before you take that What-plunge, because you're running into this social mores proposition. You may be square on – sitting on the middle of it.

Well, in view of the fact you probably haven't any 3D Criss Cross on this pc yet, or if you did have, it's not in the folder you're prepchecking him out of, or something of that sort. You're not paying much attention to this. You're keeping these things well separate. See,

there's no telling what you're running into. There's just no telling what you're running into – what kind of items.

Now, reincarnation doesn't exist as such because nobody ever went through a staged line of – became a beetle, became a cockroach, became a mouse, became a rat, you know, and then finally became a politician and then became a member of the human race, you know. Nobody ever went this particular channel.

The Egyptians used to try to lay in an I-am-supposed-to on the subject. And also the Lamas give you some interesting maps. And maybe some people believed them. I suppose there's some thetans who went around sort of remembering this map, and remembering "Now I'm supposed to become a cockroach having just been – so forth, and before I can be a temple priest again," and so on. Well, that's – merely was an interesting way to get a fellow from – keep a fellow from picking up a body and becoming your rival in his next life, too. Because that was a big problem in Egypt.

They had more problems about thetans picking up things. I know; I was there, and they had problems. They had problems. For instance, they dreamed up a good one one time, that whenever a Pharaoh died and when he came back to Earth, the possessions were st – his again. Man, you know that was unpopular at the Land Office and that was unpopular every place. But made it stick there for about, oh, I don't know, a couple of thousand years.

So naturally somebody would think up a now-I'm-supposed-to – "Well, after you die, really, you're supposed to become – at once, you see – you're supposed to go down this channel and then up this channel for this many lives." That puts you out so they no longer had – the Land Office had – any records, see?

These are just dodges. But reincarnation has gotten itself loused up with this very interesting progression that you're supposed to go through. And this progression has no regularity at all. A pc has actually been anything that he could pick up. In the lineup a thetan – a thetan goes on the motto of "Anything is better than nothing." And that extends to beingness – "Any beingness is better than no beingness whatsoever."

You'll find – sometime or another you'll be auditing a pc and he gets this little sensation; it goes *flick*, you see. He says, "What was that? You know I have a definite impression of having been a mayfly, but it just all ran out." He probably was!

It's awfully hard getting yourself into the head of a small dog. I will tell you that. It's a hard thing to do. I tried it one time. It didn't work at all. Cats – I generally save those for my randomness. Cats, they're very interesting things. You don't pick up cats – you steer cats. You do various things with cats. But anyhow, all kinds of attitudes toward beingness.

Now, every race has it's own fourth dynamic and it tends to fixate on this fourth dynamic and you get a predominance of continuance in that beingness line, you see, in any one race. If you've got gazelles, why, people will tend to – who – whatever thetans are running the gazelles will tend to go on being gazelles, you see? And they'll go on and on and on being gazelles, and they'll pick up gazelles as long as they can pick up gazelles. But what if all of a sudden the population of gazelles is too small. Well, they're liable to become almost anything. Capitalists, communists, anything, see? They go over into some other line.

The buffalo. There were at one time I suppose something – must have been in the neighborhood of twenty-five, thirty, fifty million buffalo in the United States. There are only a couple of hundred of them now. Every once in a while you're going down the street in the United States, you see some fellow with a long shaggy beard just going along. [laughter]

Thetans aren't necessarily stupid. There's no particular reason why you shouldn't have been an animal at some time or another. It's quite a relief. It's quite a relief. There's not much responsibility involved with the thing. You pick up the various now-I'm-supposed-to's very rapidly. Animals tend to stay with their now-I'm-supposed-to's because they can't talk about them. It's about the only thing that's wrong with that.

But it's interesting. In Rome for instance – of course, after you'd been voted out of office and voted out of the army and blackballed and beat up and sold into slavery and a few things like that, it would be quite natural to become a wolf and bite every Roman you saw for – for a lifetime or two, you know, just to kind of even up the score. And then go back to being a Roman, you know?

It – as far as nationalities are concerned, you get totally scrambled up politics on this particular planet. These poor nations! I mean, it's something you could hold your head in your hands about frankly, just hold your head in your hands about. They have absolutely no safeguard of any kind whatsoever from mixed politics by thetan transfer from one nation to another. They have no prevention of this whatsoever and naturally some Indian that wants to wreck England is going to pick up and is going to be terribly interested in promoting the fortunes of an Englishman. And he'll move on up into Parliament and he will move... "Well, let's see. Let's see. What could be the most destructive thing that could happen in England today? Oh yes, well, let's nationalize the railroads. And then raise their fares. Yes, yes. That's the proper thing to do," you know?

Just destruction, destruction, destruction. Everybody says, "Well, he always sounds so reasonable. You know? It must be true."

The United States is starting to get this now. Of course, they're getting Heinies. They're getting – they're getting Germans like mad. I mean German Germans. This isn't genetic line Germans. See? This was the Afrika Korps boys, and guys like this, you know?

Guy gets knocked off with a General Grant tank in front of El Alamein. You know? And he said, "Well, damn those Americans. If they hadn't come in we'd have had this thing whipped, see. *Natter-natter-natter-natter-natter-natter-natter.* "

He's too mad at the English. He isn't going to have anything at all to do with them. He goes over to America and he picks up a body. Next thing you know we see him around with an Afrika Korps black motorcycle jacket on. Imitating Rommel. There they are, going around, Hitler Youth movements, all over the place, you know?

Nobody has any way of taming this down or straightening this out, see? It causes political chaos. Because everybody's now-I'm-supposed-to's, his nationalities and so forth go by the boards and they're no longer fitted to fit in any nationality or any framework of government. There's enough people getting mad at the Russians, so God help the next crop of commissars. [laughter] See? Not quite enough time has gone by.

England has set up shop here, about 350 years, you see? They've had a lot of time to get that nicely mucked up. Russia hasn't been in the running that long. But the next crop! *Ha-ha-ha*. That will be something, see?

Quite routinely you used to go from Egypt to the Middle East to Greece to Egypt to the Middle East to Greece to Egypt to Rome to Egypt to Rome to Egypt, and then skip it all and go to Greece. By this time you've been an enemy of Greece, and a friend of Greece, and a supporter of Greece, and Greece is supposed to survive, and Greece is supposed to die, and Greece is supposed to do this and that, and don't wonder that you don't have a very interestingly complicated 3D Criss Cross package. Because it's all messed up. See?

Well, once you start to straighten this out, however, there are very straight now-I'm-supposed-to's which are dominant in spite of all this other. You get the idea, you see, that there could be no dominant now-I'm-supposed-to's on the case, that it just all goes into slush and soup, see. But there actually are, and they will be the most dominant 3D Criss Cross items. And they can be plus or minus on anything.

You can actually take the item at any given time and work out the mores of that person, and the violations of that mores will give you the hottest Prepchecks. It sounds pretty weird but they will, get it? It sounds weird only because you yourself, of course, aren't fitted in with that social structure at all. You sit there and say, "How could this bird be this upset and get this much charge out of 'not drinking chocolate'?" You know?

God! We got tone arm action from here to here, you know? It finally emerges when you do a 3D Criss Cross item, you've got a Dutchman, or something of the sort, and it's – it's a failure to maintain the East Indies or weird something or other going on. It's a hell of an overt! You find out the same time in this lifetime that he's committed every social crime known to man and he doesn't get a quiver on any of them. See, you can't find anything on what you consider social crimes, but you can find on this "Not drinking chocolate." Man, that really cooked it.

You sometimes get an item of "Failed to bite people" or "Bit people" or something like this. See, it could equally be either one, see? It's just because you believe that biting people would be an overt. You have forgotten, momentarily, the overt of omission. See? Overts consist of omission and commission. All right.

Now, don't forget "Guilty." Remember, "Guilty" is lovely. "Of whom and what have you made which guilty of?" And you can do whole Prepchecks on nothing but the subject of "Guilty." It's fifty percent of it, you see? It doesn't matter if... I'm not going to give you a long talk now on the subject of "Guilty." Just being a victim. You think of overts of "Whom have you victimized?" Well, there's a broader view: "Whom have you made guilty of making you a victim?" See? You could use words like "blame" and things like this but it doesn't quite register as sharply as "make guilty." You sometimes will find an auditor that everything seems – this is on your 6A, Form 6A – and there's this auditor and it's just nothing... He's – he's kept picking up E-Meters and bashing pcs over the head with them and he kept doing this and he kept doing that and he kept doing something else and he kept doing something else. Wild, you know? This thing is wild! And no tone arm action.

You say, "Well, he has no conscience of any kind about pcs. He's utterly conscienceless." Then all of a sudden you get on to that "Guilty" question. Oh man! He's been making pcs guilty, you see? Making them guilty. Any time the pc would say anything, he'd make the pc guilty and make the pc guilty and make the pc guilty and make the pc guilty. Tone arm action all over the place. Make the pc guilty, guilty, guilty. Of course, that principle applies to anything.

You get somebody, he has homosexual tendencies or something. Well, socially you're going to ride this into the ground. "Boy, we've really got something here. Man, this is really juicy. This is something. See? This is fine, and so forth." No tone arm action on it. So all of a sudden – guilty – ah, "Whom have you made guilty of homosexual tendencies?" and just *wham-wham-wham!* Because that's all he's doing, see? His idea of punishing, punishing, punishing, making guilty, upsetting, blaming, showing up, exposing. You see? Any type of wording that might fit in with the thing. But he's trying to make that other fellow suffer in a covert way. And this works out to this degree, that any What question, you can bleed it down of just a little bit more charge by putting "Guilty" with it. It's not necessary to do that. Nobody is even recommending that you do it.

"Have you ever let the air out of your father's tires?" See? And we've gone through this whole thing and we've got a whole chain of where he used to go out and let the air out of his father's tires and make his father think he had a puncture and that sort of thing. Something like this, and he did all that. That's fine, we got that all. Not necessary to do this. I'm not telling you, you must always do this or anything like that. But you could also ask, "What – have you ever made your father guilty on the subject of tires?" And you find out there'll always be a little more motion can come off the tone arm on that subject. Yes, because he's done overts, of course, he's made his father guilty in an effort to get a motivator. It's just the other side of the overt-motivator sequence. And it's always sitting there ready to be plucked.

Whatever side of the overt-motivator sequence you run, you can always bleed a little charge off the other side. You see? Not only doing it to somebody, but trying to get a motivator from somebody on that same subject is always hand in glove. The effort to get a motivator exposes at once a doingness. See?

All right. You already got "Appear," and as far as whole track is concerned, you should really go down the whole track. It doesn't matter where you wind up or where you don't wind up, interestingly enough. I knew there was something on a case here in class, I knew there was something on this case because it just didn't add up right. And I insisted that it be followed through, and it didn't appear in this lifetime. It appeared in last life, which I thought was interesting. I knew there was a bug there, and I just wanted that to be gotten out of the road if it possibly could and, by George, we picked it up in last lifetime. So these things will fall through sometimes.

Now, when a pc always dodges into a past life every time you try to get an overt off for *this* life, when the pc has overts for this life that matches the question, and so forth, we're posed a problem. But the odd part of it is, in the normal course of human events, if the pc gets it off on the dodge and then you clean up, "Have you told me any half-truth, untruth or tried

to damage anyone?" See? Clean up that rudiment and then ask him again, he eventually will give you the one in this lifetime if he's using that for a dodge.

Routinely in Prepchecking, you should use that "half-truth-untruth" question and missed withholds. These things are the – are the background viol that's going *hoomp-hoomp* in the corner, you know? You want to ask these things every once in a while. Don't get your pc waving madly around on the needle and the thing is all stalled and no tone arm action without asking for missed withholds, half-truth, untruths, and so forth.

And you'll get to know your pc. And some pcs require this to be cleared up about every ten minutes. You – you'll learn that from that pc. Others require never to be cleaned up. They just don't ever tell you any half-truths or untruths. But some of them, they give you three overts. You can absolutely count on two of them being utterly false. And if you don't pick up that falsity, the two falsities, why, the third true one will keep banging and your meter will just be all out of gear all the time. So the background music that you play all the time is your "half-truth," "untruth," "Have I missed a withhold on you?" You ask people these every – routinely, regularly. They're, you might say, your "middle rudiments," and you'll keep the case straightened up this way.

As far as going full track – whole track is concerned, let them go. Because as soon as your "Appear" comes up, that was what turned the tide. And "Appear" will send it whole track for you, and spit. But it can also plow the pc out of the whole track incident he gets into without it hanging up forever. So it's perfectly safe.

Now, if you were to do a 3D Criss Cross item and to do a Prepcheck on a 3D Criss Cross item – "When have you not eaten grass?" or "Have you ever eaten any dirty grass?" or "What about eating dirty grass?" "What about eating another elephant's grass?" or something, well, we've done some kind of a sort-out on a 3D Criss Cross item – and we've done this four-way run here of When, All, Appear and Who, you inevitably will go whole track. Inevitably, you just aren't going to wind up anyplace else. And you just grind it out, man, grind it out. It's all off one What question. You could make marginal notes about where you've gotten to, and so forth, but you're going to get down to the bottom of the chain.

Now, the chains are all pinned with an unknown. Unknowns appear in the incidents. Unknowns appear at the foot of the chain. The basic on a chain, for a chain to be active and charged, must be unknown to the pc. You are never plowing known material out of the pc when you are running a Prepcheck chain. All you're doing is preparing the pc to find something he doesn't know. And you'll find out that the most spectacular ones sometime are yesterday. He had yesterday mixed up with last week or something like this. You'll find his time is all loused up. Those are very spectacular and very noticeable, but they are not very significant.

The early ones are the most significant. A chain of similar circumstances occurring, reoccurring, happening, happening, happening, time after time after time, *cannot* exist in suspension in the bank without the earliest part of the chain being totally or partially hidden from view. This becomes very striking. This is so much so that I can – I know exactly when a chain will release on a pc. I know when to start going back up again, because the pc just released one big slogging "What do you know!"

We carried it down to a something or other and there was a totally buried something or other at the bottom of this thing. Boy, was it *out of view!* And we plowed this thing into view. I know now the rest of the chain will tear up. You should develop that particular sensitivity. After you've discovered enough unknownness on the chain, the chain will tear up. It's all in the pc's attitude. The pc gets very positive. The pc reacts very directly under these circumstances.

Recurring withholds – of course, the pc that tells you – tells Auditor A, "I kissed a boy last week," tells Auditor B, "I kissed a boy last week," and tells Auditor C, "I kissed a boy last week," that's a recurring withhold, you see? And that means that Auditor A, Auditor B and Auditor C did not get the withhold. They never got the unknown out.

A recurring withhold is caused by the unknown remaining unexposed at the bottom of the thing. The pc only continues to feel uncomfortable about withholds the bottom of which have not been pulled. So you could also find what would be a recurring withhold by asking a pc, "Is there anything you've told me that you would hate to have me write down and publish in the local newspaper?"

The pc says, "Oh, well, that little piece about so-and-so."

That's the one you haven't got all the chain on. The second you pull the bottom out of the thing the whole thing just folds up. But there's still an unknown piece at the bottom of the chain, if the pc still feels queasy about it. Got it?

Audience: Mm-hm, Yes.

All right. As far as missed withholds are concerned, we haven't missed talking to you about missed withholds. But if you ask the pc sometimes – sometimes this is true – if any auditor has missed a withhold on them and the pc says yes and you say, "What is it?" you very often have established yourself a beautiful chain if you work it right and if you ask the What question right.

"Well auditor after auditor failed to find out about my mother, *ha-ha. Ha.*"

All right, it's quite often – not always – but quite often quite profitable just to use that as a basis because he considers it an overt that somebody has missed, so it's already classified as a hot chain.

But this doesn't mean that it's going to be good. It's only as good as it'll move the tone arm. If it doesn't move the tone arm, why, unload into the gravel and let the handcar go putting along by itself.

"Have I missed a withhold on you? Good." Goodbye. Let that chain go by and find another one.

Now, rudiments. The main difficulty with Prepchecking that is constant, continuous, occurs over and over and over, is that Auditor A is auditing pc. Auditor A starts on a What question and a whole chain, and he's got this working very, very well. Pc comes in for next session, has a present time problem. Auditor asks the pc about the present time problem, finds himself in a new withhold chain.

Third session. He's now got the first chain and the second chain now in restimulation. Pc comes in and pc has a – an ARC break and the auditor goes into that and finds himself on a third chain! Now we've got the first chain, the second chain and the third chain all in restimulation and nothing cleaned up.

In this way, the pc, by getting rudiments out, can control the session. And you mustn't let the pc keep throwing the thing to the wolves without rudiments. The only way the pc can do this is if the auditor uses any version of O/W to handle any part of the rudiments. Now, that also, then, would apply to the missed withhold question – or the withhold question in beginning rudiments. It would also apply there.

So you translate that over to – I have – for a Prepcheck session you must use – "Have I *missed* a withhold on you since last session?" as a cleanup. "Have you done anything since the last session that you are withholding from me?" and you get a big fall. Well, don't explore the fall. Say, "Now – now look. Now, listen to me. Now, listen: Since the last session, that was yesterday at such and such a time, have you done anything that you are withholding from me?" and you all of a sudden don't find a fall. You say, "Good. Thank you," and go on to the next rudiments question. Get out of there – because it's dangerous. Why is it dangerous? By having a withhold at that juncture, the pc can louse up the whole session. And they do it consistently. I'm talking about troubles you're having and troubles I've had. And this is how you get onto chain after chain unfinished, see? You get onto chain after chain unfinished, always the same way. And it's just by using any part of O/W to clean up any rudiment.

So you could say, actually – you could say – "What's unknown about that problem?" Pc has a present time problem. You say, "What's unknown about that problem? Thank you. What's unknown about that problem? Thank you." All right. State the problem to him, don't get a reaction, get off of it. See?

Or "What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" You know? State the problem. Don't – no reaction, get out of there. Simple as that.

If you're working over, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" there's no sense in asking it in the rudiments. But you could say, "Who'd I have to be to audit you?" See? And the reason you ask ... The way you do that is, you use as a rudiment question, "Is it all right if I audit you?" – the old, old rudiment question. That is – that's only if you're using "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" as a Zero Question.

And you clean up "Who'd I have to be to audit you?" Clean up any difficulty this way – or an ARC break. But my God don't say, "What have I done to you? What have you done to me?" Oh, no! Just leave your O/W in all shapes, forms, sizes and descriptions alone in the rudiments.

Look, you've got easily five hundred processes you could use in the rudiments from Scientology and Dianetics. You can run engrams in the rudiments. [laughter] But for God's sakes, don't touch withholds or overts in the rudiments, because the pc, every time, will throw you off into a new channel and two hours later you will be sitting there auditing something the pc has chosen and you won't be over into what you were running. And that way you'll just

leave the case unflat session after session after session after session, and it's lousy auditing. So that's how you get around it. Okay?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

If you find yourself being thrown – you all of a sudden wake up a half-an-hour deep into a session and suddenly realize that you are on a new chain of withholds – this is liable to dawn on you all of a sudden – that you weren't on yesterday and you didn't clean up yesterday's, and yesterday's was producing tone arm action and today's is doing something else. Maybe producing tone arm action, but it hasn't anything to do with yesterday's session, yesterday's session isn't complete! No, just bail off that handcar, that's all. Just get off of it right now.

"Have I missed a withhold on you since yesterday?"

"Yu-du-hu-da-duth."

"Have I missed a withhold on you right now? Well, what was the withhold? Oh, well, thank you, oh, good, that's fine. All right. Well, that's all of that now and we're going to get over here onto this ..." And you ask yesterday's What question and get going.

You see just *thud*. If you find yourself that far drawn in, see? Well, break it off. I don't care how smoothly or how ungracefully or how stupidly you break it off – just get used to knocking it out, and stop falling for that. See?

Pc can come in with a new PTP every day and keep you ever from completing any chain or any What question or any Zero question. He'll actually just stay in a total state of restimulation all the time with no gains, nothing discovered, anything of the sort. You've already, I think probably every one of you, had a little trouble with that particular aspect. You sat there and found yourself an hour, you're still going on but it's some new chain that you're running. It's a brand-new chain. Hasn't anything to do with what you were running yesterday. Okay? Well, that's how to get around that.

All right. Now, I've taken up this bulletin with you in full. And I think you will find this – this is quite something or other. Your two Prepcheck bulletins, the two principal Prepcheck bulletins, are very concise and very precise and they're crowded in. They rank along, with – wording – with the *E-Meter Essentials*.

Writing a bulletin like that has two things about it, one of them advantageous and one of them very disadvantageous. When you start machinegunning data, as it is in *E-Meter Essentials*, you're putting the person on "every line is fantastically important." You're not appealing to his understanding whatsoever. You're just machine-gunning him. You're saying, "This is the data. This is the data. This is the data. Datum, datum, datum, datum, datum, datum, datum, datum, datum. You see? Produces quite a high strain. But at the same time, it's awfully easy to review, and unless it overwhelms you, awfully easy to learn. So there's something in favor and something against this type of an approach.

Well, where you get stuff as we have in these two Prepchecking bulletins – the earlier one and this one – it's fairly high tension. Every datum in it is of considerable importance. And they take a different type of approach in study. You have to read them over many more

times because there's much more there. You see, for the same amount of wordage there's twenty times as much there. We only have a few small publications that are in that classification. One of them is *E-Meter Essentials* and the other are these two Prepcheck things. And they're really crowded. And every datum in them is meant and meaningful.

Prepchecking, if you're having any difficulty with it, I recommend that you get these – the first bulletin that was written on it, very precisely, exactly how you prepcheck and this one that I have just taken up with you of March the 21st, and you just read them through several times, one right after the other and all of a sudden you, "Oh, oh, oh. Oh, that's what you do. *Ha-ha*. I missed that. You have the E-Meter on during the session." [laughter]

Okay.

Well, I gave you just this one short spurt tonight. Let you off just a little bit early and let you happily go home. Stagger out into the spring which is dawning here. And I wish you all better luck with your Prepchecking.

Thank you very much and good night.

CCHs

A lecture given on 29 March 1962

Well, you know it's very funny. The older students sit up front and the newer students sit at the back and you look at a gradient scale here, you see and it's... a very interesting gradient scale. People on the very front row look like they might possibly, some day, live. [laughter, laughs]

Okay, this is what date?

Audience: Twenty-nine March.

Twenty-nine Mar. 62, AD 12 and here we go. We are going to talk to you about the CCHs.

CCHs. And this is based on the bulletin of 29th of March – HCOB. The companion bulletins are HCOB of November 2nd, 61 and the HCOB of June 23rd, 61. Those are three of a piece and they fit together and the three bulletins, as you look along the line here, are inseparable.

Frankly, it would be not enough to know one of these bulletins. We finally determined when you run the CCHs. That's been a question which has existed here for many a millennia. In the first place, they didn't exist for many a trillennia. And I'll go into a short history of these.

Once upon a time I was in England, that's up north and at 37 Fitzroy Street, West 1, just after they had moved in, it was apparent they were having trouble with preclears. This was a fact. Some pcs, when they walked in, caromed off both sides of the door. Some pcs didn't hit the door at all. Some pcs didn't even have enough sense to hit the street and there were trouble with pcs.

We were having a hard time getting HGC results. Oddly enough, an HGC which is properly conducted, properly supervised, many, many, many years now, has been turning out pretty good results and turning out very superior results. HGCs were first organized to demonstrate that good results could be turned out and to serve as a model to field auditors and then the HGC became a thing in itself. And it was evident at this time, however, that we had hit an impasse in technology, where we weren't getting the results that we should have gotten. And I developed the CCHs. And they've been in the way, underway for quite a little while, little bits and pieces and fragments of them and so forth. And I finally put them together all in a bundle and we had the CCHs.

Well, this gave us a series of processes, which, if properly used, familiarized – now get the difference here: CCHs don't run things out; the CCHs familiarize the pc with control, communication and havingness, which is the source of CCH – Control, Communication and

Havingness. And the pc does an upgrade on the CCHs in the teeth of the adage that the pc must be at cause. Now you find out in doing these that the pc actually is at cause, to a marked degree, except perhaps in CCH 1, that's to the least degree he is at cause and then at 2 he's slightly less at cause, 3, he's considerably more at cause and 4 he is rather definitely at cause.

In other words, you get a gradient, here, of causation. CCH 1, "Give me that hand," he's hardly at cause at all, but these are not, "run out something" processes. The CCHs actually are a method of familiarizing the pc with control, with communication and with havingness. In other words, he sits there and looks at it and finally finds out he can confront it. You get the idea? That's an entirely different proposition. In other things, we adjust – we adjust the pc's thinkingness so that he can cope with communication, control and havingness and a lot of other things.

You see, you say, "Give me a time when you bapped somebody over the head and told him you were controlling him," you know? "Recall a time you controlled something," something like this. In other words we do an erasure process. We desensitize the thing in reverse. We get the reason why the pc is allergic to communication, control, havingness and numerous other factors, you see? And we knock out that and let the pc carry on. Well, we don't do that with the CCHs. CCHs are straight familiarization. Pc sees that it is occurring and finds out it doesn't kill him. That's about the whole modus operandi of the CCHs.

Now sometimes a pc can find this out in five or six hours and sometimes he finds it out in fifty hours and sometimes he finds it out in 150 hours. But somewhere along the line, he gets an idea that control, communication and havingness are not necessarily horrible. He changed his mind about the thing.

But there's some point of case where a case turns to predominately motivator, as you go down scale, your case gets to a level where it is predominately motivator and won't respond to anything else. Whereas a person has an inadequate idea of cause to be causative.

Now above that point, a person's cause can be increased easily. And below that point a person's cause can only be increased to the degree of getting him to confront something that is going on someplace else. Do you follow that?

All right, instead of letting him run motivators then, you see, what you'd normally get would be this kind of a rig. You'd have Prepchecking and you'd say, well we prepcheck the people as we go down scale, to a point where the pc is run on nothing but motivators. Well, let's look at this, see. We see this gets noplacement, because, if you want to make a test, if you want to wind somebody up in a bag sometime, prepcheck this Zero question, "What has been done to you?" And it's very remarkable, but we have – we have innumerable – we collected these quite by accident – but we have innumerable auditor's reports where this has been done and goals and gains is always "No." Made no gains, no goals. Isn't that interesting? In other words, if we run the motivator side of it, the pc himself decides, after he is saying how abused he has been for the last trillennia, he finally winds up and tells you that the session didn't give him any gains and it's true. It also follows through, to a marked degree, on profiles and that sort of thing.

So we can't run Prepchecking down from, "What have you done to somebody else?" and as we go down scale, reaching for the pc, as he is further south pc, you see, we can't get

down to that level and say, "Well, what's been done to you?" and get anything. In other words, we hit an impasse at that point.

Well, there's where the CCHs take over. Instead of letting him run up further overts by saying what has been done to him, you see, which is all accusative and critical and just runs up further overts, we get him to confront communication, control and duplication. Now I've often told you that the mechanics of auditing, all by themselves, carried out on the basis of, "Do fish swim?" would get someplace.

In other words, the actual actions of the auditor, without any guts to the session whatsoever, just the actions of the auditor, will produce a gain on a case. That is why it's pretty hard to understand how, here and there, it can be managed to get no gain on the case and those actions of the auditor must therefore, be interestingly absent. And that's the values of the TRs. You do good TRs, you sit there, just do good TRs and your pc – something is going to happen to your pc, that's for sure.

Well, you've got this factor of duplication. And you might say that havingness is reachingness. Havingness is the concept of being able to reach or not being prevented from reaching. That's an interesting definition and that's probably a fundamental definition. But then havingness is understood also to be continuous. So we get reach duplication of – duplication of reach and of course this fortifies havingness endlessly. The fellow finds out that it isn't a fluke that he could reach that time. He can now reach again. And he can reach again and he can reach again and again and again and again and again and again and again. All of a sudden he takes heart. He finds out there's a possibility here that he might be able to have. You see, he's still doubtful as he comes up the line and you're getting him to reach.

And now let's take CCH 1, "Give me that hand." It could have possibly also – I am not saying you should run it with this command – but you – "Reach me." "Reach me." "Reach me." you get the similarity here? See, pc really is at cause, see? You could just say, "Reach me." "Reach me." "Reach me." "Reach me." And make sure that he did and it would be quite interesting.

I don't advocate that you fellows do this, although once in a while, some squirrel auditor develops some technology by which he can use Scientology to make a girl more accessible.

Now personally, I find it difficult to understand this, because I myself, you see, have never needed Scientology! [laughter] I don't waste a brag, but I just want to point this out. Here you have a situation where that's a poor show. But you actually could take a girl and have her reach your right knee and your left knee and your right shoulder and your left shoulder and your nose and the top of your head and your right hand and left hand. And every now and then, ask her how she feels about you.

And if you don't flatten the process, just about the time this thing goes into the plus state, she'll tell you she's mad about you, she thinks you're wonderful. That's right. And you girls could do the same thing. [laughter] There's no use being subtle about this – being subtle about this. You don't have to make out that you knew them all of your past life or something like this, you see. Say, "Well, actually we were married once so it doesn't matter," that kind of thing, that's not necessarily right.

Suzie and I have known each other in the past track three or four times and we are both trying desperately to forget it! [laughter] Whenever I get real mad at her, I ream her out for the reaming out she gave me one time, you know? That kind of thing. I think we rode without food or water for three days and nights to relieve the garrison, then she says, "What kept you?" [laughter] I could go on and elaborate this sort of thing, but I wouldn't – I wouldn't found these relationships on past lives if I were you. I'd just be more direct about the whole thing. I give you this particular trick and if you don't flatten it you will find out that midway through, the pc thinks you're marvelous!

It's this Touch Process. "Touch my right knee," "Touch my left knee," "Touch my right shoulder," "Touch my left shoulder," you know, that kind of thing. You don't even have to be more personal than that, you know, you just do that. Now anyhow, if you flatten it, of course they think you're okay, but they're not in this – this super-emotional state. You ought to try this sometime and make sure you flatten it, because it gets to be very embarrassing. It's actually almost embarrassing if you only run it halfway.

Well, I'm just giving you an idea. Here is a change of relationship between the auditor and the pc and of course, "Give me that hand," run properly, of course, gets the pc to do the causative action and it is the most simple, the most elementary of the data I just gave you. That is elementary – "Give me that hand," "Reach me." And if you were to run this and understand the full sense of it, you would do this other test, that I just gave you and you would understand completely why the thing worked.

Person begins to realize they can reach you and therefore will talk to you and you're getting the "Talk to the auditor." That's what you're establishing with that.

Now, the next one up is this individual has been running a body on a machine for a very long time, CCH 2 – old 8-C – has been running a body on a machine. It's quite interesting then to what degree people do not move their bodies around. The body just ambulates and perambulates and walks and bends and sits down and the thetan is back there, saying, "Well, what do you know, look at that," you know? "It sat down, it stood up, I wonder where it's going?" It's fantastic you know. It's just as a total outside spectator, you know?

Sometimes, "Isn't it cute, it walks. It walks. It's talking now, I wonder what it's saying?" [laughter, laughs] And it sometimes comes as a considerable shock to a thetan, on CCH 2, that he is moving the body. And he has something to do with the body. That was why we put the you in there. "You look at that wall" and "You walk over to that wall" and "You touch that wall" and "turn around." That's why the you came in there.

We wanted to emphasize this thing. Wanted to get the fellow in the notion that he was doing something with the body. And there we'd get almost a purely control mechanism. You see your CCH 1 is a reach-me communication mechanism and your CCH 2 is a control of the body mechanism.

In other words, it's trying to assert to the individual that you are in control of that body.

Now CCH 3, Hand Space Mimicry, was developed originally to get the pc in the same communication time span as the auditor. We found out that a pc at this level only understood

tactile and they had to practically be touching something before they were in communication with it. And it's an effort to get a gradient. How far away can the pc be from the auditor and still be in a visual communication with the auditor? That's what this is answering. Can we introduce some space into this idea of hard and fast.

You'll get – you'll get some people working in an organization, you'll get some people that never can put a despatch in a basket and have it delivered. They've got to bring a body with the despatch. There's always got to be a body with the despatch. They've got something – if they're going to write to you and tell you that the laundry has arrived – why, they can't do that.

They've got to come in and present a body and so forth. That's just because there can be no space in a communication. That's all that is.

You see, their cause-distance-effect is minimal distance, see. So it's just cause-effect. And these things, they are more or less understood by them, to be occurring at exactly the same point, with no distance in between. Now, if the pc were in the auditor's head, the pc could be audited. See? That's for sure. Everybody would agree with that. Well, this is an effort to not have the pc in the auditor's head and still get some auditing.

Now we introduce the idea of communication by duplication. We've got some space in the communication. We've got some duplication going on and eventually what do you know, he finds out some more that he can talk to the auditor. Or better, at this stage, can understand what the auditor is telling him to do.

Now, the only mistake that could be made – all of this material, by the way, that I'm giving you here is coming out of the November 2nd, 1961, HCOB – the only mistake that could be made at this stage of the game, is to get too darned complicated.

You could get far, far too complicated at this stage of the game, you see, and give the pc some loses. So keep it – keep it real simple. You want the pc to be mimicking the motion. But it's a "contribute to the motion." See? We're just gradually bringing him around to the idea of *cause*, with that word "contribute." "Contribute to the motion," "Help it out a little bit," or something like that. And you ask him, you ask him now and then, "Did you contribute to their motion?" (hands, see?) "Did you contribute to their motion?" And the pc says, "Yes." And, of course, the odd part of it is if he says "No," that you don't do a thing about it. "Yes" or "No," it doesn't matter what the pc says, you're just planting that idea as you go.

Now, we get up to CCH 4 and we're actively asking if the pc is satisfied. Now, looking over this particular write-up of this CCH 4 – hmm. Yes, auditor asks pc if he is satisfied that the pc duplicated the motion. That's quite interesting because you keep doing it until the pc says he's satisfied and that is the only criterion. This is the only mistake you can make with CCH 4, besides making it too complicated.

Sometimes auditors make it so complicated that they themselves can't duplicate it. And this is a silly position for you to get into. And I do not advocate your getting into this position. There is a level of simplicity-complexity at which the pc finds comfortable, but sometimes – sometimes you have seventeen consecutive different motions, as the thing which

you want him to ... And then the pc says, "I didn't see that, could you do it again?" Of course you're sunk!

The other action which the pc makes here: It's the pc who is satisfied that he duplicated it and you know, that'll drive an auditor sometimes halfway around the bend. He picks up this book, you see. And he lifts the book up level, puts it back down again and he says, "All right, did you – you satisfied that you duplicated that motion?" you see, anything that he cares to say like that, 'cause these are not verbal commands. That is, it doesn't depend on verbalness. And the pc takes the book – has taken the book, you see, and he's gone... And the auditor said, "Well, you satisfied that you duplicated the motion?" And the pc says, "Oh yes." And the pc thinks he has. And now the auditor – and now the auditor falls into the pit of being sneering about it or being critical about it. And you know the pc can just roll up in a ball, I mean, he'll just quit right at that point. You can defeat that whole CCH. Carefully examined it in use and that is actually the only way it really defeats everything. Is if the auditor insists that the pc didn't and starts getting new motions to contribute and does it again.

"Well all right, you didn't do this, so, I mean you say you did it, but let's look at it a little more carefully here," and so on. What I normally do in running it, myself, is when I see that the pc is making some wild, wild duplications that he thinks are duplications, I try to find one that the pc will actually duplicate. And will duplicate sufficiently well that it doesn't make him a liar every time. And then I'll do this one sometimes, is I give him a motion, raise the book up and down or something like this and then he sits there and he scratches the back of his head with the book, you know. Puts it back on his lap and then you say, "Did you duplicate that?" And he says, "Oh yes." Why, I'll do two or three more and then I'll raise that book up and down again. And you know, the pc will eventually see it. It's not done in a critical spirit. I just know this is one he needs drill on badly. And he'll eventually improve it and you'll see him get a little bit better at it. But it's, is the pc satisfied with it? That's how you keep the pc at cause through the CCHs.

Otherwise there's no reason, beyond what I have just told you, why they would work. It's odd that they work at all. It's odd that there are levels that you could audit, where the person does not have any opinion of what you're doing, thinks everything you are doing is bad, sees it all backwards, wants no benefit from it, would rather blow your brains out than follow any of the commands and that you can audit straight through and have the person come up with a gain. That is what is very peculiar about the CCHs. But it is true.

It actually doesn't even require the pc's permission. It's nice to have it, but if you haven't got it, so what.

Well back there in 56 – back there in 56, they were laid out more or less like this. There've been very few changes, except I think the "you" in CCH 2. And very few changes and yet by 1958 the CCHs weren't working. The CCHs weren't working by 1958 and they definitely weren't working in 1959 and they weren't working in 60. The technology had been lost and yet the auditors (one of whom I am looking at right now) that got trained back in 56 actually really didn't want to audit CCHs very badly. I made her run them on a doll, get ahold of a doll and shake the doll's hand, you know, and run them on the doll, and so forth, and she did real well. She got so she was getting fantastically good results on the pc. Just marvelous,

did marvelously. And as time went on, much less able auditors – even more able auditors, they made no results.

Well, where'd these results go on the CCHs? We're already old enough to have had a routine varied and buried and skipped and altered and messed up so that it didn't work. It's a good lesson. It's a good lesson. 1956 they worked and part of 57 they worked. And then they didn't work the rest of 57, 58, 59, 60 and so forth, until I all of a sudden said, "What's this all about?" And I realized that we used to do them differently. And people had stopped doing them this way. That is to say, they were doing each CCH perfectly. But they were not doing them as a combination.

In view of the fact they weren't doing them in relationship to each other, they didn't work. And these CCHs don't work if not interrelated to each other.

There's a certain way of handling the CCHs, in relationship to each other, quite independent of how each CCH is done. And that piece of technology is as important as the individual CCHs. How do these four work together? That was lost. So we get a reissue of that. Short, sweet and succinct. June 23rd, 1961. It's preserved in this particular form. It's taken from a telex sent to Johannesburg. It's not that Johannesburg has a harder time, but that this was – had just been picked up on course here and so was sent down to Johannesburg.

"You run a CCH only so long as it produces change in the pc's general aspect. If no change in aspect for twenty minutes, go on to the next CCH. If CCH producing change, do not go on but flatten that CCH."

"Run CCH 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, etc. use only the right hand on '1'."

We're not trying to clean his hands up.

See, all these complications entered into it, you know, all kinds of complications got born up out of these things. You are right back to their simplest form and this group use of them.

Any pc on Routine 1 and so forth, is completely irrelevant. And another point here: CCHs not run in Model Session – not run on E-Meter. I'll take that up with you in a minute. But it's a code break of Clause 13 which is, "You must not run a process which is not producing change" and "You must flatten a process which is producing change." Clause 13 of the Auditor's Code – not to handle the CCHs this way. By the way, on running a child – on running a child, three times is flat. There is a variation of this rule. They do it well three times – that's flat. Do the whole CCH three times. That's flat. Otherwise, a child will get loses. And this will also work out, you will find, with the worse off cases, so the twenty minutes that we state here, is a maximum time. Maximal time.

Sometimes a CCH doesn't bite for a few minutes. Runs for a few minutes and it doesn't bite. Well, this gives it an adequate time to do so. If you are running somebody who is having a hard time with their attention span: three times. "Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand." They did it three times. Fine, that's flat. Got the idea? Otherwise, they start to think that you're punishing them and they start to think – you're getting loses. So the auditor has to make an adjudication on the state of the case and the attitude of the case, you see? Never less than three times, you know. Don't pull that down to

once, see. And never more than twenty minutes. That's in your reasonable range expectancy. And if the thing is running with ragged differences, it's not flat.

You can watch a person doing CCH 2 and they're doing these things very raggedly. They walk over to the wall, sometimes they look at the wall, sometimes they don't look at the wall. They shuffle their feet, sometimes they don't shuffle their feet, they lean on the wall, sometimes they don't lean on the wall. Comm lags in the length of time necessary to touch the hand, comm lags in the length of time it takes them to turn around. Differences of resistance to direction and so forth. These are all differences, so those are not flat. Then they finally do it three times in a row, three whole sequences in a row: flat. Go on to the next one.

It's the times through. And as long as it's producing a difference in timing, a difference of reaction in each time it's done, as long as it's being different, you want – you want to keep on running it, because it's not flat. But as soon as it smooths out, why, so that you get a – they are all about the same and particularly the person doesn't seem to mind doing it – that's an interesting factor. Probably a more vital factor than the perfection with which they do it.

Yeah, well, that's time to push on to the next one because you're going to catch this thing again anyhow.

Now it's quite interesting. You'll watch the CCHs behave in this particular fashion. You'll do CCH 1: "Person does it standing on their head." Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. Nothing to do with me, you know. CCH 2: "What wall?" Bang! *Ba-ba-bah*. Just all doing on the auditor's determinism. CCH 3: "Yeah, yeah I can totally do it." Everything's fine, give them a book. You raise the book, they raise the book. Raise the book... Go back to the beginning of the thing. You say, "Give me that hand." "*Why should I?*" Just now something is biting, *ooh!* Yeah. There ensues a wrestling match people would pay admission to see. [laughter] Not flat.

You go ahead and flatten it and go on and up and you find the next one is flat or not flat. In other words, you find these unflatnesses and flatten them, is what you're trying to do. Now frankly, if you attacked it from another way, from another approach, the approach they'd begun to attack it with in 58, this would be all messed up. You just get ahold of the fellow and you're going to flatten, "Give me that hand." And the individual has no peculiarities or differences in "Give me that hand" and you just run "Give me that hand," for the next 150 hours. There's nothing happening, just run it.

It goes on and on and on and on and on. There's not enough variation or randomness or different things being addressed in the case to make any difference at all to the case and the case just doesn't get anyplace. And nothing happens. So the CCHs don't work. You get ahold of some people, they actually can't tell anywhere from nowhere and you say, "You look at that wall" and they look at the wall. "You walk over to it" and they walk over to it and then, "Touch it" and they touch it. And they turn around. And they come back and "You look at that wall" and they just go on and on and on and on. And you give them a test to fill out, so that you can get their profile and you come back and you find these horrible pictures of waterfalls with bones at the bottom, you know. And you don't even find the answer to test, you know. This is very puzzling. I mean how come they can do this? It's actually just on the auditor's determinism. Doesn't mean anything to them. The wall isn't anything to them. They're

not touching anything. They're not walking. They're just, "Isn't it sort of cute? Look at it, look, oooh!" Hasn't anything to do with them. Very funny.

And you take one of these cases and you can make a terrible mistake. You can start to run "think" process immediately afterwards, you see. Because the person can do 8-C so well, we'll now run a think process and they should be able to get away... Think? What think? That's the trouble you get into. That's the trouble you get into, when you just tackle these CCHs, each one all by itself and make it an end-all. They have to be in this rotation. If you don't have them in that rotational sequence, not enough different things, you haven't got enough randomness and nothing unsettles. But you tackle it in that rotation in the bulk of cases you run – of course you don't – will go right on and get gains. You run into these sags and flat points and unrealities and so forth. But the person goes through them.

Now there's one exception to this. Is about the only thing that you can run on an unconscious person is CCH 1. You can't walk them around the room, so you're limited to that degree. And CCHs are workable on unconscious people to just the degree that they would be workable, if you ran just one CCH on a person, you see, not very universally applicable.

So therefore, if a person isn't recovering – an unconscious person isn't recovering consciousness – dream up something else, see, don't keep on. There's not a flicker of change or pulse beat or response or anything like that and you've been doing it for two hours and there's no change on it, you're not really getting a response. You're running against Clause 13 of the Auditor's Code. Run a Touch Assist on them. Sounds funny. Person's unconscious, well, run a Touch Assist on them. You also run an unconscious person through an engram. You can also run Havingness on them. Do all sorts of weird things to unconscious people. They very often follow through.

But do something else. In other words, you'd have to dream up a consecutive series of processes numbering about four in all, that'd fit this particular unconscious person. You've got a lot of processes to choose from. One is Havingness. And yeah, "Make that body lie on that bed" and Touch Assists and, "Feel this" or something like that. "Feel the pillow." "Feel your head." "Feel the sheet." "Feel the blanket."

In other words, lay out a pat four that would be the CCHs, simply because you can't run the CCHs on them. You got what I am talking about? Then go cycle through this same four, until you could get some changes. Because it's just – running one thing on and on and on, it's just running into Clause 13 of the Auditor's Code. You're running a pc – isn't producing – on which – whom you're producing no change of any kind whatsoever. And of course, that's just agin the Code. You've got to find a process that does produce change.

Now, the funny part of the CCHs is, once you've found a process that does produce change, *voilà!* The other processes which were apparently flat will now be unflat. The oddity is that one CCH unflattens the other three. Not always all of the other three. But it'll unflatten one or more of the remaining three. You get a change on a CCH, it'll change the other three. Even if you get no change on it, it tends to unsettle the remainder. It's quite remarkable to appear. That was the original way they were run; the original way that we got very good results with them.

Now, I'd like to call to your attention the fact that they're a Tone 40 process and that the Upper Indoctrination, good Upper Indoc is vital to a good handling of the CCHs. Putting that thought in the ashtray, man, that's very important. You lay these commands into the pc's head. The funny part of it is, that they're not necessarily even verbal commands. But you can overstrain this and wear yourself out. For instance I ended session for a pc, I think, last night and it possibly ended thirty or forty sessions or something. And it required no strain on my vocal chords and certainly didn't require any strain on my postulates. I just told her – just gave her a Tone 40 "End of session" you see. All right. It's not necessarily difficult for the auditor. An auditor hasn't – isn't trying to impress the pc with anything. It's just a direct lay-in of it. It's just directional. It's – you might say it's a command without reservation. And it's not necessarily a forceful command or an impressive command or anything else. It's just a command without reservation. You take the brakes off of the thing, you can practically split the pc's skull down the middle.

One other thing I'd like to say about the CCHs before we go on to the rest of "When?" One other thing I'd like to say about them is the fact that they are nonverbal. And you could run them on a deaf person. It actually could be, you see? It'd take a little ingenuity on your part to cut out the total verbalness, but factually, the verbalness is not the chief part of it. The chief part of it is the action. The solidities involved, the solidity of the reach and all that sort of thing. So the CCHs, the common denominator of the CCHs is solids, not thoughts.

That brings us to where we are on "When?" *When your pc does not get any tone arm action on Prepchecking or on 3D Criss Cross, you should be running the CCHs.*

Now the auditor could be at fault, the questions at fault, the list chosen at fault, a lot of things could be at fault. Don't worry about what's at fault. Just put the pc on the CCHs. That's when.

In the absence of tone arm motion on thinkingness processes, do the CCHs. And this will keep a lot of people from wasting time in processing. They all make better gains in processing if you do this.

Now we have a case in point. A list. I know we said on one of the Info Bulletins – you realize 3D Criss Cross is on Info Bulletins, don't you? Because it's not finalized. So when you finally get a finalization of "This is it" (Roman postulates you know?), why you'll get it in red ink, but up to that time it's in Info Bulletins. It permits one to reserve the right to change his mind. And we change our mind on this particular basis. That the pc ought to be on a meter during listing and differentiation. Except it shouldn't be, actually wouldn't need to be, but frankly, a new factor arises. You want to know how much TA motion the pc is getting. How much TA motion the pc is getting while listing and if'n the pc isn't gettin' any TA motion while listing, you have several choices.

One, if the pc does get tone arm motion while prepchecking, you had better continue the Prepcheck and knock off the list, even though you're just halfway through it.

Now, if the pc gets no tone arm motion, whatsoever, in 3D Criss Cross listing and in Prepchecking, you for sure should have been on the CCHs in the first place.

Now, if a pc has been getting good tone arm motion on Prepchecking, but suddenly just ceases to get tone arm motion, this just means you got – you've hit a bad question line. It means you should improve your question line. You know, but this is already against a history of tone arm motion. In the absence of such a history of tone arm motion, getting no tone arm motion of course, you have the CCHs.

Now if the pc on other lists has been doing beautifully on tone arm motion, you all of a sudden hit a list without any tone arm motion, of course, you could just skip that list. You say, "Well, this is getting us no place," and junk it. Start out on another line. Obviously doesn't mean anything to the pc. Don't you see? No TA action.

All right. This is saying when you run the CCHs and what you do, Prepchecking, 3D Criss Cross, so forth, according to the amount of tone arm motion.

Now, there are a couple of additional tests that you can make which are taken up in this bulletin of March the 29th, 62. And these tests are as follows:

Do not confuse a pc's settling-into-session tone arm motion with the tone arm motion being created with the body of the session. Now a pc can come in at 4 and you clean up some rudiments and you start listing or something and the pc settles in and goes down to 3, in the first few minutes of play. And just sits there at 3 thereafter. Well, that's getting the pc into session. And it's the mechanics of getting the pc into session that has brought him down there and given him that sinking arm.

See, the rudiments and so forth, were what was doing it, not the process you were running. And you'll find that that adjusts the tone arm. So leave adjustment of tone arm by reason of rudiments and by reason of the pc getting a bit used to the session, leave that out of it. Just be sure that the pc is getting tone arm motion because of what you are doing, not because of some other factor.

Of course, you realize you could sit there and kick the pc in the shins every three or four minutes during a session and possibly produce tone arm motion. You recognize that?

Now, that's a case of no tone arm motion. The pc has a – rather a history of it or has been going on for several sessions here with no tone arm motion. You can't seem to figure it out. Don't try. Just put him on the CCHs.

Now there is a case where, when you get tone arm motion, you put the pc on the CCHs. And that is every time a discussion of auditing produces considerable tone arm motion you had simply better put the pc right there into the CCHs and that's it.

That's a converse to the rule. I call it to your attention. But we've – already have obliterated that from the first tone arm motion, so it's not the same tone arm motion we're talking about, you see? We say the tone arm motion – the lack – if we get a lack of tone arm motion during the body of the session, that's a CCH.

You don't care why, it's just a CCH activity. You should put him over on the CCHs. All right. But that's the body of a session, isn't it? Now, if you get – always get – a tremendous amount of tone arm motion in trying to get the pc into session: CCHs. There's a case that if you get tone arm motion, you put them on the CCHs. You sit there and talk to this pc on the

subject of auditing and you get tone arm motion. You get three-quarters of a division, a division, a division and a quarter tone arm motion: CCHs, man, don't monkey with it. Why? Well, you should be able to work it out for yourself because the pc of course, has fallen into the classification and the exact category of why the CCHs should be running. The pc is insufficiently familiar with control, communication and havingness to be able to be held in-session. So you always find yourself in trouble trying to get rudiments in.

And you spend three-quarters of every session trying to get the rudiments in, in order to get one-quarter of a session done, during which nothing will get done. Won't get done. The person obviously is so concerned with the fact that there's a session going on that *durrh*, he's not getting anything done. You get why?

All right. Now the other one is – another one case where tone arm motion indicates the CCHs is, if you run tactile havingness on the pc and you happen to notice that you get tactile havingness and you get tone arm motion, but you prepcheck and you don't get tone arm motion: or you do 3D Criss Cross and you don't get tone arm motion, man, that's where tone arm motion directly indicates that you should do the CCHs. That's what you should do. It's obvious, isn't it? All right.

Now, here's the case where you run Havingness and get nice tone arm action and you prepcheck them and you get no tone arm action. Oh man, that's CCHs. Why? Well, it comes under the same heading as tactile havingness.

You read the tone arm, see. And the tone arm sits here – our tone arm sits here at 3.5, sitting there very nicely. And you say, "All right, put down the cans. Good. Now touch the table, touch the chair, touch your head," you know. "Touch this, touch that," and so forth. "All right, pick up the cans." Tone arm is reading up here, 4.25 – CCHs. That tells you their best avenue of improvement for the case.

Tell him to put down the cans, touch the table, touch the chair, touch this and touch the ashtray and so forth, pick up the cans – 2.5. Oh man, they need CCHs like the western desert needs water! That's what they're going to respond to. You see how you adjudicate. As a matter of fact, you'll find that same pc ordinarily, will go up to 3.25 on a Prepcheck question, then go up to 3.4 on a Prepcheck question and 3.2 on a Prepcheck question and 3.25 on a Prepcheck question. And this would be wild tone arm motion for that pc. But on the tactile havingness 4.25 – 2.75, man! You get this extreme case?

You'll find that's very common. You're wasting your time not to run the CCHs.

Now, let's get back to the bad old days when we relegated the CCHs to psychos. Because it's not a psycho process. That's all. It just isn't. Oddly enough, we're finding cases that have been passing for sane for a long time, even on this planet, do beautifully on the CCHs. And make faster case gain on the CCHs than they've been making on thinkingness processes.

Now, because only the CCHs can be run on a psycho that is an inarticulate, combative, noncooperative psycho and because we were so happy at that time to have something that *would* run at that level, people started to attach stigma to themselves because they were being run on the CCHs. And it took a – it was a bad thing.

The CCH level is not much lower than we suspected before, but much higher. See, it runs well up, well up. It runs in the cases that would get benefit from 3D Criss Cross and would get some benefit from Prepchecking. And they will get much faster benefit from the CCHs in the early stages. How do you like that? That's interesting, isn't it?

Now that's a recapitulation of an old process and this is time tested and very true and where the CCHs lost out was in a change of application. The application of the CCHs you have now is – aside from the "When," which we have never been able to answer until now – it is severely the first version of the CCHs. We're actually running the CCHs the way I was teaching you to do it and you were going back and forth on the tram and pumping the doll's hand. I remember that very well.

Very funny. Jenny Edmonds – she was in tears practically over this thing. She couldn't confront this person. She couldn't get through, just wouldn't do it and I thought – so I made her pump a doll's hand and make the doll do the CCHs. She had some time on the bus and so forth; and I imagine that helped her overcome a lot of her shyness, sitting there on a bus doing things with a doll with all the other passengers looking on. Imagine that scenery. And for two or three days her pc couldn't have been scraped up off the bottom of the Fitzroy Street sewers and was going down for the last count.

Now all of a sudden Jenny got the hang of this thing and that pc just soared, just as nice as you ever saw. And just came along fine, thank you. Never saw an auditor more proud of a win. Isn't that right? Yeah?

Female voice: Yeah.

That's all in doing them right.

Actually it isn't true that some auditors can do the CCHs and some can't. That's much too broad a generality. There is this: Some auditors will audit and some won't. I think that's about all you could say about it. But the CCHs done under these existing – these rules, they had no bugs in them other than that, if you just do just this and don't do anything else but this, contained in these three bulletins and you'll find out they work for any auditor.

You sometimes get the idea that some auditors can do the CCHs and some auditors can't do the CCHs, because you're not watching some auditors do the – (quote) (unquote) "do" the CCHs.

And where you get them parked back of a door and they haven't been too well trained into it and so forth, what they consider 8-C or something like that, has no relationship to any bulletin we have discussed this evening. So your – you see, in view of that fact, we got into a bad opinion. We thought that there was some mystic quality about this, see. Thought some auditors could do it and some auditors couldn't do it. Now it isn't true. Some auditors were doing it and some weren't. The gross auditing error was the omission of the CCHs.

You do the CCHs. They're written up here. It takes a certain degree of certainty. It takes a positiveness of action and so on. But frankly doing the CCHs is the most restful auditing that anybody ever did. You don't have to think of a thing! Except, please notice, when it's ceasing to produce change. [laughter] And please notice that it's still changing, if you notice those things.

Of course, you understand it's a natural thing to Q-and-A with the fact that the thing isn't changing to go on doing it. You realize that. You know? It isn't changing, it looks like you ought to keep on. You know? And if it is changing it looks like you ought to change. You know that.

Now, an auditor has to swim upstream against this. And if it *is* producing change, you don't change. And if it has ceased to produce change, you change. Which, of course, is going into the teeth of fate, the time stream and eternity. I mean, that's the exact reverse from the way you've been living. All right, now there's the CCHs. And you're doing them now. I thought you would like to have a very – a recapitulative lecture concerning them and be reassured that no vast changes have occurred in the CCHs since the last time you did it. I hope you are reassured and I already know that you're getting some wonderful results doing the CCHs.

Thank you.

Good night. Thank you.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: CCHs, 3D CRISS CROSS

A lecture given on 29 March 1962

Thank you.

Lecture two, Mar. 29, AD 12. Lecture subject, blank. I'm giving this lecture to give you an opportunity to ask some questions. If anybody feels that they just can't help but reverse the flow, do so! Any questions, any questions? Yes Herzog.

Male voice: Ron, I'd like to know that if you have a case and you process him and the tone arm moves up ...

Hm.

Male voice: ... something about 3.5 or 4, and it stays for a long while there until suddenly he talks to you and, boom, it comes down. You know, in one fell swoop, without him necessarily making a cognition ...

Hm.

Male voice: ... or anything really happening. But this is a kind of a pattern.

The case always does this?

Male voice: That's right.

That's repetitive tone arm motion and is a peculiar phenomenon of where the tone arm goes to the same points and does the same thing without something happening. There's a thing called a stage four needle. Well, this is the equivalent behavior on a tone arm. And it's actually a circulation between two masses. And the individual has mass one and mass two. In other words, valence one and valence two.

And you'll find out that when a case is pretty heavily pushed in, you can almost hear the click when they go through these valences. And valence two reads at 3, and valence one reads at 2, let us say, and they go *click-click, click-click, click-click*. And it hasn't anything to do with tone arm motion. It is an odd phenomenon that you – you've seen there.

You shouldn't suspect that when you see – it creeps up to 2.25 and then it goes to 2.75 and then edges up to 3 and then comes back to 2.5. That's not the same action. It rises up and will get to about 3.25, and sometimes it's much worse than this, sometimes it goes up to 4.5 – more usual, even, and then, *clank!* All of a sudden goes to 3.25, 4.5, 3.25, 4.5, 3.25, 4.5, 3.25. And if you see any variation, adjust your trim knob! [laughter] There are – there are such cases. There are such cases.

You shouldn't confuse it with tone arm motion, because it isn't. That's just a direct read on valence one, a direct read on valence two. It's unmistakable, by the way, you – you wouldn't be wondering very long whether you had a case like this or didn't have a case like this. I mean, I've seen a case hung up in this for quite awhile, and then all of a sudden bust through and do something else.

But there are some cases, you get them in, get them on a meter, and they do nothing else but this. And the auditor sits there and happily thinks the case is moving like mad, and actually the case is going exactly no place. It's as bad as this: When the pc talks to the auditor, he's in valence one. When the auditor talks to the pc, he's in valence two. It will just go, *click-click, click-click*. And then the thing reads proportionately. Okay? Right.

Yes, Charles.

Male voice: In this bulletin on CCHs you mention you run the CCHs 1, 2, 3 and 4 until they're runnable without somatics or reasonably flat – and reasonably flat. Could you elucidate a little bit, on "reasonably flat"?

Well any CCH-type process, for instance "Notice that (room object)" is actually a CCH – it actually comes under that classification, because it's a direct havingness, straight observation process of the present time environment.

All right. If that turned on a somatic, you have to continue to run it until the somatic drops out. That is the fundamental of what you're talking about. See? The fundamental is that, in view of the fact that only a CCH will turn *off* the somatic it turns *on*, or a series of s- you know, running through, maybe the somatic will hang for awhile, and then it'll finally shift down – you're honor-bound, if you start the CCHs, to run the somatics flat off of them.

Now, if you had a case that the somatics came off, but they were still ragged in spots, you would continue to audit it until the pc didn't mind any of them. So, one, be sure and run them as long as they generate somatics. That's vital. That is a must. And then we have the nice thing to do, which gets the full benefit out of the CCHs, is run them so the pc can do them all willingly and do them all well, in sequence, in rotation, and it doesn't bother them, and so forth.

Take off the gross change that you get on the CCHs – the gross change is, of course, the somatic. And then the less gross change is the raggedness or the irregularity and the little unwillingnesses and that sort of thing that you run into on that.

Does that answer that question?

Male voice: Yes, thank you.

Right, right.

Yes!

Female voice: Ron, would there be any extra value in running the CCHs with the beginning and end rudiments?

Yeah, well, I didn't mention that until I was going over it again, because it – I said I was going to mention it, I'll mention it now. Thank you for bringing it up.

If you wanted the CCHs to produce the highest possible gain with the least possible blow, on pcs who are pretty sensible anyway, you'd probably put in your beginning rudiments and do your end rudiments on a meter. And do the body of the session on the CCH. It makes a different breed of CCH, which would of course be rather understood to come about if you started using the CCHs not on very low-scale pcs exclusively, but started using the CCHs on middle-range pcs.

You could possibly have a situation like this: The pc is sitting there with a howling withhold, you see, of some kind, and that's been missed, and the pc is blowy, because of the withhold, and then you get something going on one of the CCHs that causes him to blow, and your pc tries to blow ten times as hard. In other words, by doing this, you could soften up the blow factor, and the pc at the same time would tend to stay in-session a little bit better.

But I would still rather leave this in an auditor choice proposition because it has not been done. You see? It's a fact offered without experimental background. And I ordinarily tell you when this is, and if you want to go ahead and do it, do so, and we'll rack up a few of them and we'll look it over and see how it works, and then it would be whether you did it or whether you didn't do it. But it's certain that on many cases you can't do the beginning and end rudiments on a meter in the CCHs, you see. That's impossible.

But it's also become certain that if you're going to start running people, just because their tone arms don't move because the auditor is not running the right Prepcheck, or something of this sort, well, probably the case would make a better gain if you ran beginning and end rudiments. I don't necessarily say it would. I say it's not necessary to do or unnecessary to do it this stage of the game. This is something that will require more data about. I think there would probably be an additional benefit to the CCHs if it were done that way. And I think also an auditor could get so involved with the beginning and end rudiments, he didn't do any CCHs. So maybe the thing has blessings, and maybe it has curses. It is an idea offered, rather than otherwise. Okay? You bet.

Any other questions? Right!

Female voice: on 3D Criss Cross, is there any indication whether definitely we should oppterm each item as they come up, or get them across? You know....

Well, originally, we hit it in a sloppy way. In 3D Criss Cross we did – oh, several, and then start oppterming. Get several lines, and then start oppterming. And I don't know that this isn't the best method. Once again we're on a data question mark. I do know this, I do know this, that some items are so heavily charged, and the pc gets so momentarily and so tremendously fixated on the item, that you actually couldn't do much more than oppterm them. But on a little work I have been doing recently, I still favor the first method we were using – of getting several lines, and then finding out – and then reading down the items and finding out which one of them is particularly live today, and oppterm it. You know?

There's that possibility that if you did twenty lines without a single oppterm, that you would be running the pc into nothing but sensation. And the pc would just be getting dizzier and dizzier and dizzier. And now I can give you a rule by which you can follow this. The rule is a bit sloppy, but it is still a rule. And that is, if your pc, after you've done one, three, five lines, is starting to complain of dizziness – in other words, lots of sen – or is getting continu-

ally grievous or something – anything that is under the heading of sensation, you know, misemotion or dizziness or sensation; you know, everything is going far away and coming to them again. At that stage you have gone too far without oppterming. And the thing to do is to oppterm. That's when you *must* oppterm. When your pc is getting a lot of heavy sen. Then you *must* oppterm.

But I wouldn't do that just because the pc was getting heavy sensation on one line. Well, so he got heavy sensation on this line and at the end of that, and then you did another line and the pc is now *really* getting heavy sensation and between session is starting to go dizzy. Now, you've got to. Now, you've got to oppterm. The thing – the way to cure that is to oppterm.

So, within these tolerances, it doesn't much matter when you do it. But I can tell you when you *must* do it. Okay?

Female voice: Hm-mm.

All right.

Yes?

Male voice: And you do that by assessing your items, taking one which is pretty heavily charged ?

Yes. The first way we were doing this is probably the best way. That is to simply get a lot of lines, then read through several of items that you've already found – you've got maybe four, five, six lines. You read those and you find out that one is really knocking. That's the one to oppterm. Yeah. And if you're going to oppterm all of them at that time, you would read through the remaining ones and find out the heaviest one and oppterm that one, until you'd opptermed them all. You'd of course would really oppterm them all. You wouldn't leave one out just because it wasn't knocking. You'd oppterm anything that you'd ever found. Even if it was wrong.

Try and oppterm a wrong line sometime. That is really marvelous! That winds up back of nowhere faster than any other operation I could guess at. Because you've come up with a wrong item on an original line and now you're going to oppterm it. Pc goes way out into left field and falls in a gopher hole and that's the end of that! Okay?

Yes?

Female voice: Could you tell me, when you start doing the third line, how many lines to get to the person – oppterm – before you start to oppterm – you know, do your third oppterm.

Now ...

Female voice: I mean when you get your one item, then you oppterm, do you go down – further down the line and oppterm again?

Oh, well, oppterm smoothly. In other words, if you're going to start oppterming, you wouldn't get your third item until every first item had a second item.

Female voice: Yes, I know. I see.

All right, now, you get everything a third item. And, you wouldn't start getting anything a fourth item until everything had a third item. In other words, you'd fill up the lot.

It'd be perfectly all right to have – as far as I know, and from what I've seen of this – to have twenty first items with no second items at all, see, because you've got one item each, unless you run into this sensation thing I was talking about. And then your person starts going dizzy, and so forth, between session, you better start oppterming. Well, the moment you start oppterming, oppterm the lot, see? But take the first one that's the heaviest one. Now, don't get your third item until you've got the second item for everything. In other words, keep a balance to that degree.

The reason why, if you don't do that, is you start losing lines. You lose lines, inevitably, anyhow. Lines all start to cone in toward a limited number of items. But you start getting the third one before you've got the second one, and the bank gets all monkeyed up so that you get your second one over here as the third one and you've already – lose a line. See? That's real heavily charged and it appears over on the wrong line. And the next thing you know you're narrowing much too fast. Okay?

Female voice: Yes.

All right.

Yes, Fred.

Male voice: Would the sensation phenomena also apply to the pain phenomena, if you were getting only pain? Would ...

I'm sadistic.

Male voice: You would continue on if – you wouldn't oppterm it then?

It'd be almost impossible for the pc to maintain his terminal. You see, the mechanics of the thing, Fred, are these: that the pc *is* his terminal. And a terminal always has pain on it. And here is this terminal on which there is pain, facing outwards, always, against an enemy. So, you've given this terminal he's stuck in, an enemy, an enemy, an enemy, an enemy, and he gets dizzy because he just got too many enemies. But on the pain phenomena, he's simply being somebody else. You see? And you actually wouldn't get that kind of a phenomenon. You won't get 3D Criss Cross turning on constant pain, but you will get 3D Criss Cross turning on constant sen.

Male voice: Thank you.

You see why?

Male voice: Yes.

Yeah. All right. You bet.

Male voice: I just wondered why you left out the one side.

Yeah, well, that's – the reason why is the pc – the pc as his terminal is never opposed to the pc as his terminal. See? Now, you can give him too many enemies. He's stuck in being a cat. And you don't know what he's stuck in. You haven't found a cat yet, you see. You're

finding a lot of other parts of the package. But actually all this time he's being a cat, very obsessively – you've never relieved this one, you see. And you get a lion, and you get a dog, you see, and that's real cheerful. And you get a dogcatcher and – and then you will go along a little bit further and you get a housewife, and you say, "This is interesting here. We're finally finding his female characteristics, you know." And then we get a small house, and then we get a sandbox.

You see, up to this time we haven't added up why – what we've got there, you see. And the pc can actually start stacking up, and the phenomenon that he's stacking up is, "They're all agin' a cat."

And it's looking like a mighty hostile environment to the pc by this time, and he'll go – start going zzzzzz-zzzzzz, wog-wog and actually get dizzy enough that he can't walk up and down stairs. I mean, it can get that gruesome. And also, you've occasionally heard of the pc where the room – walls of the room went out of plumb? That's all part of the same sen, by the way. That's just sen. That's too many oppters, too many enemies. I didn't mean to beat it on the head, but it's interesting that the fact that – the second he's out of a cat, you see – so a cat has lots of enemies. Now – now he is being a warrior. That's his terminal. Well, all right, that's got lots of enemies, too. But one of its enemies is not a cat.

Male voice: Uh-uh.

Okay?

Male voice: Thank you.

Right.

The mechanics of the mind. They're very mechanical. They for sure are. Gets to be fruitless after a while to get lines when sen is on too strong, by the way. Because you're just getting opposition to the same thing, you're just getting more and more oppositions to the same terminal. Those lines are all going to disappear. So you're just overworking yourself for nothing. That's only when sen turns on.

Okay. You sure started one with that!

All right, any other questions?

Well, I'm glad you know it all! I'm peculiar in that I don't!

Yes, Jan?

Female voice: Are these two still correct from last spring? This is CCHs again. "If the pc fights you tooth and nail, steadily, for twenty minutes, that's no change."

That's correct!

Female voice: "Or weeps steadily for twenty minutes, you come off of the thing."

Yeah, that's relatively speaking correct. You can be too severe with this. Because the pc, you understand, would have to be in a very interesting state to have no change in the fighting, or no change in the crying. You know. For a pc to weep without change for twenty minutes, that'd be very peculiar. But by the definition, that is absolutely correct. The pc weeps for

twenty minutes, and he weeps the same for twenty minutes, you've reached a point of no change in that CCH.

Female voice: There's another half to it, and that was, the business about you don't count a somatic which the pc simply describes to you, but you can't observe it, on his body.

Oh yeah, that's right.

You can't see him twitching or clutching bodily parts in anguish ...

That's right, if you cannot detect ...

Female voice: ... if he had a splitting headache you can't see it ...

If you can't detect the somatic on the pc because of physical representations, the pc doesn't have one, as far as the auditor is concerned. The auditor never buys any statements of the pc. These are nonverbal facts about the CCHs. CCHs are nonverbal. You see that pc, and he's going this way, you know, and he, *oooooh*, and so forth, *hoooo*. All right, so there's something wrong and the pc's got some weird things going on in the cranium and it hurts. All right. Fine. Fine.

And the pc says, "Oh, I have a splitting headache, and you do this just one time longer and my head is just going to fall off and this is absolutely killing me. And I've never had anything kill me as hard as this is killing me," and so forth. It has no validity with the auditor. Just has no validity.

We've had too many pcs dream up somatics. That's where that comes from. They'll go into valences of victims and give you a long line of symptoms and so forth and they get at the motivator side of it. When that motivator thing starts running out, they give you victimization dramatizations. Of course, pain, factually speaking, is a victimization dramatization. Okay?

Female voice: Yeah.

All right. Yes?

Female voice: I wanted to add to, or to ask something about what Jan said. If the pre-clear, say, happens to be – I've never seen this particular thing – but if the pre-clear should be crying for twenty minutes solid, without change, just boo-hoo-hoo, the same type boo-hoo-hoo, but say that before you looked at your watch he began, or he or she began crying two minutes before your twenty minute period, so that in fact he had been crying twenty-two minutes, but without change – you know, I mean without any change in crying – so, on the basis of "The process that turned it on, if continued will turn it off," could you then make an exception to that twenty minute period? You see what I mean?

No, actually you can strain at these things too hard. Because for the exact same *boo-hoo-hoo* to carry on for twenty minutes, it's not going to run out. That's all there is to it. It just isn't going to. You're not likely to see any change in it at all. But, remember, for twenty minutes of exact *boo-hoo-hoo* without ever any change of note, or – or sniffing up and saying, "Well, we'll be brave now," and nothing like that happening, is quite unusual. And if the pc started, you know, *hmm-uhh* and so on. Well, all right, and went on for two seconds, and then *boo-hoo-hoo*, and then so on and so on. Those are all changes. We've got here, actually, an ideal situation, or a theoretical situation, as opposed to a practical one. Okay?

Female voice: Thank you.

All right.

Male voice: Ron, on the subject of pain, why is the pain on the pc's terminal ?

You tell me. Come on, Peter. Tell me.

Male voice: Well, he – he – he's in the victim valence.

All right.

Male voice: But this seems to – doesn't phase with the fact that...

I'm not being smart with you. I really meant it. Tell me. I'm not being smart. I don't know! [laughter] I just tell you that that's an empirical observation. It's the darnedest thing I ever saw in my life! Yeah, how come the pc only experiences pain when he's in a terminal? How come he experiences sensation when he's in the opposition terminal? The difference between these two things is fantastic. And reason it is so fantastic is, if you run the pc on the oppterm, you just wrap him up and put him on ice. You ruin him. And you run him on one of these painful terminals, he runs like a dream. Yeah. All right?

Female voice: There's an overt there kicking him in the head.

Huh?

Female voice: There's an overt there kicking him in the head.

Yes, yes, it must be – an overt. It possibly is in that field, you know? They possibly don't have any overts, except on what they're viciously in.

If you look this over, it doesn't seem too unreasonable that a person should experience pain as himself and sensation as being somebody else. Well, that's fairly obvious. But why is it obvious?

All right, it'd be an overt if, as his own terminal, creating pain with somebody else he would directly feel the pain only when he was in the terminal that had created the overt. That's highly probable. Highly probable. I won't go all out on the thing. It's just an empirical observation, as far as I'm concerned. And you really took the lid off, didn't you? You're sorry about it, aren't you?

Male voice: I'm feeling pain. [laughter, laughs]

Now, that's strictly, strictly an empirical fact, and undoubtedly it's explainable, and that's probably the explanation that you gave. But nevertheless that is peculiar. You can always tell which is the pc's terminal. That's the only thing we could ever find that would tell the pc's terminal. You pays your money and you takes your chance, you know? You start running the oppterm as the terminal, oh man! All hell will break loose. Pc almost caves in. The case gets some advance, oddly enough.

You know, I've seen an oppterminal run flat with the terminal still totally alive. It was – didn't seem to matter how long you ran the oppterm – it didn't do anything to the terminal. Backwards situation for some reason or other.

You can take an oppterm and run it overtly, and you'll see it go flat, and the pc will feel better. Or, God help you, if it's one of the beefier ones, he'll just go into more sen and more sen and more sen and finally the room is spinning, and the Prehav Scale starts beefing up and everything starts going to hell in a balloon and you wonder "why did I ever begin this intensive?" So does the pc.

So, you need some signal. You need some signal to differentiate the terminal from the oppterm. And the oppterm gives sen and the terminal gives pn. That's as far as we went with it until you opened your face. [laughs]

Okay. Yes Fred?

Male voice: You said before, don't buy any statements from the pc since the CCHs are not verbal. But CCH 3 and 4, we do handle preclear originations. Especially in 3.

Only out of courtesy.

Male voice: I see.

Ah, it's just courtesy. Keep the pc from being ARC broke. You couldn't care less. You really don't care. You don't care whether the pc talks or doesn't talk, or anything else.

Now, in ordinary auditing – in ordinary auditing you'd pay considerable attention to it as to whether the pc was advancing or not. You would monitor it to a large degree on what the pc was saying, and how the pc said he felt, and all that sort of thing. And oddly enough, you can trust none of that in the CCHs because the most fundamental and basic stuff is running off, and this fundamental stuff will cause the pc to do and say the damndest things you ever heard of and most of them are outright lies.

Now, anything – anything that will run off electric shock or Metrazol shocks, and so forth – that has as much power as that as a process – of course, will also run off all kinds of counter-creates of every description, and certainly runs off verbal counter-creates. And you're liable to get these weird statements on the part of the pc. And if an auditor wasn't fortified in advance, that they are not verbal, an auditor would change his approach to it. And the auditor's approach to the CCHs is grind on, grind on, grind on. Doesn't matter whether the pc says the moon has just become solid pink tea, he grinds on.

The pc will try every trick in the book. "I can't stand it!" because this is the thing they can't stand. Communication, control and havingness are the three things they cannot tolerate. So they'll actually think of all sorts of things to throw you red herrings and everything else. I never trust a pc when I'm running the CCHs. I don't trust them at all.

Pc says, "I feel much better now."

"I'll bet you do!"

It's almost so much so – I have an impulse to say, "All right, where does it hurt?" [laughs]

Because those processes will run off a fantastic river of counter-create. For instance, if a person's had a lot of – a lot of ridicule in his life. Supposing a person has been ridiculed, ridiculed, ridiculed – raised out in the Bible Belt, something like that – ridicule, ridicule, ridi-

cule. And you start running CCHs on him, you know the ridicule will run off. In other words, the counter-create comes off. So therefore, you're going to have somebody sitting there ridiculing you all the time. Just understand what you're looking at. You're looking at a counter-creation coming off of the pc.

And a pc doing the CCHs *never* originates. They *only dramatize*. Nothing is truer than that. You may, in having it done on yourself, get the subjective reality on it. All of a sudden you say, "What am I saying? You know. What the hell was that? Why am I doing this?"

Well, it's actually some kind of a counter-create and it's just coming off, that's all, and it comes off in the muscles. Sometimes it comes off in the vocal chords.

Yeah, yeah. Well, if it'll run off electric shock, it'll certainly run off mama's jeering. So therefore your pc will jeer.

All right. Let us suppose he was – had a parson for a father. And all his father ever said to him – he'd lie there with a broken leg – is "I'm sure everything will be all right now." See. And his father'd beat him, and say, "I'm sure everything will be all right now." And his father'd kick him down the stairs and say, "I'm sure everything will be all right now." And give him a new bicycle and say, "I'm sure everything will be all right now." You audit this pc, the pc will tell you, "I'm sure everything will be all right now."

He just can't help himself. He's going to tell you that, that's all. And you, you fool, if you believe him, you probably haven't vaguely run it out, you know? So you just don't pay any attention. You'll be on the safe side. You don't have to get into a games condition with the pc. Just ignore it and do the CCHs. Okay?

Male voice: Yes. Thank you very much.

All right. You bet.

That's a point I'm glad you brought up, Fred, because it's an interesting point. The process is so heavy, you know, the CCHs are so heavy that a person goes into these dramatizations and he just can't help but dramatize the doggone things. Sometimes he feels silly. Sometimes he feels this way and that way, watching himself dramatize these things. But if the pc is aware of the fact he's dramatizing, why is the auditor paying any attention?

Okay. Yes?

Female voice: Is there any reality factor to be established in the CCHs?

Any reality?

Female voice: Factor – at start of the session or after the session, if he inquires about changes or anything. Is that to be established then – talking to him? You know?

Oh, you mean get your R-factor in as to what you're going to do and that sort of thing?

Female voice: Or rather inquiries after the session.

And after the session answer his questions? And so forth? It'd only be proper for an auditor to pay attention to this. That's as close as you are – must get to rudiments, is you tell the pc what you're doing, you tell the pc why you're doing it, or anything you care to. Try to

get the pc's agreement to do it before the session begins. Anything you would care to do to get a session started, or anything you are able to do, and then you run the session anyway. See? And after it's over the pc wants to know this or he wants to know that, or he wants to know something or other, and so forth. Well, if you can tell him without evaluating for his case and so forth, by all means do so. And you'll find the pc will stay in a closer ARC with you.

Yes, the R-factor is established in all cases. In essence you do it by rudiments. But you notice these demonstrations I've been giving you? Usually before I start a session we'll get some kind of a rundown on an R-factor. Seldom after the session. But certainly before the session, because, just before the session ends, you have, "Is there anything you'd care to say or ask before I end this session?" See? And you get your R-factor questions at that time.

But I normally will talk about auditing to the pc or ask them how they've been doing or something of this sort, before the session begins. Give them time to catch their breath and brace up to it. Well, it's that type of R-factor that you establish in the CCHs, or you tell the pc what you're going to do.

Say, "There's a bunch of drills and I'm going to do them. We'll see if you can do them," and I'm not above leading the pc into a complete trick on the basis, you know, tell the pc, "Well, there are a bunch of drills and very smart people can do them, and very stupid ones can't. Now, let's see if you can." Anything, it doesn't matter what.

The CCHs become most trying to me when they start in at a high scream, and it's a high scream from there on out, and you're obviously just breaking a person to pieces bit by bit and leaving the chips and punks of flesh all over the floor, and the – and it's just a wrestling match from the word go, and no R-factor of any kind can be established. I always have the feeling when I see this is happening, that an R-factor could have been established. Inevitably I have this feeling. I always wish I had established the R-factor better. Okay?

Female voice: Yes, thank you very much.

Right. Yes, Jim?

Male voice: Referring back to dramatizations that occur when a CCH is run, how closely might these be connected to terminals and oppterminals?

Oh, very closely. Yes, very closely.

Male voice: I see. I wonder if you'd like to say some more about that.

No, no, not particularly, because nothing can be read out of it. The worst that the pc is sitting in starts to discharge, because the one thing this circuit can't do is duplicate. And another thing the circuit can't do is have. And the other thing the circuit refuses, of course, is control. So you start to give a person control, communication and havingness, and inevitably they start blowing in and out of 3D Criss Cross items. And these things will bang in and out most gorgeously. But normally you'll find your pc is usually sitting in no more than one. And this thing will try to discharge. And the pc will get these heavy masses beginning to occur around him, that he's never (quote) had before (unquote). They've always been there, but he's had them totally not-ised. And the CCHs knock out the not-is.

So, weird things show up that the pc has never seen before by the simple reason of the vanishment of a not-is. The communication, control and havingness run out the not-is and start to get an "is," of course, and it shows up this valence. It's inevitably a valence. And around him some opptersms will inevitably show up. Now, they very sel- occasionally show up as actual masses that the pc has never been aware of before. And he thinks they've been turned on by the CCHs. And he thinks they have been made tougher by the CCHs. Neither case is true. If anything, they've been slightly turned off, and his feelingness has gotten up to a point where he could feel them. These are true.

And you'll notice in doing the CCHs, these surrounding masses of the pc will tend to loom up where the pc has not seen them before. And he'll start to get somatics inside himself that he has not seen before and not felt before. And then these will discharge and very often he moves on the time track in the valence he is in, to a more comfortable position.

To run them all out by the CCHs would be impossible.

Male voice: Oh.

Yeah. It's quite interesting, but the phenomena which you see in the CCHs is the phenomena of a valence. And the phenomena which occurs around the pc is the phenomena of opptersms.

Male voice: It ties in with the familiarization, too, you know.

That's right!

Male voice: Because the preclear if he's pretty sharp, would get a familiarization with the kind of terminals he's going to encounter later on.

Yes. That's right. Very definitely true. Okay Jim.

All right, any others? Yes, Jan?

Female voice: Since Peter's question I've been wondering if there is or could be manufactured a pair of definitions that will cleanly distinguish between "pain" and "sensation." Practically, they're not hard to tell apart, but to put into words ...

Well, I'd say it is very simple. It's very simple. Now, wait a minute, it's very simple. Unfortunately it would be impolite of me to say, "Richard, shake her," and "Richard, stick her with a hat pin." But those would be definitive.

Female voice: Yeah.

Got the idea?

Female voice: Yeah.

Or, "Richard, disorient her." See? All right, that's sensation.

Female voice: Yeah.

Sensation is that which is produced by reason of other beingness and dislocations. And terminals are produced by direct contact between the thetan and an identity. The pain is produced by the directness of the contact. In other words, the pc is more intimately connected

with the terminals, always, because he is the terminal. And he feels more directly the pain involved in the thing.

All right, what is pain? Pain is heat, plus cold, plus electrical shock. That is pain. And if those three things are combined exactly, and somebody touches them, a thetan touches them, he gets that experience known as pain. It comes at the wavelength of 1.8 on the Tone Scale, is the sensation wavelength that he gets, and that is known as pain. He must be intimately connected with the mass. In other words he must be touching the mass with an idea that he is it, as a difference than "other is it."

All right, now, get the idea of you – you know this is your hand. And you put it down on your heat-cold-electrical shock gimmick, the response which you would get – knowing this was your hand – would be the sensation as pain. It'd be quite sharp and it'd have a very definite wavelength, and so forth.

Now, if, as you touch this table, somebody picked up the table and moved it around, or pushed the table up against your hand, or shook the table, see, you'd get sensation. Now, emotion is more intimate. Emotion is more intimate – like tears and apathy and that sort of thing – is more intimate to the person than ordinary motion, but is still within that band.

I wouldn't go so far as to say that emotion was exclusively an oppterminal action or exclusively a terminal action. But I would go so far as to say that sensation could include emotion, rather safely in your adjudication of the situation, and that a pain definitely determined the terminal. The sensation is what you get being kicked up 150 feet into the air, tumbling over and over, and let fall. Now, that would give you a sensation. Being taken out and hung over the side of a building and told you were going to be dropped, I think that would give you a sensation. Get the differences in these things? The sensation is inevitably dislocation of space, and pain is inevitably alteration of form. Where emotion fits between these two things is a question.

Yes?

Male Voice: Well, this isn't strictly a question, but with regard to Peter's question about why would a terminal have the pain end of it, we might have an attention factor, because I notice when you're hurt, your attention snaps inward. Now when you have sensation, your attention tends to snap outward.

I think that's probably a very reasonable answer.

Male voice: The oppterm would be over there, and the pain would be in, so it's ...

That's right, something like that. Of course this is a difference of why you have these things, as opposed to their existence. Yeah. They do exist.

Male voice: Yeah.

Yeah. Now, why they exist, well, there're some explanations could be given. You had a good one. Self always has the overts so therefore is the one that hurts, because therefore he's pulling in hardest on himself. Trying to keep from pushing out against the other ... I don't know.

Biggest mistake anybody makes, of course, is regarding a human body as self. That's marvelous. But, of course, you can regard anything as self. Just anything. I can think of some manufacturer regarding a factory as self. And somebody drops a wrench into one of the drill presses or something and smashes it up, and he goes, "ouch!" Actually is not the least bit peculiar. Might sound odd, but it's within the framework of it. He considers the factory himself. And you've seen mothers double up like jack-knives when little Johnny is hit in the brisket. And she regards little Johnny as not an oppterm but herself – an extension of self. I imagine if you smashed up an E-type out here ... [laughter, laughs]

So, that would be the way it is.

All right. Well, it's nice to have a question period for a change. I hope that you've enjoyed it as much as I have. And I also hope that your next couple of days' auditing will be as successful as it has been getting lately. Your auditing is getting more successful, have you noticed? Have you noticed that your auditing is getting more successful? Have you thought that it wasn't? Well. You're getting more successful? Is auditing getting dangerous? Dangerously successful?

Well, I want you to get these lower edges fixed up. I want you to get CCHs and Prepchecking, 3D Criss Cross all wrapped up, because the Class IV stage I've pretty well got worked out, and it's just about the easiest stand-on-the-head that anybody ever did. It's all in reverse. Prepchecking is actually harder than 3D Criss Cross. And apparently Class IV is much easier than 3D Criss Cross. So we run backwards on these classes. The easiest action comes at the highest class. That's the way it's happening. That's the way it is. But, of course, it's only easy because you can do the two lower classes.

I pretty well got that end of the game wrapped up. As a matter of fact I can see the goal post in the end of the line. And I've been studying for quite a while to find out the best way to handle terminals and that sort of thing. And I had to wind up with some new factors of common denominators of terminals. And that was one to wrestle with. And we needed that one before we could go on with Class IV, and so we wound up with that one. So it's all easy going from here on out. Probably. [laughter]

But all of you should be very good at these lower levels before you get onto the upper one.

I want you all to have twenty or thirty or forty items. I think that's not unreasonable – thirty or forty items on your 3D Criss Cross plot. I think that's easy. I think you should get your basic chain shaken out. I'm more eager now to make sure that you get any CCHs that are going to be flattened – flattened. And any 3D Criss Cross you're going to get done – done. And to learn how to do Prepchecking very, very well. *Learn* how to do it very well as opposed to putting your end-all weight on it. Because, actually Prepchecking can be used after the fact of 3D Criss Cross, don't you see, and it's most valuable after the fact of 3D Criss Cross.

So, I'd be glad to see you wrap up your CCHs, as an auditor and as a pc, and wrap up 3D Criss Cross as an auditor and as a pc. See, so we can get on with the rest of this sort of thing.

Okay? Thank you.

The Overt-Motivator Sequence

A lecture given on 3 April 1962

Thank you.

What is this?

Audience: April the 3rd. The 3rd of April.

3 April? By golly, you're right. One lecture, Saint Hill Briefing Course, 3 April A.D. 12, and I haven't got anything to lecture you about because I got a withhold.

Female voice: What is it?

Male voice: Tell us. Well?

Yeah, I got a withhold.

Male voice: What's it about?

Are you interested?

Audience: Yes!

Well, I haven't prepared it or revved it up, but I've been taping a Class IV.

Audience: A-a-hhhh.

And I finally just tipped it over – just tipped it over on Class IV, and so forth, and now I got it taped. I've been fooling with this for some time – what do you do with 3D Criss Cross items and that sort of thing?

And what do you know? (This is all I'm going to tell you. This isn't a lecture on the subject.) The only thing I was withholding is that the solution to what you do with 3D Criss Cross items, of course, is the resolution of what makes the overt-motivator sequence; and I've suspected this for some time. And I just got some processes and so forth, here, which undo the overt-motivator sequence. I think it's absolutely fascinating. And the withhold in this lecture would be the fact that I, out of my own interest and so forth, would normally talk to you garrulously about this particular action, because I'm terrifically interested in it – the overt-motivator sequence. How the hell did it ever get that way, you know? And can it be undone? I've been asking that question for ages. Instead of having to run it, can't you undo it? Because

I know it'd be a junior phenomenon, see? And sure enough, apparently you can undo it. And so that's a good piece of news.

So anyhow, I'm not going to give you any more about that in particular right now. End of withhold. I'm delighted, you see, because if you think of running out all the things which you have done and from which you are suffering at the present time, you see, when you run these out one by one, and selectively on the whole track, it becomes one of these things like running out every engram on the whole track. It's just an impossible action, it's so long and arduous.

You take Jim over there, for instance, or you take Dick or somebody like this, and you get all of these overts – you get the idea? We won't even mention Peter. [laughter] You get these fantastic numbers of overts. And if you're going to suffer from every overt you have ever committed – see, that's impossible. I mean, mathematically, on one lifetime, you'd be dead a dozen lives over, don't you see? And if you got a motivator for every overt, for instance, and so forth, how could you live?

So I've been fooling around with a lot of combinations that have to do with energy and MEST-universe ideas, and ideas and that sort of thing, and it's – comes out rather well. And apparently it's a very junior idea to prevent people from attacking.

And I have now told you about all there is to know about it, even though I would love to go on discussing it for a long time. It's just a mechanism to do just that one thing – nothing else. That's it. Well, end of withhold.

I'm terrifically interested in the Class IV. You have no idea. This has practically laid me in my grave trying to get this thing done, because you start going over the top of the whole Goals Problem Mass, and just not-is the lot, and sit around and look it square in the teeth, and reserve aplomb in one way or the other, it's something like living in the middle of the living lightning, don't you know? And like to got my head kicked off on this one. But that's about all it amounts to. It's fascinating, isn't it?

And it's just a mechanism. It is not even an axiom. See, it's nothing. Because every way you look at it, it can't be. It'd be impossible. And there wouldn't be any way by which this could be.

You see, if the only thing that ever affected anybody was you, in the final analysis – you get this now – then you would have a perfect alibi for everything you had ever done to anybody. Don't you see that at once you have never done anything to anybody? You see? So therefore, looking at that, that makes it look pretty specious, you know? You say, "Well, that's – that's kind of a gag."

And now, if nobody ever was affected by anything except what they themselves did, do you realize you have never talked to anybody anyplace?

Audience: Hm-mm. Yeah.

See? So from all these sides ... You know, I've told you for years, the overt act-motivator sequence was limited. You know, I knew it was limited, but I couldn't find the entrance point of how the hell you ran it out. And I imagine I must have tried at least, oh, I don't

know, fifteen hundred, two thousand combinations trying to blow this thing down just as itself, so – that is, that would run, that would run on a case. Just nothing would, except itself.

You look at it from numerous other angles, and it becomes impossible. If only you have ever affected you and nobody else has ever affected you, numerous things then apply. And amongst those things, you wouldn't even be able to keep the same time track. See, there's a lot of things wrong with the overt-motivator sequence. I've known that these things weren't reasonable. But I knew at the same time that everybody had fallen for this malarkey and that everybody responded to it.

Well, if everybody responds to it and everybody has fallen for it and it processes – you ask a fellow what he's done, and this immediately relieves things. And his withholds and all that sort of thing – these things are all pertinent to this. And they all relieve, don't you see? I mean, you can work with this; you can operate with this.

So it doesn't wipe out all processes which do things with it. Doesn't wipe out Prep-checking. You can sit down and prepcheck somebody, you know. And that's fine. But how about just knocking the whole ruddy computation in the 'lead? And now I have just opened up a nice, wide-open, twelve-pass express highway that does. It is just a mechanism to prevent people from attacking. That's all.

And handled in that fashion in processing, why, it all becomes very explicable – runs, in other words. Like to kill you, running it.

But I don't wish to leave you in mystery. I'll give you a specific process: "What shouldn't A attack?" "What shouldn't you attack?" That should carry you well enough. Of course, to keep in communication with the subject, why, you have to add attack, you know? And then because that won't be explicit to some people, you will have to get synonyms for attack. These are the usual complications which arise when you release a process.

So if you do an overt assessment of the Overt Secondary Scale, it'll probably give you a better word for your one particular pc. But it would be on the basis of "should" and "shouldn't." But this, of course, could be expected to be modified to "could" and "couldn't" and "have" and "haven't." You see the variations – these are the normal variations through which a process goes.

But if you just got somebody to list, who was sitting in a whole bunch of motivators and overts and so forth – just list what they shouldn't attack, just as easy as that ... That, you should remember, was the lead-in. It might not be the final process that you run, but that was the lead-in on the research level which gave the result and made, all of a sudden, the overt-motivator phenomena look, of course, as corny as Christmas tinsel. It's just a mechanism by which people have dreamed up ways and means to prevent other people from attacking. That is all.

Of course, you don't want people attacking you, so of course you tell them that you shouldn't be attacked. And you tell them how you shouldn't be attacked, and then you tell them what they shouldn't attack, don't you see? And what you overlook is, at the same time, they're teaching you what you shouldn't attack – the same time you're doing this. So eventually it looks like you have an overt-motivator sequence.

See, the most sensible thing in the world is, is there's certain things which you, in a human body, shouldn't attack. And the lesson which you learn from the physical universe: that if you attack these things you get hurt. And that is the basic mechanism and the learning-ness which underlies all the overt-motivator phenomena. See?

Well, then, if you don't believe me, take your fist sometime and start a buzz saw up, and – oh and let's not be quite that violent, lawn mower will do – and hit the lawn mower in the blades while it is running. Well, as far as that's concerned, just find a nice, rough stone wall and haul off and hit it, and you are immediately taught this lesson: that you shouldn't attack it. Because it reduces your havingness, of course.

So you teach yourself the lesson that you shouldn't attack, and then this goes into a philosophic wingding. And the philosophic wingding comes after this fact. You see, after you've learned that you shouldn't stick your paws into lawn mowers and shouldn't kick paving blocks, and various things – when you've learned all these things – why, of course you've learned the remainder: that is, what you do unto others will happen to you.

That's not true at all. That's a philosophic extrapolation from the fact of what you do you get recoils from. And it comes back to the basic law of inertia – Newton's law of inertia. It's a physical universe law: says what you hit hits back. It's as simple as that.

Now, you can build this up philosophically, that if you say something critical of Joe, Joe is going to say something critical of you. And if you say something critical of Joe, why, then you can be hurt by Joe's criticism.

But a withhold is basically nothing more than your unwillingness to attack or your unwillingness to be attacked. And that's all a withhold is.

You can take any withhold a person has got: if he gives you this withhold, you could ask him, "Well, what shouldn't attack you about that?" and run that off. And then, "What shouldn't you attack in this particular way?" – any phraseology you care to use. Your withhold is going to evaporate.

See, your withhold system also takes care of it, but there it is. It's quite fascinating.

I'm sure you will excuse my absorption with this particular scene, in view of the fact that it is the single complication that makes your case awfully complicated. You get so that you won't bawl out cops and you go around being good, and all kinds of wild things accumulate as a reason for this.

Personally, I've never learned this too well. It's not that I've been particularly bad in that particular thing, but nobody has ever really taught me I shouldn't attack. I mean, it's been rather hard to grapple with the thing. People have tried. People have tried.

But I'll give you a little hyster – historical note – a little hysterical note here, which you might find amusing. Hasn't anything to do with the price of fish.

One of the points where this broke down was, I was examining what on the track I felt worst about. I wasn't getting audited; I was trying to find out what I felt worst about, see – you know, that I had done. I was trying to bracket this thing, this overt-motivator sequence, you see? And it was necessary that I do this and get studying it, and I've been very reticent

about this recently for this reason: is it looked for a while that doing anything to anybody's mind was the most destructive thing you could possibly do. That's quite interesting. I was studying that, you know, and I got the bad auditor, and so forth. And I went on and looked at this even further, and taking responsibility for somebody else's mind, and that sort of thing, it looked like it was a pretty bad show, see? So that looked awfully bad for auditors.

Well, I wasn't trying to disprove this, and you can get quite a jolt out of this by running it on somebody – "Whose mind have you helped?" or something like that, you know. And you would think offhand that this would be what tangled up your wits, you see – would be helping somebody or doing something with their mind.

And I went through a little period there of looking this thing over, and it had a limited workability, and it did make some sense one way or the other, and fortunately proved to be not true at all.

It is the energy involved. It's the attack on the energy involved. It's the attacking of energy. And it's not even bad to attack energy. It's just that you have tried to convince people, and people have tried to convince you, that it was very bad to attack energy. So you become allergic to energy.

The definition of being good – as long as I find myself talking about this – the definition of being good is the definition of being overwhelmed, you see? A person who is good is overwhelmed.

I first began this study nautically in this life. It was a naval study with me. There's one thing: I'll hold something that bugs me, that I don't understand and I'll put it in a bull pen. And I'll put it over on the side. And I'll say, "This green puzzle doesn't fit with these pink pieces, you know? What is this thing, you know?"

Well, one of those things was the fact that every fighting man I ever had under me was always in bad with other people at a time when they needed fighting men. And the only people that were getting any pats on the back with the shore patrols and so forth were people who weren't worth a damn. I mean that – just weren't worth a damn. There was definitely something wrong here.

I'd have six or seven sailors out of a couple of hundred, you know, and they'd – man, action be engaged, one of those fellows (I don't think the period could have been longer than about a minute or thirty seconds, or something like that), he was at the wheel correcting the course, he was up on the gunnery platform correcting the training of the guns, he was down studying the chemical recorder, and he was handling the engine room telegraphs; and while he was doing all this, he was carrying on a conversation with me.

And on almost any ship I ever had in action, there'd not be more than four or five people on the ship that would help me fight her.

And you had this enormous supernumerary, you see, out there. That always bugged me, because these boys were the boys who were always in trouble. The people didn't like these fellows. They were always in bad. They weren't particularly bad people, but they were just always in trouble.

I've seen it now, you know? Some fellow – God, he'd have hash marks, and he'd have gold chevrons and eagles, you know, clear up to his shoulder, and he'd come aboard, you know, reading Horace or something, you know? He'd walk aboard with his package of laundry or something or other, and check himself in at the gangway and go below and put away his book and his nice, clean uniform. And his record would be beautiful and he'd always say "Yes, sir," and everything would be so nice. And he was a very pleasant fellow and not very obtrusive. Nice man, you know, and so forth. And he'd have all of the bonuses, you know? And he'd have all of the stuff that anybody ever awarded anybody. Service records, you know: "laudable," "terrific," "marvelous," you know, and just rave notices in this damn thing.

And in action you would just have to knock him out of your road. That was all. Always be in your damn road. "Go on up forward someplace and you know – stand down there with the damage control party. Don't get in the road." You know, some totally ineffective function. Get him out of the road. Ammunition passer – maybe you'd get the ammunition there and maybe you wouldn't, you see? But there'd just – oh! There'd just be dozens of these guys, see, just dozens of these birds, drawing all the pay, getting all the pats on the back.

And then here would be these madmen: always in trouble, always upset. When the ship was engaged, it would have sunk without them. Well, there's something here, see?

These weren't necessarily bad men. Looking them over, they weren't criminals, nothing like that, but just nobody liked them. This fact used to stick in my craw. I used to study this. I did an awful lot of studying of men and life and things like this, and it's something I didn't quite understand. But the shore patrol just loved these other fellows. I never knew what to do with them – use them for spare anchors or something like that? It wasn't that I didn't have their loyalty and affection; I did. But action would be engaged, they would be just as calm as they always were.

And you study men under stress and men in various guises and men under various actions of this particular character, and you find out that the world has built up a series of superstitions about people. And they're not facts – they're superstitions. They hardly even are dignified as findings.

Your animal psychologist has categorized the whole lousy lot. I mean, he's got them all. His textbooks are nothing else but the mirage of ought-to-be, see? There's no facts in there. It's just a bunch of ought-to-be.

He tells everybody, "Beware of anybody who is active." Isn't that interesting? "Beware of anybody who is active." You will find in the civil-defense manuals of the United States government, in that area delegated to (ha!) psychology, that the whole provision that they have made is for anybody who gets active: and if a citizen were to start flying around and talking about what should be done or what shouldn't be done or blaming the government or saying anything like this, he is the one you have the butterfly nets for. And this is why you have psychological units in civil-defense teams. They're the butterfly-net people, and they're supposed to pick up these guys who get active. And that's exactly what it says.

I'm not minimizing this or I'm not stretching it or – I don't have to. I mean, it's a marvelous example of "be good." You see, the whole U.S. civil defense system is based on the idea that there is a thing called the government which is composed of people (which already

is silly), and they're going to take over the country at the moment of an attack, see? They aren't there now. They're not part of the people, and they're not human, you see? And they're parked up someplace in Canada along the DEW line or down in Mexico or out on some island – and they don't exist there now. And at the moment of an attack, nobody is supposed to do anything but be taken over by the government. That's what you're supposed to do in an attack.

Consider it absolutely fascinating! It's just as bad as Eisenhower's design for the Normandy landing. I mean, there was nothing worse than that. I didn't know this until the other day. I'm going to write a book on it. I'm going to call it "The Great Myth." You see, I was a Pacific amphibious warfare officer before these Normandy landings occurred. And there are certain ways you're supposed to make landings. Well, they didn't make them that way at Normandy ha-ha! They killed men instead.

So anyhow, I didn't know it was that bad. But this is some more of your the-government-knows-all sort of a situation and "no individual is going to do anything." You got that? No individual – we're not going to count on any individuals. The government is going to do these things. You get the idea? The government is going to. Somehow or another, totally disassociated from anything that is made out of skin and blood, see, this is all going to be attended to.

So the government teams are going to take over in certain zones of the city, and so on. And it's all worked out. And the only thing they've overlooked is these people are people. And apparently, looking over the Normandy beachhead landing schedule, there weren't going to be any people involved and there was going to be no war involved. I think this was interesting – those two oversights that they made.

As early as 1941 I noticed something that probably nobody has noticed, that I might comment on, and – that war is the antithesis of organization. And if you organize in some dim hope that when battle is joined that organization is going to prevail, you're going to lose your war, because then it breaks down to the being, the person, the man on the job. And the other schedules never go off right. They just never, never go off right.

The fellow who is supposed to be there at 5:61, well, I can tell you from experience that he is never there till 5:00 and 61, if he appears at all. And if the whole intricate machinery depends utterly upon this man pushing a button at 5:61, man, you've had it. Because this – look, this fellow is flesh and blood. This fellow is die-able. And war is the antithesis of organization. War is chaos. And the only thing that you can organize for is chaos. And if you're going to organize it, organize for chaos; and that's the only way you can organize.

And if you're going to organize for chaos, there's one thing that you must count on utterly: the individual. There can be no great third-dynamic shadow which suddenly spreads out across the land and makes everything all right. Who are these beings that are going to take over the middle of these huge cities and set it all to rights after the bombs have landed? See? Who are they? Well, they're human beings. Well, by that very fact, you can count on the fact that some of them are going to be missing.

Now, in space opera we very often tape this better than they do on planets. Very often – very often – they have relatively indestructible dolls, relatively indestructible robots. But they're forced into building these things by this other factor: the extreme destructibility of

individuals and beings in areas of disaster. And even in space opera these fellows disappear. Oh, I love one of these. It's like the – I don't know what battle that was; I don't know what the Union called it. It was one of the first battles that Grant fought. The Confederate general was Johnston – very early, out in the West someplace or another.

But the only thing the poor Confederates did wrong was draw up a wonderful plan of battle; the most marvelous, intricate plan of battle you ever saw. At these times these regiments were going to be there, and this was going to be there, and everything was going to be there, and it was all going to be marked out this way.

And of course, they do all this for a battlefield nobody has been on yet, don't you see? They lost. We got clobbered.

This Normandy beachhead: Demolition teams had twenty minutes to knock out all the underwater obstacles on the whole of the Normandy beach. Pfft!

In the Pacific we used to spend three days and use certain tools, but they didn't do it over there. They had a schedule, and it ran off – bzzzzt! And for seven minutes this happened and then seven minutes this happened. No part of this schedule is pinned to an actual event, don't you see? No part of this schedule is pinned to anything having happened. It's only pinned to the clock. Do you see that?

You get how mad this will get after a while, see? Unless you pin something to an event and say "Seven minutes after this happens or has occurred, then you start the next event" – well, you can do that. But you for sure can't say "At 6:00 this happens, and then at seven minutes after six this happens, and at fifteen minutes after six this happens, and at 6:30 this happens." Well, you can count, you see, on whatever is happening at 6:15 has probably not quite arrived and is probably taking place at 6:35. So the team that is enroute to do this thing at 6:30 runs into the team that hasn't done what it was supposed to do at 6:35, and – ooooooh!

Don't you see what happens? A confusion is an untimed, uncontrolled area. Well, you've only got one guy. You've only got one guy. I don't care how many textbooks you write or how many psychologists you give degrees to, you've, in the final analysis, only got one thing. And that is a being, an individual being. That's the only thing you've got.

Now, he may have responsibilities, and he may have dynamics and he may have a lot of other things, but that's all you've got and don't forget it.

You know, I can see some South American reformer, some Simon Bolivar. A great guy, Simon Bolivar. No doubt about it whatsoever. And this is not what he did, but I can see some lofty, ivory-towered character, and he says, "Now, let's see. Our people should do this. And our people should do that. And the government should do this. And the government should do that. And then all will work out to a marvelous utopia. Yes. So here is the schedule."

Well, man, I'd let that poor fellow in on something: He is working with the individuals he is working with, and he is working with nobody else.

Now, every once in a while somebody runs an ought-to-be on me on organizations. And I noticed from an essay Peter wrote one day over a telex spontaneously – oh, it's a snide piece of thing. You can't mock up a thetan. But they run it on other people besides me.

And people are always saying to me, "Well, why don't you get some 'good people' in central organizations?" That's a hell of a slam, isn't it? People on the outside, "Why don't you get some 'good people' in Scientology?" you see?

Where's this fantastic reservoir called "good people"? [laughter] Where is it?

Well, I can tell you the last one to have a monopoly on it is the United States government or any other government. They don't even know that it might exist.

But all of their actions are based on the fact that in some mysterious way "good people" are suddenly going to occur without anybody doing anything about it, you know. Just from somewhere, "good people." It's as pathetic as the Greeks sitting down at a battle one time, as it talks about in Plutarch's Lives, sacrificing and making auguries until the right moment to repel the attack, you know? Greeks are just falling in windrows on all sides of this dumb bunny, and he's busy slitting the guts of birds to find out if it's all right to make the attack, you see? "No, that liver isn't all right. Give me another bird." Slit him up. "No, that liver isn't all right." Man.

It's what's known as being auguried to death. Even a private commented on it and went down into history.

No, there isn't any such reservoir. There isn't any such reservoir, and that's basically what everybody has got on automatic at this particular time. They've basically got it all on automatic. "Good people." That's what they got on automatic. All the systems are geared for "good people."

Government selection. Military selections. School teachers. Everything else. Any body that you can think of, it's all geared to the fact that from some mysterious reservoir someplace, some "good people" are going to come along and pass some examinations, and it'll all be all right.

Brother, one of these fine days, St. Louis or Chicago, or somebody ... The rest of their atomic plan, by the way, depends utterly on the fire engines coming from Chicago to take care of St. Louis, and the fire engines from St. Louis going to Chicago to take care of Chicago.

It never occurred to these dumb – ah, that ... [laughter] never occurred to them that any elementary atomic planning would cause the bombing of St. Louis and Chicago simultaneously.

So anyway, they got it all figured out that from some mysterious reservoir, why, these minutemen of steel, impervious to all excitement, are going to show up. And what are they going to do? What's their first instruction with regard to people? That to take anybody who is doing anything – see, any private citizen that isn't duly authorized, you know, isn't wearing the magic badge, Fifth Fire Brigade or something, or the Royal Atomic Defenders of the Gasworks, or something – if he hasn't got the right badge and he's trying to say to people, "Go

down that street there because it's still open," if he's standing there at the corner doing this, then the butterfly squad has orders to pick him up. He's the man they want – in the nearest hoosegow, quick.

And that is what the psychologist in an atomic war is being trained to do: to pick up the active person. I consider this fabulous, you know? I studied civil defense in the United States, and then my stomach gave out. Actually, there are probably only about five thousand people in the United States that know anything about disaster relief, and not one of those people has ever been called to the civil-defense department, which I consider very, very interesting. They were the people who handled civil defense in the various war theaters under chaos, and so forth.

But these beautiful organizations, man: "Yeah, George, Bill and Pete will go in Joe's car three and a half minutes after the first alarm, from the south entrance of the building." Oh, no, you know? You can see it now: They never get out of the car park. Just one of the things that happened: Bill didn't bring his car to work that morning. See?

You're dealing with beings, you're not dealing with punched-tape card systems and that sort of thing. You're dealing with individuals. And I don't care whether you're trying to make a perfect government or if you're trying to make a perfect civilization or a more livable world or anything else, the basic building block with which you build is an individual, and there is no other building block. God isn't a building block; government isn't a building block; the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Uniformed Cats isn't a building block. None of these things are building blocks. It all comes down to the individual.

Is he any good or isn't he? And that's the other question. Is he competent or incompetent? United States today – not roasting the United States, particularly – recently passed a rule that no officer could be promoted until his wife had been passed on by the admiral.

Well, I suppose I've been an admiral a few times in my past lives, but I never went that far to make ... [laughter] Honest. I never had to go that far. I didn't. I never had to go that far. You just look around: There's this pretty girl; it's a pretty girl. All right. And you used to say "Whhst!" you know, like that. You never had to pass a law under Congress that part of an officer's fitness report was the availability – I mean, excuse me – [laughter] the niceness of his wife.

I can just see that wife now, out there on the bridge of the destroyer, steering like mad during the battle, can't you? I can see it now.

Oh, man, how decadent can you get? What's that got to do with it? And yet I've seen officers and officials and organizational people promoted simply because they could slap better on the back and hold more liquor more asininely than anybody else around. So of course they get promoted.

No, it's competence. If you want to get something done, you depend on the competence of an individual, not his socialness or whether he's a good fellow. It's "Can he do his job?" That is all. Can he do his job?

Now, yes, it is true that an individual can be so mean and so vicious and so something or other that he gets in the road of doing his own job. Never met one myself, but I'm sure that can exist.

No, an individual is either competent or incompetent.

Now, when an individual ceases to be able to run his own life, you always can have communism. You can always have these group idiocies which take responsibility for conduct out of the hands of the individual and place it in the hands of some God-awful, God-help-us monster whereby everybody decides this. Everybody decides what he's supposed to do and what he isn't supposed to do, and whether he can spit, and whether he can breathe, and so forth.

But let me ask the burning question: Who's going to tell him? See? You get the point. This is the idea they never think. They never think this one other step. After you've destroyed all the individuals, who's going to tell them? They never think of that one.

It's a fascinating point. It's the automaticity of competence, the automaticity of this vast reservoir of competence, which somehow or another is always going to rise up someplace.

One of the ways they meet this is they've got everything all geneticized. You know, you raise good horses? You know, if you breed the right mares with the right stallions, why, you get an intelligent horse. I don't think anybody has ever been able to make animal husbandry work, but it's still a popular superstition. If you make being a horse so uncomfortable that no thetan – no self-respecting thetan – will have anything to do with it, you'll have a bunch of creep horses. [laughter] You will, too! You can see them at the horse show now, misbehaving.

All right. Now, the basis of the individual is his ability to observe and make decisions and to act. And that is ability: his ability to observe, to make decisions, and to act. He has to be able to inspect and know what he is looking at – what he is looking at. He has to be able to make a sensible summary of what he is looking at, and he has to be able to act in accordance to what he's inspected.

Now, I don't care if you go into the field of study. This is true of a student, this is true of a soldier, this is true of anybody: If he can't observe and can't make decisions about what he observes, why, he's in bad shape. He's in a bad way, very promptly.

Well, he couldn't help but be. I mean, if you knock out any one of those points ... All right. He can observe and he can make a decision, but he can't act – in any way, shape or form cannot act on his data: You've got a fool.

Now you take somebody who can observe all right and see what he's looking at, but is unable to make a decision before he acts. He's a nut.

Now you've got somebody that's perfectly competent to make a decision – perfectly competent to make a decision – and perfectly competent to act, but always does so without observing anything. You've got a catastrophe, man! That's a catastrophe.

You got Congress. Congress is always building a man-of-war. You know, in 1896 they were building a square-rigged, line-of-battle, wooden man-of-war. They actually appropriated money enough to build that thing. They couldn't observe where they were. They kind of slipped on the time track. So anyhow, you got these various things.

Now, the only way you could have a good country, from my point of view ... Well, you can have all kinds of systems. Doesn't matter how many systems you have. The world is system-happy right now. My God, the one thing we don't need is one more governmental system. They haven't got a good one, and they probably could use one, but actually they haven't got the fundamental on which you would build a system.

And the fundamental you'd build a system on would be an individual. I don't care how many communisms or "Engelsisms," or something, that you dream up, you're never going to have a utopia. You can Plato-ize day and night for years and never come up with a utopia that would work unless you have individuals who are able to observe, to decide and to act.

I'm sure that Mussolini, taking people who were – they had been pretty badly knocked around over a long period of time. He was making his way, but they were still having to make all the decisions in Rome. All the decisions had to be made in Rome. And the only trouble with a fascist government in a small town was they could maybe observe and they could maybe act, but they had to telephone Rome for the decision.

Well, the funny part of it is, you see, Rome wasn't there to observe and Rome wasn't there to act. So this got looking pretty weird, and their – a government like that gets pretty unwieldy. Nevertheless, they were making their way forward until they finally got knocked in the head. They got knocked in the head because individually they hadn't come up along the line into enough determinism yet to actually stand on their own two feet.

The main thing I'm trying to say is, here, that just if you haven't got the individual, you have nothing! And if you go in the direction of a system, if that system isn't designed to eventually make individuals, then it's a system which will fail. And it's the only kind of a system that you dare embark upon.

You embark upon any other system that ends up in slavery or ends up in the total subjugation of individual ability to observe, ability to decide and ability to act – if you impede any one of those three things – you're going to find yourself with a slave society on your hands. I don't care how many labels the thing has. So the only system that is justified is any stopgap system which pushes people forward in this direction.

I know I myself am rather proud of the fact that the dispatch traffic to me from any Central Organization of five years ago consisted easily of five hundred pieces of paper for every one I get today. Isn't that interesting?

The volume used to be fantastic! You know, "Ron, can I spit?" Man, it'd just be about that bad. And that has just cut down and cut down and cut down and cut down, because all the time we're working in the direction – we have this tremendous advantage. Of course, individuals are becoming more independent and more capable of observation, and so forth. I don't go on the basis that it's all right for them to make terrible blunders and knock everybody in

the head before they learn how to walk. But I would incline slightly in that direction, that it was better for them to make a few mistakes than to be guided every minute of the time.

Their cases are coming up the line, everything is coming up. From where I sit, we're making it just this way. We're getting more and more autonomy. Our communication lines are longer and longer. We are acting, oddly enough, more and more in concert, which is rather fantastic, you know? I mean, the further apart we seem to be moving, the more in concert we are seen to be acting; and the more we get good individuals, the more coordination and agreement we have. Isn't that peculiar?

The reason you have an organizational form and the reason I lay down organizational forms is basically (1) on experience, and (2) to get agreement amongst organization members so that they can move forward.

But I myself, in the early days, was the first one to scoff at any need of organizational form, as any old-time staff member can tell you. I used to say, "Oh, for Christ sakes, you're not going to make me define that!"

Well, yeah. So there's an interim in which a system can exist, but that system gradually goes out of the way to the degree that individuals are brought up to being able to observe, to decide and to act. And it's the only way you can make any progress, from my point of view.

Now I daresay, if I were to talk to some professor of "learnedology" in Spinbin U., who had a socialist penchant about it all, I imagine that I wouldn't talk this way. I would probably talk to make my point with him, because I amuse myself with those jokers. And he would be selling me the great value of the system, and I possibly would never even dare tell him what I thought or the truth, because his realm is in the never-never land of nowhere.

I well remember one debate that I had with such a character. He was one of the leading socialists of New York. And before the evening was over, in front of a bunch of intellectuals, he had admitted and declared, and had now begun to stand up for this one interesting fact; he had progressed from "socialism is wonderful" down to this interesting fact: that the only way that you could make socialism work was to kill every man, woman and child in the world. I finally got him to agree to this and was all set to go on forward on a program to put it into effect, when he suddenly found the garden path down which he had been led. But he still had agreed that this was correct.

How he got there was, of course, just by total specious spuriousness; you know, making him agree by shades, to agree by this, to agree by that. But it was all on this basis, that you couldn't have an individual. See?

Obviously, you see, you have a socialism, why, then obviously you couldn't have an individual. If you had to have the socialism, socialism must exist because you couldn't have an individual. And then, of course, I led him on, on this gradient scale, and then finally he realized that the only way it would really work was to kill every man, woman and child in the world. And then it would really work. You might really have a socialism. And he was quite sold on the program. That's known as brainwashing by gradients.

But you see whereof I speak here.

Now, if we have systems which depend utterly on making people good, we can never get out of the soup. But we can't have systems which make everybody good if we mean, by this, blind acceptance of a now-I'm-supposed-to without inspection, without decision, but only by action. If we totally concentrate on an action, an automatic action, and if we call that automatic action "being good" – see, you see an old lady crossing the street, so you're being good, you must help the old lady cross the street. "So now I'm supposed to help the old lady across the street." You get the idea?

She just got through shooting her daughter-in-law in the guts, you know, and she's carrying the .45 in the bag. But that's beside the point. "Now I'm supposed to," you see? Without observation, you're supposed to act in certain set patterns. That is what they call being good.

And the only way that is achieved is by overwhelming a person with energy. You overwhelm a person. You show him that he will get into too much action – more action than he can stand – if he does not concur with this action. In other words, he chooses to have this minor act or actingness, see; he chooses this minor actingness in lieu of all of this *rwooooooooooooowrwoooooowr*, see, of *krwow*, see?

You know, the way to make little Johnny eat his peas is to take a whip, don't you see, and to whirl it around in the air a few times and hit him across in the behind and scream at him real loud. Well, that is action he cannot confront, isn't it? So you get him to not confront this action in order to do the action of eating his peas. See how that works?

There are other ways you go about this, of total loss, total ostracism: "You're going to be expelled from school if you don't study ...if you don't study..." Oh, I don't know what they study in a school. I've never been able to find out, but, "If you don't study it, why, you're going to be expelled, and your father and mother will never speak to you again and they won't feed you, and you'll be thrown into the gutter, and socially you will be totally ostracized." And that's what an E, F or G grade would mean when you're in the fourth or fifth grade, see? You're ostracized.

As a matter of fact, this even works on you, see? I use it simply on the basis of you better get a rush on, or something of the sort. You don't take it that way. You take it on ostracism – "Ron is mad at me," and so on. I never feel that way at all.

No, it's the out-create of action which brings about the fixed actingness that we know as "being good." See, "We can create more action and energy than you can, so therefore your only choice is to fit into this small actingness and energyness pattern." You got the idea? Well, you get into this on the basis of coordination. You coordinate the actions of quite a few people. Yeah, you can snarl them into line and so forth; it has a certain workability. But it only works up to the basis where they know it works or where they know it should work that way, or something.

In other words, it'll only work in the direction of consulting their observation of things. If they can now observe that this is workable, or that they would do it anyhow, and they would have decided to have done it anyhow, and got on this actingness, then perhaps you would be justified for a while in saying, "Ra-ra-ra-ra-ra-ra, and I'm going to out-create you until you do so-and-so, and so forth." You get the idea? "I can shout louder than you can, so therefore you're going to do this actingness." You get that?

Ah, but that is not the road the world follows. The world follows a total different one. It's "Regardless of whether this is reasonable or unreasonable or anything else, man, you're going to do it and you're going to be blind to everything else from there on." We call it "faith." We call it "discipline."

They used to take a soldier who deserted from his post and stand him out in front of the rest of the troops and shoot him down, or spreadeagle him on a wheel and beat him to death, or hang a sailor over the gangway and slash him to death, or just, you know, something like this. A Sunday – you'd never go to church on Sunday three hundred years ago but what you didn't pass some guy in the stocks who had been doing something or other, been drinking beer or something like that on a Saturday night, or some other criminal action.

In other words, there were various actions by which more energy was thrown at the individual than he thought he could confront. This is the idea of making people good, do you see?

So therefore, he fixed in this pattern of action because it was a choice of either fixing in this pattern of action or trying to face all of this unfaceable and unfrontable energy. Do you follow me?

That's being good.

Now, when you have a totally disciplined nation, you have a total failure. A nation which would make everybody good and sacrifice every individual characteristic in it, sacrifice everybody's observingness, everybody's decidingness – you got a complete end product: complete failure. That's what you'd wind up with – a complete flop. And there's where every old civilization goes, and that is why they become *old* civilizations. That is why they decay, that is why they become decadent. Because people just become gooder and gooder and gooder, by which we mean they observe less and less and they decide less and less.

You have this fellow walking down the middle of the street taking a certain mincing gait and so forth, not because he thinks it's anything, but because he's supposed to do it because his ancestors did it.

Oh, you can think of thousands of examples of this sort of thing. And when you finally get a totally decadent, totally gone society, it gets licked up by any chaos that hits it. It can be overwhelmed. By what?

Well, if everybody in it was trained to be good by being trained that they couldn't confront certain energy masses, then of course any hostile energy mass that shows up can conquer it.

So an old civilization is set up by its own premises to become conquered, and you have the cycle of civilizations. And that is how they age and that is how they die.

Now, the way an individual ages, the way he dies, is to give up his power of observation and his power of decision, and acts on the basis that he cannot do as much as he used to be able to do, he can't stand as much as he used to be able to stand. And he attributes this to advancing age. He never attributes it to being able to stand less. The source of advancing age is being able to stand less. Advancing age is not the cause of being able to stand less.

In other words, aging is caused by a lessening ability to confront action. That is all. It's not because the person can't, but he merely ages because he believes that he can't. Do you see how that goes?

See, it's a reverse, look. Well, if the way age is regarded at the present time doesn't solve old age, which is that an individual gets less and less active the older he gets (do you see that one, the less active, you know, the older he gets, the less active he is) – if they follow that through uniformly, let me point out to you that this does not result in a knock-out of old age. So it couldn't possibly be true. See, if everybody believes this implicitly, it couldn't be true. Because, boy, they really believe that one. The medicos and everybody else believes that one.

The reverse is true: that a person gets as old as he is incapable of confronting energy, whether it's a civilization or an individual or anything else.

You hear of somebody coming off the beaches at Dunkirk with his hair turned white as snow. Yes, well, he aged. Well, why did he age? Well, he looked at a lot of fury and ran away from it. See why? See how that is?*

By the way it's now past – its about four minutes past your leavingness time. Do you want me to let you go on schedule? Cause we had the (line?)

Audience: No.

Are you being polite?

Audience: No.

Okay.

Well now, the age of the individual is established by his ability to regard action.

The concern of an individual with action is coaction or attack of action. You can act with or you can attack an action, or you can avoid the attack of an action.

In other words, you either have a lot of energy which you are merely utilizing, or you're attacking energy or being attacked by energy. See, I mean, turning the band saw on and off and sawing up some lumber probably never made anybody insane yet. But attacking everybody because they saw up lumber with band saws and going on a considerable vendetta on the subject, and then shooting all those people, or something like that, or being shot at in return – that will cause an aberration, because it singles one out from his natural ownership and responsibility of the universe.

An individual is first as big as the universe, and then he selects out half of it to fight, and so becomes half the size of the universe; and then selects out half of the remaining universe to fight, and so becomes one quarter the size of the universe; and then selects out half of the remainder to fight, and so becomes one eighth the size of the universe. And I could go on and enumerate these steps, but why should I when here you are?

* Editor's note: the following 6 lines are missing in the Golden Era audio version.

Your size in relationship to the universe is directly determined by only one thing: is the amount of randomness you care to confront in the universe, or the amount of attack you think you're subjected to or care to subject the universe to. That determines your thetan size. That's how big you are as a thetan. It's how much you feel you can take on, or how much you feel may take you on.

Now, let's look at the mathematics of a civilization. We have 100,000 people in this particular civilized strata – let's take some ancient civilization of no great size – 100,000 people in this civilization. And at first we say to these 99,999 people, other than self – we say to these fellows, "Well, I am as good as any of you and can take any one of you on. And maybe even take on two or three of you, or six or eight or twelve or fourteen. Who knows? In fact, I'm liable to take on anybody who messes me up." And they think this way equally, see? And they're liable to take it out on you, too, you see? But – so on.

And then one day somebody breaks his neck or breaks his brain or something – some other vital part – and he can't fight. So he invents justice. And then he gets some other fellows that are pretty weak, and they band together, and they invent this thing called "justice." And that is, justice consists only of this: that when the one individual, when the one individual errs, all other individuals in the society are banded together against him. And in the final analysis, that is justice.

You go out here and you lay your hand on a man's shoulder: that's an assault. So you have every member of the entire British Isles, collectively called the government, issuing a summons for your arrest. That makes you versus the government. Right?

Now, look. You were willing to take on one or two or three or four, or five or six, or when you were feeling good one morning, maybe ten or twelve. But now you're opposed with the idea of some tens of millions.

I love this gimmick: "The people versus John Jones." Where the hell are these people? Well, they're a collective nonsense that was dreamed up by a bunch of birds who couldn't fight. That's about the only thing you can say about it.

Now, we expect in a group of men you will get a leading order of hens. I'm sorry to mix the metaphor, but ... We expect this. We expect this.

You turn a bunch of knights loose in a tourney, and they're all going to wind up with a champion and a bird who disgraced himself, and between the rest of them, the rest are going to be stretched out on a gradient scale of who can lick who. But they very, very seldom form a council to go against all the knights of the realm this way, until they get into an order of knighthood or something like that. And they only get into orders of knighthood when a lot of them have been licked. And then you get orders of knighthood. Up to that time, nobody bothers, see? Do you see how this works?

But think over this proposition called civilization. It's rigged so that the individual, if he commits a fault, finds himself pitted against every other being in that whole realm.

And that, he conceives – I don't know really why he conceives this, by the way – but he conceives this a too-manyness. So he is overwhelmed and he is good and he obeys the law

of the realm – not because he thinks it's a good law, not because he observes that it is right or not because he's decided upon it; but he just obeys the law of the realm.

I used to always be able to put this into effect. You race out down the highways and you're trying to bring law and order to an area; you hang a bunch of guys to the nearest trees. See, you just catch some birds that have been cutting purses or burning farms, or something like that or – it doesn't matter much where you get the bodies. But hang them up on some scaffolds and trees, very visibly, you see? And law and order spreads in all direction.

That's because you and maybe four or five men-at-arms are more than any robber band. And you are law and order. You get the idea? And it's just simply the matter – it's this equation: "You rob somebody, without any reason, we will hang you as soon as we can catch you." You see, this simple, simple equation, simple arithmetic. So they stop robbing people. See, people who would rob people tend not to rob people because they figure that guy, and so forth, will overwhump us. You get the idea?

Now, when you get old and you get creaky, and the climate of France and England has at last entered your bones to the point of arthritis, you of course subscribe to justice, and you invent this thing. Instead of you there with a strong right arm, you see, you say, "Well, look, 'the people' will get after you." See, a considerable police force. But it's "the people" who will get after you, and you're being hung by "the people."

I never really bought that sort of justice. Any justice that I ever brought to an area was exactly this other type of justice, as crude as that may be.

"All right, you robbed the coach, we're hanging you."

And guy would say, "Well, my laws and my rights, and the Magna Carta, and so forth," and he'd go right on talking right up to the time when you pulled the rope check.

But I'd always let them know that it hasn't anything to do – "This is a peculiarity of mine. We have peace in this area. And we're going to have peace in this area. And we're going to have lots of peace in the area, not because you want it and not because the people want it, but just because I say so." And in that way may have escaped a lot of motivators and overts, because it was honest.

I'd always hated this other idea. I knew there was something wrong with this other idea. I couldn't quite figure out what was wrong with the other idea.

But isn't it a masterly gimmick? Look it over as a mechanism. You do wrong, and instantly you are going to have as your enemy several tens of millions of people. Isn't that a muchness? Huh?

Well, all "goodness" is brought about by force, whether individually delivered or delivered collectively. And goodness is never brought about by philosophic persuasion.

Three guys observe that they get a lot of planting and hunting done as long as they don't knock each other's heads off. They observe that one day they knock each other's around, and they don't get so much hunting done the next day, and they say, "That's a stupid idea. Let's have some peace and declare war on somebody else."

Well, all right. That's an incipient and a quite proper civilization, because it's based upon the fact that they have observed, they have decided, and that is the way they act.

"Ah, but, you see, law and order and justice actually are the best things, and they're the best principles, and you should be a very lawful person, and – or your father and I will hate you. And uh ... we uh ... And you see that policeman down the street. Well, he'll arrest you. And there are thousands of them." And I wouldn't say any duress had ever been brought against you to be good.

Now, and one of the oddities of it is that man is basically good. This is the oddity. But that he gets a synthetic bad valence. He gets a synthetic valence. He gets a mocked-up "baddy," see? And then he can get into this valence of being bad, and after that you have bad men. It's quite amazing.

If you don't believe this, process somebody someday on the basis of bad valences. And you'll find out these are the wildest synthetic valences you ever saw in your life. They're described to him, they are borrowed from him, they're his concept. You realize every 3D Criss Cross item is either some life that you yourself have lived, or its oppterm is merely your ideas of somebody else. There isn't a somebody-else in the whole bank. Do you see? There's never a somebody-else. It's only you and your ideas of. No oppterm of any kind whatsoever.

Now, what does this all add up to? Well, it adds up to the fact that if man is basically good the only thing wrong with him is his imprisonment in evil. But the evil is false. This is quite interesting. If the evil is false, what would happen if you set him free? He becomes good.

Ah, then what witchcraft has been worked here? We tell a fellow he is evil, and we convince him one way or the other that he shouldn't attack, because other things are good and he is evil.

And we just have another civilization mechanism.

And one of the ways of phrasing it is that everything done by you will be revisited [visited] upon you. That's karma.

"You will pay for everything you have ever done": that's karma. And a lot of people get the overt-motivator sequence mixed up with karma. They are not the same thing.

The overt-motivator sequence means that you have to lay yourself open to feeling bad about something – to a motivator – with an overt. That's true, too. But do you know how it's true? It says there's an area you mustn't attack. And that becomes the keynote and the whole swan song of a people: There are things you mustn't attack.

The only reason that wall is stably there for you and can trap you is because somewhere down deep you consider it sacred. Did you know you considered the wall sacred? But you do. You have certain sacred valences; they mustn't be attacked. You've convinced everybody they mustn't be attacked.

The priestess: She walks up the temple steps and turns around to the multitude, and she says, "Peace," and they serve her up for stew. She's a religious figure. She shouldn't be attacked.

The toughest valences you are holding on to in 3D Criss Cross are the same wool and warp of this civilize structure. They are merely mechanisms to prevent you from being attacked.

And that's why you have withholds. The reason you withhold something is to prevent yourself from being attacked. You've all done something at some time or another, anyone has done something at some time or another, in a civilization, where this civilization mechanism goes into effect. You would be attacked if it were known, see? You'd be attacked if it were known. You know that.

I can think of dozens of police forces, not only in this galaxy, that would love to have my name and address right now. As a matter of fact, they have it. Well, come to think about it, the shoe is slightly on the other foot.

But we've got a matter here of the sacredness of beingness. You got the idea? A good, nonattackable beingness. Hoo-hoo! That's the thing, see?

Only trouble is, we fall for the other unattackable beingnesses around us. People are horrified when they hear me giving the Christian church what-not. Every once in a while we get fantastic comments on this subject. I don't see it myself, although I've had ample reason to believe that people get upset about this. See? I believe people get upset about this; I don't believe you shouldn't attack it. I think all mechanisms of slavery should be attacked.

Now, the basic mechanism by which people are persuaded not to attack is to show them that attacking will hurt them. And that is the whole lesson they try to teach in war. You go over a parapet and across an open field up against machine guns, and if you're damn fool enough to have a meat body with you, you're liable to get some holes in it, you know? The air is liable to start going through where the bullets went. You see that? That's a bum thing you're doing, you know? You get punished for attacking.

But you kick a stone and you'll get punished for attacking. But why does a stone hurt you? Well, you must consider that it shouldn't be attacked. You must consider that the MEST universe should not be attacked. Well, look-a-here, it's here. Nobody has as-ised it. So obviously it's under the curse of no attack. See, you mustn't attack. It attacks you though, doesn't it? I think that's fascinating. Every once in a while a cliff falls on your head, something like that, but you mustn't attack it. Sounds to me like a wonderful mechanism for keeping a universe going.

But now we move into the overt-motivator sequence, having observed that if you attack into the teeth of spitting machine guns, you get your guts full of lead. Having observed this, it is very easy, you see, that any evil act you do to others will be visited on you. See, after a guy has had the first lesson – you know, he kicks the stone, the stone hurts him; he's charged the machine gun, and the machine gun has shot him – then that he will harm himself for knocking somebody's block off.

And the next thing you know, there he is with a withered arm. Didn't even hurt him actually. This bird was a totally defenseless goof, and he walked along and he went pow! you know? And the other guy's head fell right straight off, you know? The next thing you know, the guy has got a withered arm. You want to cure it as an auditor, you run out the knocking

off the other fellow's head. Well, I'll be a son of a gun, his arm all of a sudden works! Because you've created a miracle.

There's a further miracle that you could create. How come it got withered just by knocking off somebody's head? Now, it didn't even hurt his hand! Where did that mechanism come from? And that's the overt-motivator sequence. Where did it come from?

It comes from this one mechanism of "You attack things, you will be hurt." And if you can teach enough people that, you have a civilization. But they will all be enslaved, they will all be trapped; and none of them will be able to clearly observe, to clearly decide or to decisively act. And they will all sooner or later go crazy.

Now, when I have said these few choice words, I've described everything there is really wrong with the human mind. There isn't anything else. There's no other outstanding phenomena, in the final analysis. Once you know the basic phenomena of Scientology – that is, the as-ising and energy and pictures and what the universe is composed of, and the Axioms and things of this particular character – you get down to that as far as processing is concerned, the only thing that you've got in your thetan bank at the particular moment that is giving you an awful lot of trouble is something you know you had better not attack.

The consequences of attack overweigh you so heavily that you will not attack it. Otherwise it will disappear. If you attack it, it will disappear. That's one penalty, but it is the only penalty. There are no other penalties. All other penalties are totally imaginary, and at this stage of development of Scientology can be considered so, wholly and completely.

I'm not now giving you processes to run on this. I'm trying to get you to understand this philosophically – understand it, on the head end, that there is no liability for attacking anything, but there is tremendous liability for not attacking. There's tremendous liability.

That sounds like we're going to make a lot of vicious people. [laughter] Well, if they all become vicious before they come good again on the other end, I'll just have to live through it, and so will you, because that's the way it is.

But there is obsessive attack – people could no longer control their ability to attack; there's all kinds of species of wildness and gyratingness and upsettedness and so forth. They're all misemotional and none of it under control. Overt attack never got anybody in trouble. Never – really never did.

The only thing that you ever lose when you do that is some havingness or something like that. It's about the only thing. But if it's a havingness you don't want, what's the difference?

Well, that doesn't erase the fact that the overt-motivator sequence, you understand – that doesn't erase the fact that it works. You can take it apart, you can get withholds, you can do all these things which you know how to do. I have just been busily trying to get to the root of the structure and find out exactly how it stood, and so forth, to find out if it could be swept away when we reach into Class IV with 3D Criss Cross items. And I find out that it can be swept away, and the residuals and so forth of the bank have as their common denominator things that must not be attacked, reasons why one shouldn't attack, reasons why one shouldn't

be attacked, reasons why one shouldn't attack others, ways and means of restraining oneself from attacking others, etc., etc., etc., ad nauseam. You understand?

And out of this you get all kinds of minor things like criticism, and you get all this kind of thing. And you also get overt-motivator sequence. But it's just one phenomena amongst many. Okay?

Thank you very much for staying over. Good night.

Sacredness Of Cases

Determinism

A lecture given on 5 April 1962

Thank you.

And now we come to the crux of the situation – you. Why is your case sacred?

[part missing] [there is is also something to be checked in the middle]

This is a lecture of April the 5th, AD 12, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill. A very late spring. But if you will notice we have some gorse or whatever it is, from Scotland, blooming. And we have a whole slew of daffodils. Brave flower. Spring won't take forever. And neither will our new quarters.

I was out slopping around amongst the plumbing out there today and find out the contractors have come out of hibernation. [laughter] Awfully nice of them.

Well, let's get down to the meat of the situation tonight, and let's find out why your case is sacred.

Well, why is it? Just contemplate that for the moment. Why is your case sacred? If it is. If it is.

Sacredity raises its ugly head. Sacred equals don't attack equals preserve equals protect equals survive. And now at last we understand the theetie-weetie case. If you notice, everything to a theetie-weetie case is sacred.

All right. Now, let's just add up that case – not to throw dirty names here or anything – but let's just add up that case.

Those equations which you just took down in your notes – you also ought to hear that, you know. You also ought to hear that, hear what I just said, too. [laughs]

If you'll look that over, just let's add up this case where everything is sacred. Mustn't attack it, mustn't be attacked, must protect, must preserve, must survive, and there's a final equals – equals no results in processing.

And frankly that is the only reason that anyone ever has, for a no result in processing. That is the secret of this universe. The secret of this universe is that it is a sacred universe and shouldn't be attacked. And this puts every poor thetan that comes into it on a shouldn't-attack which puts attack on, of course, automatic. So it's the universe of automatic attack.

Now, there are two states of mind – three, really. There's the state of mind of pan-determinism, of where one can see or fight or control or anything else on his own choice on

either side of the situation. Pan-determinism – either side of the question, either side of the situation.

I know it used to disgust my fellow writers. I took politics – politics to me are something on the order of jokes that you read in joke books, you know. Like Pat and Mike joke books or something like that. Or minstrel joke books.

And I could never really take this sort of thing seriously. After you've gotten too familiar with something and been mixed up in it often enough, you see – after that you get very familiar with it, you see?

And you'd have a bunch of fellows holding out violently, you see, for one side of the political picture, you see? And another bunch of fellows holding out violently for the other side of the political picture. And I would sit there and be violently, you see, on the side of the first blokes and then about halfway through the evening or a half a pint of rum later, something like that, why, I would become violently in favor of the former opposition, you see. It really upset everybody, you see?

Well, the symptom of this was – it didn't make this much difference. I'd just as soon have fought on either side of it as long as it was a good fight. But you see, these poor fellows were fettered. And they were hostile to this point of view because they were fettered. Because group A – the first group, violently "in favor of," you see – their principles were sacred, you see? And group B – violently opposed to them – their principles were sacred, you see? And so it was a matter of die or else, you see. I mean, this wasn't any thought of any change here or shift. And for somebody to come along as cavalierly as this and argue on both sides of the political situation, you see, with this much wild abandon, was a shock to one and all because neither side was sacred to me.

You see, politics is, at best, shifts and mechanisms of control, you see? And it's somehow the shadier side of control, if you want to really get down to brass tacks. But this – this is generally the attitude of this universe on the subject of pan-determinism, so pan-determinism gets into bad repute.

I think I've joked about the denouement of this particular bunch of fellows. I remember one time there was a socialist and there was a communist and there was a democrat and there was a fascist, and boy, they were having a ball, you know, and each one was taking his sides, and so forth. And finally I got them to argue on one thing. Got to argue in the direction of just one item and they finally came up and approached this item and they all agreed that there was only one government that was a workable government and to which each one of them could wholeheartedly subscribe, and that was a benevolent monarchy.

So after we'd approached this by very gradient scales and very small steps, and they found themselves, who had been at each other's throats on this particular subject, you see – they found out they were all royalists. That's what I told them. See, I just dropped a bomb in the midst. "Well," I said, "I'm in the middle of a bunch of royalists and I myself am not a royalist, so that's that." Disgusted with all of them. This is a terrible thing to do to people. But they'd actually all agreed on this subject.

There's only one thing wrong with a benevolent monarchy. You cannot choose its succession. So apparently every other form of politics is based on the inability to choose a successor. So we then have to – we have to ... See, all these forms of politics are based on the inability to choose a successor. Hasn't anything to do with the kind of action you take during the political action, you see. You see that? I mean the present time of politics is of no concern, then. You have to have these other shifts and dodges because of the successor, see. You don't have to... Apparently any one of these forms of politics – fascism, communism, socialism, anything it doesn't matter what – are only necessary because you cannot guarantee that a good successor will follow a benevolent monarch. So they're all out of present time, aren't they? They're all somewhere up into the future or something. So this becomes very amusing. You can go on this way but people don't approve of this. People frown on this. It's pan-determinism of one kind or another. You base it on this particular basis. A benevolent monarchy, of course, they could count on its being pan-determined. It would take up the right or the wrong on the basis of – you know, a good monarch, you know. He'd take up the justice of the situation, the points of the situation. But they could never guarantee that if he died they would get another one. So they have to become socialists or communists or fascists or something else, you see?

You see, all the – the only thing that afflicted the entirety of the Roman Empire was stability of government. The types of governments which they had could not guarantee that you wouldn't have choice of successor by civil war. So therefore they were in a terrible mess. So all of the ensuing fifteen hundred – or, I guess, about thirteen hundred years of monarchies by succession by birth, you know, princes and divine rights of kings, all came out of the failure of the republic called Rome, you see? So they found out they couldn't have a republic because they couldn't guarantee a successor, so then we had divine rights of kings and had it genetically.

Now, you and I know that if any thetan can pick up any body, that would be the total apathy of successiveness, wouldn't it. Yeah. The genetic entity is going to succeed to the rule every time. And this is practically what happened. He will have an awful lot of trouble. Every time you get into pan-determinism all kinds of conflicts arise as to how are you going to continue pan-determinism, you see? And people don't. They slop off into self-determinism.

They go for "for and agin." They get into this self-determined attitude, and that's your second state of mind. It's a state of mind of "pro me." And then you'll have vast philosophies growing up of the virtue of selfishness. "Well, whatever you choose, why, you'd better think of number one first," see. And you get a vast activity going on the subject of how self is all-important – by which they mean self-determined action is all-important. And this carries with it another thing: that other-determined action is bad. See, that's the other side of the situation.

Now we have enemies. And now in any given group, why, about the most that you could be would be 50, 60, 70 percent of it, you see, because you could never be the whole group. You've dwindled in size or force, you might say.

And now there's a third state. When people get into this state they're nuts, to be technical. I was roused up the other day about somebody in New Jersey was cursing me for using a very bad technical approach, you see, and using technical words, and so forth.

Isn't it funny? The last person that did that violently was also from New Jersey. You know, I think it must be in their drinking water. So I'm being careful tonight to being very, very technical. Anyway, a fellow who is in a other-determined frame of mind can be counted on as to be very technical; to agree with this New Jersey thing – nuts.

This person is only always for the other guy and never for himself. You start an argument in this person's vicinity and they get reasonable with you. They'll always be reasonable.

You say, "Well, those damned psychiatrists shouldn't ought to use 220 volts as their only procedure."

"Well, I think they are perfectly good-intentioned men," and so forth.

Now, you make the mistake of believing you are talking to somebody who is pro-psychiatric. And you're not. You're talking to somebody who is simply other-determined. And someday you should try this little excursion: As you talk to them and find out that every time you attack something they defend it in some way on the fact that it must be all right and it must be good and it must be – you know, there must be some *reason* for it, you see, just attack something else at random. Attack the sellers of apples at Times Square or something of the sort. And then you'll find they will immediately tell you, "Well, those fellows have to give money to the police, and they, you know, and to keep their license. And that is why they charge what they do for apples at Times Square," and so on. And then just choose your next tactic. Attack the Society for the Dissemination of Cats.

And say, "Well, they shouldn't disseminate all those cats," and so forth.

And they'll say, "Well, they probably have a good reason for disseminating these cats."

And you'll begin to wake up after a while that this person is really not *for* anything for himself. He's only for those things which are agin. And if you say agin to him, he has to be *for*.

Now, this one escapes your view. This one is a hard one to see because it's already entered into the lower-scale mockery of pan-determinism. You see, you're already just now entering into the lower-scale mockery. That's just the way it looks, however. This person is *not* pan-determined. This person is *never* self-determined. Now that's – that's what you fail to see as you speak with this person. This person is *never* self-determined. This person is *always* other-determined .

These people, peculiarly, get into politics. It's a lower-scale mockery. Peculiarly. And it would just drive you stark staring mad if you were running a country and you had these people on your military and economic staffs, and so forth, because every time you said something was against the country, they'd have something reasonable to say about it. And they would give this vast example of being impartial people. But they are *not* impartial people. They're only for what is agin. You see that?

All right. Now, of course, we go down into the lower, lower harmonics, and we get, of course, these things repeated over and over again. But it's pan-determinism, self-determinism and other-determinism. Those are the three grades as you go down. And it usually escapes

your view. Only thing new to you about this would be – probably would be the fact that other-determinism – a person who is totally other-determined – escapes your view because he looks reasonable and he looks pan-determined and he looks like he has good sense. It always sounds like he has good sense, you know.

You say, "Well, these fortunetellers shouldn't manipulate the stock market the way they do."

"Well, they probably have a – you see, they probably have some sincerity and some faith in what they're saying, and they have to live, too, you know. And ..."

You see, the question you never follow up. You just keep – you keep talking about fortunetellers to this person or something of the sort. So you never discover this other point. The person is not for himself.

Now, in processing, that is the first level of case that is really going to give you trouble. You can be sure that case is going to give you trouble, because if you prove to him utterly he ought to run out certain engrams to benefit himself, he won't. You got it? He's not for himself, ever. You run into all sorts of things.

All cases, you understand, at various parts of the track, get stuck in these various phases. I mean, any of you at some part of the track have been looped up at one or another of these points. Even me, you see. Even thee. See, at some time or another.

You know, you really got caved in. You went through two wars and an economic collapse and came out at the other end and found out you were sweeping out latrines as your highest dedication of life. And that the medicos have kept the body going and the only original part of the body which you have left is the left shoulder. And the rest of it's all artificial and yet you can't escape from it and you can't get away from it, and so on. You get low-toned. You get low-toned about this time.

And you're liable at that time to have found yourself very reasonable about the enemy. And what went along with this is you were agin you. You see, that's very easy because you looked around in the present time environment and found everybody was against you. And if everybody was against you, why, then you must be against you, too. Otherwise, you'd be out of agreement with the whole universe, wouldn't you.

So a person trying to stay in agreement with the whole universe will sooner or later at some phase of his track become momentarily or otherwise other-determined. You see? It's a defeated proposition whereby he goes into agreement with the fact that he ought to be defeated.

Periods of illness best demonstrate this – people who are ill or chronically ill. You'll see most people who are under heavy attack or who have been heavily attacked or carrying a very large level of responsibility will occasionally flick in and out of this state. And of course, that makes almost any political leader on this planet or in this universe – almost any political leader is liable to get into this state. And the next thing you know, he will only sign a reasonable treaty which is favorable to the enemy and never favorable to his own country. And he will not sign a treaty which is favorable to his own country and will only sign a treaty that is favorable to the enemy.

And you wonder how come, after these wars, you get such fouled-up, mucked-up treaties of peace. Well, you got weary leaders who have gone totally other-determined. See, they look at all the overts they've racked up during a war, you see. And they finally get to the point where the enemy should be saved and they should be defeated.

Now, you can be in this frame of mind on certain subjects without being generally or broadly. So a person on any given subject – that is not as a general mental attitude but as a specific mental attitude on any subject – is pan-determined, self-determined or other-determined.

And only in those areas where the person is furiously other-determined will you find a consistent and continuing somatic. That's the point of other-determinism – where the individual is assisting the attack on self. Of course, he's the only one there that can make the somatic, don't you see.

So now, what I'm talking about wasn't as scarce as you thought. Now, when we get to the point where the *whole* individual and the *whole* situation and the *whole* attitude is pan-determined, self-determined or other-determined, of course, we have states of sanity. These are the states of sanity.

Everybody, you see, on any given subject – well, there's people here that are pan-determined on the subject of women and there are people here who are self-determined on the subject of women and there are people here who are other-determined on the subject of women, see? Take any subject and you'll find a variety of generalized attitudes.

Now, when you find a terminal by 3D Criss Cross, that terminal will be, if pan-determined, undiscoverable because it will never have hung up. Self-determined – somewhat troublesome. And it'll be part of the Goals Problem Mass. Other-determined – it'll damn near whip you in trying to audit it if you really don't have the locks spotted and the right keys to open those doors. Because every time you hit it the pc attacks himself. See? You could never help the pc in the vicinity of this other-determined valence.

You see what happens? Instantly, the pc is the loser. You find this, the pc's the loser. It's the winner.

So you find people – I mean, don't shudder at this because it applies to me, thee, everybody, and so forth – but you find people are most likely to get hung up and seize onto and keep and perpetuate valences which are totally against their best interests. They're other-determined valences. You see that?

They may look like terminals, and it may be all fine, but you'll find it's very difficult to move the person out of the track. Why is it difficult to move the person out of the track?

Because every time you hit them, they survive, the pc doesn't. So you see, you have at that instant of that section of the track, you see, that you hit this in an auditing session... We're not talking about what went on that gave us this mechanic, we're talking about in the session. You hit this thing – "Bulldozer," see. All right. Bulldozer – terminal. You hit bulldozer. Bulldozer must survive, and it's all for bulldozer, and it must not be for pc, even though the bulldozer is the pc's terminal. We can call it that. But nevertheless, it's one of these other-determined valences, see.

So, my golly, the pc will just sit there and do everything he can possibly do to preserve that terminal. Bulldozer. You see, he'll build it up, and he'll fix it up, and he'll try to achieve its goals, and he'll follow its postulates. And wow, you know, there it goes. And you try to run this out, and at this instant of track when you find the pc, the pc is zero.

See, the pc has no force in this whatsoever. But bulldozer will attack the pc. So if bulldozer will attack the pc, why, he'll just keep attacking himself. And you'll find him trying to run this. The pc will do weird things. They get themselves all kinds of PTPs between sessions.

And they get themselves all mucked up, and they're having chronic present time – or present time problem of long duration maritally. And during the session, why, they'll go out and phone the marital partner two thousand miles away, you see, to – and start a hell of a fight. And it looks to you like they just got restimulated and they're just ... No, no, no, no. See, they're in the middle of this terminal and this terminal makes a backfire against them, you see. And they'll just keep on making the terminal backfire against them, see. It's the darnedest thing you ever saw.

And yet the pc may hit one of these that's sufficiently strong to make him look totally pan-determined on the same basis I was just describing to you. Pc will get very reasonable about everything. They get very reasonable about this terminal, see. They get very reasonable.

They say, "Well, that's not a bad thing. That's really a good thing, and so forth." And well, a vestal virgin collector or something like this on the whole track, you see. And they'll say, "Well, that's very reasonable. And that's a lovely terminal. And I had a lot of fun doing that." And they go on, "And it's a perfectly nice terminal. And isn't that fine?"

And you get whipped in about this. And you say, "Well, that terminal isn't very important, you see. It must be something else because the pc says so." No, that isn't true at all. That's the terminal that defeats the pc. He's not pan-determined about that terminal at all. He's being totally other-determined about the terminal.

The terminal is all. The pc is nothing. That's all it adds up to. Well, if it just stopped there, you'd be able to run it out easily. You'd be able to run it out very, very easily. But it doesn't stop there. You get into that area, the terminal attacks the pc. It's not just nothing. It's less than nothing.

So you have this funny thing of man, the object and picture of man, trying to destroy himself. You have all of these odd phenomena that you continuously encounter of the self-destructive aspects and impulses of man.

You have a bunch of politicians sitting around a peace table, and they rig it all up so they're going to have another war in twenty-one years, see. Good heavens! I mean, why, the idiots, you know.

And you say, "Well, why did they do that?" Well, why did they do that? They were being very other-determined. That's all. And each one of those politicians was sitting there trying to figure it out so he and his country would be defeated.

Every once in a while in administrative activities, some staff member will blink and his jaw will drop. I will give him a piece of paper to sign – that somebody should sign, you see? Something's giving us trouble someplace or another. Something's going over the hills and far away, and give him a piece of paper to sign. I always take this chance because there's a possibility it'll happen, you see. And as a matter of fact, it's quite – the odds are in favor that it will work out this way, because this person is already doing something very destructive in attacking Scientology or something of the sort, and so forth.

So you sign up a confession you know, or sign up a note or sign up a document – write up, rather – document taking full responsibilities for this or that or the other thing. Just a suicidal legal document, you know. I'll write it up and give it to the attorney and ... I don't give these to attorneys anymore. The attorney will sit there, and he'll be very other-determined about the whole thing, you know. How nobody would sign this and very unreasonable. It'd be very unfair to the person who's signing. Well, they're being very unfair to us, why not be unfair to them?

But the attorney couldn't possibly figure out this because it'd ruin all attorneying if this principle were broadly known. About eighty percent of their cases would just go *pfffft*. And you set it down in front of the person, and you say, "Sign it."

And the person reads it over. "I hereby guarantee to pay \$1,750,000 damages and fully and freely confess that I burned the house down and ..." – anything.

"Sign it!"

"Is that satisfactory?"

I don't know what the percentage is, but it's a very high percentage that whenever I've done that, the other person signs.

I only have trouble with our own attorneys. They're always trying to make a fight out of it, see. And they'll win the other person's case for them if you don't watch them. So you try to bypass them. Because the truth of the matter is that somebody who's so nonsurvival as to try some stupid, silly attack against us somehow or another, can usually be counted upon to be sufficiently nonsurvival they will also commit suicide from a legal viewpoint. And they do. It's amazing.

In other words, about sixty, seventy percent of the cases perhaps, that walk into court down here, the litigants involved, if either one of the litigants made up a document saying, "Well, I..." and you know, just made it terrible ... You know, there's a 50-pound debt involved and if he'd – if somebody would just write up a judgment for 200 pounds at compound interest (you know, 50 pounds and a 150-pounds damages) and then with compound interest, and then a jail penalty or something in it, you see, and draw it all up in this totally vicious document, you see, and just give it to the other person to sign; the other person – oh, yes, yes, they'd sign it. They know. They appreciate it because it's agin them. That's where they belong. [needs to be checked against the original]

You see, the world operates on the basis that everybody defends himself and that everybody is on the kick of self-preservation. And this is not so. The people who are causing trouble in this world are not on a kick of self-preservation. They're on a kick of succumb. And

our biggest trouble is they look to an auditor, or they look to an organization, or they look to me, to be an executioner.

And we only get in serious trouble when we refuse to fill the role. That is quite amazing. You'll see this work out in your own activities, I am sure.

I think you – some of you have seen it work out in organizations and so on. But you're trying to be reasonable. This guy walks up and he says, "The organization is no good, and everybody in it ought to be killed and so forth. And you're in bad, you're bad people," or saying something like this. Or he's going all around the neighborhood ... He's usually not anything direct like that. He's usually going around the neighborhood saying, "That's really a communist organization," you see, to all the shopkeepers or something like that.

And right away all your legal advice says you sue him for slander. No, you present him with a confession and an award of damages for having slandered. And just draw it up in a legal form and give it to him and he'll sign it, and you'll execute in court. And that's all there is to it. You don't sue him.

The guy has only one enemy. See, himself, exclusively. He just has one enemy. And he'll go on and fight until he finds a satisfactory succumb. You try to make a bargain with this fellow. You keep saying, "Well, all right. You pay \$200." And your ordinary bargaining is, "All right. And you – all right. Well, you won't pay \$200? All right. Pay \$150. Oh, well, all right. You won't pay \$150, pay \$100." See, you're trying to make a deal, see. Ah, that's the wrong direction.

You say to this person, "\$200."

The person, "Oh, no, no, no."

And you say, "Well, \$250? \$300?" You finally get it up to \$790, and that's how much he thinks he ought to cut his throat for. And he signs at that point.

This principle of other-determinism – I'm not driving it home to you as though we operate this way exclusively, and so forth. But if some guy goes on a psychotic spin and starts attacking the organizations or something of the sort, which happens rarely enough, our legal advice is normally and generally 100 percent wrong, because it's operating on the basis that those people are being self-determined. And if those other people that are attacking you are being other-determined, then they will not settle any reasonable deal that gives them a benefit.

You have to make a deal which is murderous to them. You just keep worsening the deal you make, you see, and they'll eventually square it up. That's how legal matters get hung up. Because this third state of mind is the one that gets in everybody's road – other-determined frame of mind, whether on a subject or as a general mental attitude. And that's the one that gets in your road in processing.

You, the auditor, try to get easier and easier processes, less and less condemnatory, less and less damaging, lighter and lighter, lighter and lighter Prepcheck questions, trying to go through an area of other-determinism on the pc. And you'll find out, quite ordinarily, that when you start going in the lighter and lighter direction, you'll be less and less successful.

I have watched you on Prepchecking get lighter and lighter and feather touched and more feather touched and so forth. Less and less arduous Prepcheck questions, you see. You drift off of the violence of them.

Always go the opposite direction. This type of Prepcheck question doesn't work, well, we toughen it up and toughen it up and toughen it up and toughen it up and toughen it up, and *finally* we get the one that the pc is sure will make them lose adequately, to go through one of these other-determined valences. And they'll buy that one. You'll get tone arm action and everything else.

It's a sort of a bloody-minded frame of mind if you don't mind my saying so. You would just – you would be very interested how this works out. I don't mean that you have to shout at him louder and louder. That isn't what I'm saying. What you do is, you just give him rougher and rougher questions. Not lighter and lighter and easier and easier questions. Our ordinary summation of it would be that we'd make the questions lighter and lighter. And that isn't really the way it works when we're trying to push through this area.

I must tell you this because you'll be pushing pcs through other-determined valences rather consistently when you're running 3D Criss Cross, you see.

They've got an other-determined valence. You found it. It's in full view. And on that valence they will only buy suicidal-type processes. Quite fascinating. They will only do suicidal things in processing. Quite interesting.

I don't mean that they're trying to kill themselves, but they'll only buy things that look like they could have a good chance of knocking them off.

You tell them, "Well, this is terrible. This is an awful process. And I hate to have to run it on you because it is just too murderous."

"Oh, well, all right."

And they run like a dream, see.

And you say, "Now, we're having difficulty here. Therefore, we're going to have a very – we're going to do a very light process." Bog. See? It doesn't fit the same frame of mind.

Pc has – well, let's see, "What have you – what have you done wrong? What do you consider you've done wrong? Well, you've ..."

Pc tells you, "I occasionally look at people."

And you don't get any tone arm motion at looking at people, so I ought to – just liable to go off into a spatter of question marks if I'm not getting anyplace with it. Just trying to set up a Zero question of some kind or another.

"Well, what do you do? Do you ever throw rocks at people? Throw rocks through windshields? Kick people? Stab people? Drag people down back alleys and slip a knife into them? Take them into basements and torture them to death? Some sort of a thing for which the police would arrest you instantly and come streaming in the door this moment? If the police did come streaming in the door at this moment, what would they be here to arrest you for?" And all of a sudden, they'll give you their – the chain.

Either on the basis of a protest, "Well, it's not that bad. It's just coercing women. I – it's – heh-heh. That's all I've done." See, or something like that. It's either – it's a little less than what you said – you've exaggerated it and made it too much – or it's gotten awful enough and dangerous enough that it is self-destructive enough from their point of view that they will own up to it.

And then you have to operate all the time on half-truth, untruth. Every few questions, get that half-truth, untruth rudiment straight, because a person going in this state will overstate the case and try to destroy themselves.

I was giving a demonstration here one night when you saw somebody doing this when we were pushing him through a certain zone and area. And all of a sudden he was trying to make things blow, he said, remember, by admitting to more things or making it worse, making it sound worse, remember?

We were pushing through a certain valence zone or item attitude, see – you don't mind my mention of that? – a certain zone of thinkingness, you see. And it was actually an other-determined zone of thinkingness. And frankly, there isn't much profit in processing anything else, because self-determinism isn't particularly batty. And pan-determinism certainly isn't batty.

So this relegates you, really, to the processing of other-determined attitudes. Self-destructive attitudes. It's the only thing that's giving the pc any trouble. That's what he's doing to himself. He's trying to destroy himself. And you're trying to help him out, to get him through an area where he's trying to destroy himself. And you're trying to help him through this area where he is trying to destroy himself. And frankly it takes a bit of auditing. Because the pc will take almost anything you try to do for him and convert it into a motivator.

You say, "Well, good chap, take a moment's rest. End of session." This is a screaming ARC break. Well, know what you're looking at. You ran into a zone of other-determinism.

Well, what is this other-determinism? Let's be very precise. I've shown you its application in processing. Now, let's take up this original proposition here again.

Well, other-determinism is a successful sacredity. It's a, "Shouldn't ought to attack." And the person has finally agreed 100 percent that that valence or identity is something that shouldn't be attacked. And the common denominator, therefore, of other-determined valences from beginning to end, are valences with this conviction of, "Shouldn't attack." They're sacred. They must be preserved.

Now, if you stop and do this mental exercise here for a minute or two – let's just think of this as a mental exercise – if you want to be perfectly safe in this society, what would you be? Let's think it over for a moment. If you want to be perfectly safe in this society, what would you be?

All right. Have you done that?

Audience: Yes.

All right. You have a sacred item. And if you look a little bit further, the item you just thought up, to some zone or area, is sacred to something. Do you add that up? That make sense? See, that's how that first equation I gave you in this lecture works out.

Mustn't be attacked. Of course, that becomes a formidable other-determinism. It inevitably and always becomes an other-determinism and never becomes a self-determinism. Figure that one out.

How could it be a self-determinism? Try to figure out how it could be a self-determinism.

All right. Take this item that you might or might not have, but probably did think of, you wanted to be. All right. Is that you? Is that really you? It isn't, so therefore it's an other-determinism, isn't it?

Now, you see what 3D Criss Cross is barreling at. To some degree then, *all* items in 3D Criss Cross are other-determinisms. Therefore, the Goals Problem Mass itself is an other-determinism and therefore is seeking to destroy the person who has it.

Sacredity. I think it's very amusing, if you like to laugh at funerals. I do myself. I do. The last funeral I saw in Kansas, I was perfectly willing. A dead wagon went by, you know, and it was one of these hearses, you know, with the great big plate glass side windows, you know. You could see the coffin in there. Flowers all over it. And here came limousines after it, you know, one after the other, after the other, after the other. More and more limousines. And there were people crying and people sobbing in these limousines.

And when the dead wagon – the first one, came by, you see, the hearse came by, why, I pulled off to the side of the road, naturally, and I took off my hat. And all this was just automatic, you know, took off my hat. I sat there and watched this thing go by. And car by car my risibility started getting the better of me, you know. I thought here's this bird, he kicked off, you know, and they shoved this body full of embalming juice, and this bird is sailing around here someplace or another. He probably already picked up somebody in a maternity ward or something of the sort, and he's long gone, you know, and here's these birds left with this piece of – with this piece of MEST, you know. And they're crying and sobbing, you know, and they're filling it full of flowers and embalming fluid, and going to take it out to the graveyard and erect some stone over the top of it, you know. And ... oh, what a ball, you know.

Car by car, the unreality of these people and their attitude and what they believed, and what I myself knew for a fact, you see, were so far apart that I'm afraid that by the time the last funeral car had passed, I was just doubled up with laughter. I just can't take funerals very seriously. I'm sorry. It's too silly.

I don't think there is a funeral anyplace around now, except maybe Ireland, where they have any thought for the guy. I think in Ireland they still throw the window up hastily so he can get out. [laughter] I think they still do that in Ireland. But I don't know any other part of the world where they do that.

In China they're on a reverse. They have all kinds of firecrackers and pennants and sort of thing to drive off evil spirits. Start thinking that one over. I haven't been able to take

funerals very seriously since that time. You would get the picture better if you really understood the seriousness of a funeral in the Bible Belt. Man, it is the most serious activity I have ever engaged upon in my life.

Sacredity. But what an interesting trap. You know, you're not supposed to speak evil of the dead? Did you ever hear that one? Oh? We're not supposed to as-is any dead? We're not supposed to attack any dead? Oh? What's that going to leave us with? Now where are we going to wind up? A bank stacked up with dead.

You're not supposed to be mean to the sick. Oh, come off of it now. If we're never mean to the sick and we're not supposed to communicate with the sick, we're going to wind up sick, man. Because we've set up a sickness sacredity.

You're not supposed to be mean to old people. Well, we got a new sacredity. There's a grand new way on how you get lots of old people in the bank, you see. And spirits and ghosts and that sort of thing, they're all bad. But there's a lot of saints around that you're supposed to be able to talk to, but you mustn't ever be mean to. You mustn't ever say anything bad about. And you must be reverent toward. Well, that sure sets up an awful lot of interesting attitudes and sidepanels on the subject of spirits, doesn't it. Other-determined spirits so that a thetan can't even be himself anymore. He's going to – he's going to be an other-determined thetan. You know, that's getting – that's really getting someplace now.

And then we have the big thetan idea. The big thetan theory. And you're supposed to talk to him, but you can't talk to him, but he won't hear you because he punishes you, because you mustn't say anything bad to him, because if you do talk to him, well, you can't talk to him, and you're totally at his mercy. And then they wonder why they have people around in spinbins saying they're God after having set up the mechanism overtly and directly.

Well I don't say there is or isn't a big thetan. I'm sure you were pretty big at one time or another. There may still be some around that are pretty big. Maybe you're still that big, you know. Who knows? Hasn't anything to do with size anyhow.

And then we get – we get all sorts of these things, so these valences look very peculiar, but now what are valences made of? What are valences made of? Well, that's another story. And let it be enough to say that wherever you set up a sacredity, you set up a shouldn't-attack, and you also tend to set up a shouldn't-really-look-at, shouldn't-really-communicate-at – conditional communication, and so forth. And the rougher this gets, the more the other-determinedness gets in the item.

So it goes in direct proportion, that the *less you* should communicate *with* and the more *conditional* the communication, don't you see, why, the more other-determinism will result from the item.

And you can take any 3D Criss Cross item and simply analyze it on the basis of how should or shouldn't, or could or couldn't one attack it, and establish its level of sacredity.

And the most sacred item in the lot is going to give the pc – that is, the most sacred item in the lot *to* the pc is going to give the pc the most trouble in the bank. There you have a direct index, then, of how to select out a 3D Criss Cross item.

If you were to have twenty lines – this is a lot – with twenty oppters or forty items in all, and were to combine these things up into various packages and inspect them all and discuss them all with the pc from a viewpoint of how sacred each one was, at that point where the pc takes on a totally benign look, you can absolutely count that at that point you have hit your highest level of other-determinism and your most self-destructive point of the bank. The least the person should attack this thing, why, the most destructive this thing will be to his own self-determinism, don't you see? Because this thing is an overwhelm. We look at it as an overwhelm angle. The thing must intentionally be overwhelmed, you understand? It must have an overwhelmingness to the pc.

It's level of sacredity, in other words, see, attackability of this thing, the deification of mother and all of this kind of thing that you'll run into – there are all kinds of things, you see, on the backtrack. And at different periods they've had different values. So taking these things into account, you would have to shake the thing out; but you do have a direct index: that thing which would be the most sacred, the least attackable.

And also it must carry this condition: the least actual guaranteed communication with. You know, insecurity of communication must also have this point involved. And reach, of course, that's the least havingness, the least havingness, you see, the most uncertain communicatingness, the greatest level of sacredness, the most overwhelming aspect of, combined up into threat from – how dangerous is this thing to the individual? This also must be taken into consideration very definitely.

At first glance, you'd say well, it's anybody's friend, and therefore "friendship" would be the greatest enemy. No, that I'm afraid is not the case. You see what it is? Oh, yeah, you don't want to knock your friends off, that's for sure. But you can talk to your friends. So that rules that out. And your friends aren't trying to overwhelm you all the time. So that rules that out, see. Sacredity – up-on-the-pedestaledness. That sort of thing.

Now, that gives you the key to the Goals Problem Mass. Some of you hearing this are liable to think, "Well, it's only sacred items like gods and spirits and that sort of thing" – oh, no, no, no, no, no.

Individuals worship in the most peculiar places. I am, of course, not unaware of this mechanism. And have never been totally unaware of this mechanism. That's why I make sure that you don't run up a bunch of O/W with regard to me and set it up so that you can communicate, you see, at the same time. So we don't want to get an overwhelm situation going, here. We set that up, but nevertheless some people are always – are going to come up straightaway, "Well, it must be Ron, you see."

They do. I watch these analyses every once in a while. The guy to whom they could communicate the most easily, you see, and who would help them the most – that's *safe* to have as an overwhelm, you see. That's very safe to have as an overwhelm. See, it isn't a real overwhelm at all. Oh, no, no. This one, the person *is it* while *it* destroys *him*. Follow that? That's a lot further. That's several mile posts or light-years down the line from what I just said. You got it?

The person *is it*. He doesn't exist in this area. That beingness *is him*, and that beingness *is all*. And there ain't no "him" there. And every time "him" there starts to emerge in the

slightest degree of self-determinism, he gets slapped back. That's the mechanism of the somatic and that is all a somatic is there doing. It slaps the guy back every time he puts his head up.

Now, you'll find the basic element in the bank which is the most sacred, you will find the pc being it and in that condition, and so you could separate this out rather easily. Follow me? Horrifying vista I have opened for you, haven't I?

Audience: Yes.

Horrifying. Absolutely horrifying.

Good enough. Well, take a ten-minute break and think it over.

As-Isness: People Who Can And Can't As-Is

A lecture given on 5 April 1962

Thank you.

Okay. Second lecture, 5 April, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, AD 12. Now, we've been talking about what won't as-is. The things that won't as-is. First and foremost, of course, the things that won't as-is are the things you don't know anything about. Can't as-is it if you don't know anything about it.

And the next thing is something that you can't communicate with and that can't communicate with you. So that's a poor show as an as-is. That's just overtly can't, you see. A person knows something about the natives of upper Lombovia. It's very hard to as-is the natives of upper Lombovia if one simply has the idea that they might exist. You've never talked to them. They've never talked to you. But this is not in order of damagingness to the individual.

There is a reverse situation that you would never suspect, which is nothing there to do any as-ising. See, you'd never suspect that one. There simply is an operating GE. You get the idea? And of course, it won't as-is. Nothing will as-is with regard to this thing because there's nothing there to as-is it. That, of course, is the – basically the most obvious but the least discerned of the as-ises.

See, if you're not there to look, why, there it'd be. But it'd be something with nothing in it to as-is it. And of course – and that won't as-is, of course. Won't alter-is either. It won't do anything.

Therefore, any mechanism which makes nothing out of the thetan becomes non-as-isable. Do you see that? See, if something makes absolutely nothing – you see, a thetan really isn't nothing. If a somethingness must always have matter, energy, space and time connected with it, of course, then a thetan could be nothing, but a nothingness wouldn't have ideas and a personality and capabilities and creativeness and position ability and view ability and register ability and memory ability. You can't call this a nothing, you see.

Although it may be nothing with regard to matter, energy, space and time, it is not nothing with regard to its abilities. See, it can *do* things. Well, a nothingness can't do things, but then a thetan isn't a nothingness. So if you had something which made absolutely nothing out of a thetan's abilities and a thetan's existence and a thetan's lookingness and a thetan's creatingness and a thetan's doingness and a thetan's causativeness in all directions – you would, of course, have a not – a non-as-ising situation.

Only the not-is that exists there is in reverse. One is not not-ising the item. The item is not-ising the person. You see that is a reverse mechanism? And of course, that is your most dangerous valence.

A lot of religions tend to set up this valence. The campaign of most religion is to get rid of all the evil spirits. And they really go to town on getting rid of all the evil spirits. All early religions – I don't care how they become modern religions later on – or some – after they've gotten rid of all the evil spirits they usually become modern and benign. That's because they've done their job. But early they're quite militant. Any religion, whether Christian or Mohammedan, anything else is quite militant on the subject of the evilness of the spirit – the evil spirits that must be around.

So that you get the religion of the German woods is totally based upon how horrible all these things are that live in pools and trees and caves, don't you see? How they're liable to spring out at you at any minute. Earlier religions, less violent, less aberrative types of religions, admit the existence of beings which are not necessarily malignant. There you get the Irish. The Irish have a whole category of little people that do various things, not necessarily bad.

And it's very funny that that ancient religion would ride right alongside of the most violent, modern religion which we have – that these two things would go hand in glove. But they seem to have succeeded in doing so. And of course, we probably will see the day when we know nothing about – who was it that "driv' the snakes out of Eire-land"? we won't 'ear about 'im anymore. We won't hear about him at all, but we will still have leprechauns – the wee people.

And when a religion has been totally successful, utterly and totally successful, it manifests itself in a society where the spirit is totally unknown and there are no spirits. Now, beware of that society because it is the furthest south. There are no spirits. They just don't exist. Man is MEST. The brain is the limit of psychology. There are no spirits. Now you've achieved a total overwhelm.

Not only are there not even no – malignant spirits, but there just are *no* spirits. And you have a soul like your car has a spare tire. It has nothing to do with you. You're taking care of this soul. You see, it's an other-determinedness by this time. You're taking care of this soul. And if you were a good boy or you were a good girl, why, you can send this soul off at your demise to some pie-in-the-sky sanatorium [laughter] or something for souls, see.

Well, let's take a limit – a limiting view of this sort of thing. Now, how has this manifested itself in our present world. Well, let's take what they're called – the exact sciences. And let's see what these exact sciences are all about.

Matter, energy, space and time. Well, the first fundamental of elementary physics as taught in every school in this western culture is the conservation of energy. This is the first and foremost thing that is instructed. Energy cannot be created. Energy cannot be destroyed.

Along with this we have conservation of mass. You burn a candle and if you were to seize all the carbon and all the other gases and elements and compress them in fragments down again and to rescue all these things and put them together in the platter, they would

weigh as much as the candle of. See, once the candle is burned the residue which is left will weigh as much as the candle. I consider it very interesting nobody has ever done it. Interesting theory.

Well, we could see that this is perfectly *reasonable*. But notice how *reasonable* we all are on the subject of physics. Very *reasonable*.

We cannot destroy or create energy. And all mass suddenly turns out to be energy. Well, the weird part of all of this and the contradictoriness of all of this, if there's matter, energy, space and time and there's never going to be any more energy or any less energy and all – it's always going to be this much energy and nobody can do anything to this energy except maybe alter its condition – if that's the case, where do they come off having an expanding universe. See, they have conservation of energy, but they haven't gotten to a point yet where they have conservation of space.

See, they still talk today about the expanding universe. In other words, there's more and more and more and more and more space. Interesting way of overwhelming somebody, isn't it. There's going to be more and more space, you see. And there's never going to be less space, so it's expanding, expanding, expanding and expanding, see.

But you're not going to be able to do anything to energy. And space is just overwhelming you. Well, you wonder why a physicist goes nuts. The commodity which he is handling he is instructed that he can never do anything to. See, he can never destroy it and he can never create it.

So if he can never destroy it and never create it, of course, it's sacred. And, man, if you ever want to get into a religious argument, start talking to a flock of physicists. It's a religious argument. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the reasonableness of this or that.

They don't realize that religion itself has brought them to the pass of this, because these things consist of a series of postulates which are agreed upon and made. And having agreed upon these postulates, having made these postulates, we wind up, of course, with an agreed-upon situation and condition. But I think any one of you on the backtrack are liable to find out where you violate the principles of energy or the principles of mass.

I imagine you've been sprinting up and down the backtrack at some time or another and you may have run into, all of a sudden, well, I don't know, making things disappear suddenly and startling everybody or suddenly making things appear and startling everybody or making all the trees grow twice as big suddenly or half as big, or just as-ising things at a glimpse or overwhelming in general someplace on the track. See, doing something to energy.

I think somewhere, even if it's just stopping somebody, you've got a facsimile of doing something to energy. But of course, if you can't do anything to energy, time becomes inexorable because time is manifested by the change of space of particles – well, of course, is itself a postulate and is not monitored by the change of space of particles.

But one becomes aware of the passage of time because of the change of space amongst particles, even if it's just the tickety-tock of a balance wheel of a clock. It's still change of space of particles.

Now, the physicist, then, is actually a priest gone mad. That's all he is. And having imbibed all of his stable data and having sworn on the blessed Black's textbook on physics or something like that, to forevermore uphold these principles and to never turn away from any of them and to support them to the death, he then starts studying nuclear physics. And this is very difficult because he finds there's such things as holes in space and sometimes certain particles will shoot through in certain ways and become two particles and they were only one particle. And energy misbehaves. And the finite laws of elementary physics start to get foggy.

Now he's trying to hold on to a set of principles which tell him conservation of energy, while experimenting with a set of principles, of course, which tell him that there – something is astray about the conservation of energy and he usually winds up by saying, "Well, it – none of it violates the conservation of energy at all," with the attitude of a boy whistling as he goes by a graveyard.

And he goes mad about that time, so it's no wonder that the primary threat to this particular planet at this particular time is the explosion of bombs of nuclear fission. Because the first thing such a fellow would do would be to destroy himself.

We hear of the dedication of science and the dedication of science, of course, is all for science and nothing for me. All scientists should give all of their patents and developments to the club or to the university or to the manufacturing firm or to somebody or other. People should not, themselves, take out patents on their developments.

Nobody should have a right to his own developments. One of the most violent experiences that any physicist wants to have, will greet him or any chemist or something like that, if he's working for a university and happens to pour test tube A into test tube B and get molten student or something. If he were at this particular moment to take out a patent on this process in his own name he would probably be thrown out of the American Society of Chemists, the American Society of Physicists, the university and probably out of the house, too, as having been a traitor to the cause. He had done something to himself. It's quite peculiar.

If you think of the number of times you have tried to tell an educated person in the field of the mind or a psychologist or somebody, about Scientology, it would strike you as absolutely amazing that anybody could make the – this remark: "Well, I don't blame you for keeping it all a monopoly to yourselves." And yet that is the adjudication that the American psychologist makes about the Scientologist – that we are keeping it all secret to ourselves.

If you think of the number of times you have tried to disseminate and compare that with an attitude that we are keeping it all secret, it will look absolutely asinine to you. But of course, these birds are just asking for an executioner, that's all. You'll never have any trouble when you finally top the rise on this sort of thing.

The only trouble you will have will be trying to save the psychologist from his suicide. He will not combat you actively. He will only combat you in a direction which executes himself. That's the only way he'll combat you. And he'll probably make hysterical public statements – they do, you know – that make them sound discreditable or silly. Or they steal the wrong part of the technique. It's all theirs, but they steal the wrong part of the technique, you see or something like this, just to publish some asinine nonsense based on this sort of thing.

What's very peculiar and the only thing I'm bringing up here is, is here we're practically trying to force it down the guy's throat, you see and they're only mad because we keep it secret! That's from their view that's what we must be doing.

I've had one of them tell me that – accuse me of not publishing papers in the *American* – I don't know what they call them – the *American Society of Psychologists' Journal*. Why didn't I publish papers in the thing. It a – "Just – *just* one of these cases!" I had heard one fellow say one time, "*Just one of these cases! Just – just* look," you know. The guy..." The average gain in an HGC, you know. "*Just one of these profiles* published would *revolutionize* the whole of psychology!"

They'd never publish one of those things. You could walk in with Sten guns and they'd never publish one, see. The guy's very upset because you're not publishing, you see, in this magazine. And this magazine, of course, would never publish anything you gave them because you're keeping it all secret. Isn't this a fantastic spin? Well, I used to go round and round with arguments of this character.

At first, if you tried to talk to them and some of you will, sooner or later, you'll talk to such a chap and he'll be impudent or insolent with you at first and then just go into apathy. *Thud*. There isn't any gradient scale. He just doesn't go down like this, you see. He goes along insolent, apathetic.

Now, what he's trying to do is carry on something he thinks comes out of physics. See, he's trying to keep the sacredness of energy. He's trying to keep the sacredness of the brain. We've long talked about care of the body, care of the body, as one of the ills of our modern society, you know. "The worship of the body." Let's put it that way.

Care of the body, care of the body, care of the body. You got to do this with the body, you got to do that with the body. You got to get up, you got to exercise and you got to – got to do this and you got to do that. Well, maybe you got to but ... When a fellow starts telling you that the brain does all the thinking, of course, this is just an effort to get what's inside the brain – a thetan – totally overwhelmed by his immediate environment. See? Which will get a total survival of gray matter and the total nonsurvival of a – of a thetan.

See, when you try to teach a psychologist about Scientology you're going straight up against his basic stable datum, is that the thing which is there to as-is isn't there.

Now, therefore, those valences which you'll have the most trouble trying to run out or will give you the most trouble on a case are those valences which totally deny the existence of a thetan because there's nothing there, you see, to as-is.

That's different from – you look at a steel plate and look at it very heavily and you know you're looking at it and you'll – one of your first conclusions would be that looking at the steel plate would be – well, that would be a hard job of as-ising, trying to get a steel plate to disappear just by inspecting it. Now, you will – you would admit that this would look pretty hard. No, this is nothing. This is nothing compared to being a steel plate. See, at least the first situation, you're there looking at a steel plate trying to get it to disappear. But the second, there is nothing to look at it.

So that is the extreme case of not as-is. No as-isingness can take place in the absence of something to as-is it. See, you're not going to get any lumber sawed if somebody has hidden all the saws in the land. There isn't a saw in the land. How're you going to saw the lumber? You're not going to.

Now, being a steel plate and being only a steel plate, not being a spirit that is in a steel plate, but being a steel plate – "Me the steel plate" – is the least as-ising situation. See, as an auditor, you must know what the least as-ising situation is.

Now, if – therefore it gives you some wisdom in your trying to disentangle items. You look over a whole bunch of items. Let us say, we go over this list of items and we inspect them. Your E-Meter reading will give you the one most likely to as-is. It doesn't give you the most overwhelmed. See, it'll give you the one that *will run*. But remember there are some others after this has run and the individual has increased his beingness, his own beingness, you see, to the point of not being what you have just run out. Now, he will be in a situation where he can be assessed again and will become aware of the fact that he is not quite the steel plate. We – before, when you went across that, you got no reaction at all because you just got the reading of a steel plate.

He's being totally a steel plate, you see. Next time you run across and you read steel plate to him, you see, you've increased his ability to view, to be himself without being something else – and he'll register now on being a steel plate because he's not quite a steel plate.

A tree out here – if you put an E-Meter on a tree, you won't get much of a read because trees are really being trees. Boy, are they – are they ... Whatever spirit combination puts together trees is sure being trees.

But oddly enough tomatoes aren't really being tomatoes very hard. That's very peculiar, you know, because you can get a tomato to register. You can get corn to register – maize. A lot of vegetables, a lot of flowers will register and a lot won't.

It's the amount of *endure* connected with a vegetable which gives you the lessened needle registry on the E-Meter. In other words, the more endure the less registry. That's an inverse proportion.

The greater the effort to survive, the greater the endurance, the more mesty a thing is. And the less registry you will get of livingness.

So frankly, in the early stages of sorting out a 3D Criss Cross Goals Problem Mass, you will come across no reaction at all on those that should be run. Put somebody on the meter. You say, "Do you have a Goals Problem Mass? Do you – have you ever been anything else or anybody else?" The possibility is you get no registry at all.

He's in two conditions. He's in the condition of not-know about any of them and they're there but he isn't there. In other words, you get a total overwhelm involved here that includes a not-know and of course you should be able to see at this time that a total overwhelm is a not-know.

Of course you get no registry at all. But now, you start differentiating items and you start nulling them and you start getting items. All of a sudden *bing*, a fellow is this one and

bing, a fellow is that one and you've got another one and got another one. You're getting your various lines. "Oh-oh, there's a feeling along here someplace that these things have a peculiar beingness of some kind or another."

You at least have the fellow in present time exterior to the view of being able to say, "Yes. Somewhere on the track there's a whizzer."

Ah, well, that's much different. You see, up to that time, he couldn't say a whizzer was even on the track because, you see, he was a whizzer without being there at all. So all you got a reading of was a whizzer. Not a whizzer plus a thetan or a whizzer being inspected by a thetan. That – you didn't have that. You just had a whizzer.

And the fellow who is saying, "I wonder if I could have been a whizzer?" See, that's the period where he's sort of coming out of the morass – coming up to a point where he can inspect.

So your listing, differentiating, nulling, finding and proving an item, is leading a person further and further along the line of being able to inspect and is lessening his identity with MEST because *all* of these valences are composed of matter, energy, space and time and trapped postulates.

They haven't got thetans in them; they got trapped postulates in them. You can see the postulates come to view. The person doesn't see himself coming out of these things. He sees at first the ideas of them come alive. And then eventually, why, hell – he sees there's been a thetan in them, namely him.

So what you've got in 3D Criss Cross – a gradient scale of bailing somebody out. Well, of course, the extreme condition you're bailing him out of is you're auditing a brick wall. You're not auditing anything, except an object, an identity. You're auditing a plumber, see. It doesn't even register, see. The Goals Problem Mass has no registry on it of any kind whatsoever.

At that stage of the game, before any differentiation took place, if by some necromancy you had been able to look over the shoulder of Yahweh or Tetragrammaton or whatever the fellow's name was... Somebody keeps books on somebody. I think he has an angel that keeps books. And if you'd read the angel's books and not got that from auditing the pc and you found out he'd been a waterbuck and a tiger and a whizzer and a plumber, see, off the good books and you said, "Waterbuck, tiger, whizzer, plumber," you know, you would get no reaction on the meter at all.

It wouldn't do you a bit of good to know all the Goals Problem Mass on a pc if the pc didn't know any part of the Goals Problem Mass on him. Because you'd get no registry. Because you're reading those items which are there which are not as-isable because there's nothing there to as-is them. He's just in them. But he's not there in them. They just are. And they look to him like packages of MEST when he first begins to view them.

They're balls of energy sitting in space. They have mass. Sometimes some time gets connected with them and pieces of MEST when he first looks at them. Well, he is that MEST when you first encounter these things. And there's no differentiation of any kind at all in his mind. So you don't get any read on the needle.

No, you have to approach this from the point of view, not even of, "Could this have been me?" That will occur to him rapidly enough.

You say, "Who or what – ." You notice he scratches his left ear. Let's take some weird gradient here. This is not necessarily a proper approach at all. But let's take a lightest possible approach. And you notice he very often scratches his left ear. And so you say, "Who or what would oppose scratching an ear or a left ear?" We do a long list of this thing.

All of a sudden, why, the item that falls out of it is, "a doctor." And he suddenly has a picture of a doctor in school who used to tell them never put anything smaller than your elbow in your ear. [laughter]

And he gets an actual identity. And this actual identity falls out of the bank and there it is. Well, you know. Well. Suddenly the past track, you know, there's something a little more real to him here, you see.

Now, "Who or what would oppose the doctor?" you see. And if we did something like that, there's another identity that he was being obsessively in. It tends to come out just a little bit, you know?

You're getting something there which can as-is. See, we're moving from a not there and therefore can't as-is. Can't as-is because one is not there. These other things are there, but he is not there. You see, it's an other-determined condition entirely. We moved that on a gradient to these other things being more and more and more observed. And of course, on this gradient we get more and more awareness of self.

And of course, we have more there *to as-is*. Now, you've heard me tell you for years and years and years and years and years that the most difficult pc was the one who couldn't as-is, whose thought didn't have any effect on anything.

You've heard that one. All right. Now, put that together with what I've told you tonight. Of course, the least condition of having an effect on anything is not even knowing you were there to have any effect on it. So that sums that case up instantly. And that tells you why 3D Criss Cross has a constant, continuous gain. That – this is what I'm telling you is the therapeutic value of 3D Criss Cross.

Now, if you're not getting tone arm action during listing of 3D Criss Cross then you're not there and they're not enough there to have you there, so of course, nothing is as-ising.

Well, you've got some tiny action. Yes, you could probably keep it up. You could probably win from that tiny gradient.

But there's another way to approach this situation. And that is to use the CCHs. And when you do this the pc appears – pardon me, the beingness of John Doe and the beingness of the auditor – no thetans or other beingness – but those two *identities* appear. And out of all the nowhere-ness we've got an observation of identity. See, we've got an observation of present time identity.

Now, objects can – all cases go on this gradient of show up. This is items that show up. And they go on this gradient. But some cases are not as far south as others. But this would be the extreme gradient: Future items, present time items, present life items, past life items.

And as we go north from a case that's all the way south we would first pick up future items. Sounds crazy, doesn't it, but it's true. We'd pick up future items and then we would pick up present time items and then we would pick up present life items and then we would pick up past life items.

All right. Now, if a person isn't getting much tone arm motion, it's much easier to cut them into this scale suddenly, *clank*, with CCHs. See, without struggling around about it and monkeying with it, well, let's just cut them in to present time items, namely, an identity pc and an identity auditor. Let's not worry about where they're lurking on the track. Let's just cut them into present time and take off from there.

Of course, you get enough control, communication and havingness going in present time and the individual will sooner or later get the idea that the identity can reach this other identity called auditor and certainly that the other identity called auditor can reach the identity called pc and therefore they are two different identities. That is the first lesson that is learned. And that is the first CCH items that show up.

See, as when you're going – when you're going at 3D Criss Cross on this route you attain your first two items by CCHs. Sometimes the first one is auditor and sometimes the first one is pc. Sometimes the first one is pc and the – and the second one is auditor. But those are the first two items that show up.

In other words, they get a higher and higher ability to differentiate between pc and auditor and auditor and pc. You're not really differentiating that way.

We do have one of these CCHs that you're well acquainted with called Op Pro by Dup. which actually does *forcefully* show the individual... Oh, inevitably, if you run enough Op Pro by Dup smoothly enough you're going to have the pc sort of saying, "You know, I'm kind of out here looking at the body do it. You know, I mean..." It's a gradient. Their arms get *thin* or objects get *thin*. Something happens that they're not so cockeyed sure that they are an *it* and they get an observational point of view. That's if Op Pro by Dup is going to work, that's the direction it works. It's a great exteriorization process.

Of course, exteriorization is terribly violent. It's without a gradient scale at all. This is not saying – this isn't Op Pro by Dup exteriorization. That's not violent. But I'm talking about now, exteriorization.

We say, oh, well, you want to get this guy separated from items. *Ho-ho*. Well, that's easy. Try not to be three feet back of your head, you know. *Bang!* The guy's three... All of a sudden he says, "What! I'm not that? God help me." you see and *bang*, he'll go back in or fly into other valences or something like that. *Oh-oh-oh-oh*. Shakes him up. Gives him a – gives him quite a start. Quite a shock.

It was very funny. A few minutes afterwards it would be very vivid to him. And a day or so later, it never happened. You've had it happen to you as an auditor, I'm sure.

"No. Why, the auditor keeps saying he exteriorized me. Why, he didn't exteriorize me, no."

Person was outside saying, "*Gee, my gosh! Really! Oh no!*" And you know. "*Gosh,*" you know. "What about that, you know!"

Next day, "No, I didn't exteriorize. Nothing actually happened at all."

In other words, you can, on *your* determinism, blow him out of his 'ead. But that was n't on *'is* determinism. So you've blown somebody out of his head who is in no position to recognize that he is any different. And the only way he can survive is by being an identity, some other identity and being thoroughly enmeshed in it.

And that's good. That's good and safe and so forth and you give him no chance to get used to it. Well frankly, 3D Criss Cross is an exteriorization process. It does it on a tremendous gradient. It's a very, very gradient, gradient. Very slow. Item after item, mass after mass that the person has been in, the person begins to come out of. And they don't even come out of them very far, each one at a time, don't you see? They don't violently come out of them. Their attention goes on the things and as you increase though, the individual passes into an ability to as-is. And the last item that will come off is the one which was most *sacred*. And the one which was most sacred was the one that was *him*. Because he wasn't there and it was. And that would be the most extreme case on the bank of, "it was there but he wasn't there." And he wasn't there at all, not even vaguely was he present. He was it.

You ask any pc. He says, "Oh, well, I just want to be myself."

You say, "Well, good. What's yourself?"

He'll give you something, but it won't be really what he's being. He'll just give you a lock on it. He never gives you the real one and just gives you a lock on that thing.

But he'll finally be able to answer that question of what he is. And the one step out from that is he really is just – just "me," you know. He's just a "me." He is not a dandy with a three-foot top hat carrying a two-foot-nine cane, smoking Murad cigarettes, see? That is not what he is. It's just "me." And this is going to drive somebody batty someday when they're doing listing, you know. The guy keeps saying "me, me." you know, it's toward – way toward – you got about thirty, forty, fifty items, you know. Case has been progressing real well.

And, "Yeah and what would oppose that?"

"Well, just me. Just me. Just me."

And you finally get an item which is "me," which would of course be your last item. But of course before you get that last item that is really "me," you have thirty, forty, fifty items at the absolute minimum, all of which the pc knows are "me." But this last one, he finally knows, "That is me. That is just me."

"What would oppose that?"

"Me."

Well, that's of course, if you did the whole of whole track dynamic clearing with 3D Criss Cross only, assessment only, never running, if you assessed out, that would be your final item.

But of course, every item before you get there, each one is, of course, "me."

So there is the substance of the thing and there – how the bank sets together. There's the person who can't as-is. There is how you get a person to as-is.

Your CCHs cut into this very simply and very easily by simply slashing into present time and finding two items in present time – auditor, pc. Also, can find another item – wall.

And even if these items – a person knows he isn't these things, he becomes much less these things as he goes along.

One comment. How does all this happen? I mean how does a person get that interiorized? And I just want to make one comment here because it's now late and just one little comment.

How does a person get this way? By asserting a reaction of an identity or an object. He's asserting that it will react. That is the clue to all future interiorization.

Now, that – it sounds silly. If you wanted to set up this chain reaction you could say this piece of paper will react. And you've set up the overt-motivator sequence, you see. This piece of paper will react, you said. If you do so-and-so then this paper will do so-and-so to you. That's going even a little further than it just will react.

You see, a first gradient is this paper will react. The laws of reaction, don't you see. But then if you do something to this paper, this paper will do something to you. Now, you've got the chain well settled and that is the overt-motivator sequence.

See, if you touch a match to this paper and don't take your hand away, you will be burned. See, if you learned that lesson very thoroughly. If you set up this piece of paper to react in that particular way, you would have set up the sequence which would lead to a fully established overt-motivator sequence.

You say steel reacts. You go along and punch your fist into steel and it'll really fix your clock. Now, actually the resistance of steel depends to a large degree upon its conductivity and the fact it doesn't react. See, it doesn't react on itself and it does react on you. See, this is getting a little more complicated but it's all under the heading of react. If you do something to the steel, the steel will do something to you, but nothing will be done to the steel, don't you see? You made the steel sacred, in other words.

I can see it now. Some metallurgist wanting to make better armor plate for the Royal Navy. He knows how to do it. You just get everybody to sit down and pray down at the iron works and you'd have it made. That would work out just fine providing the enemy heard your prayers. But you'd have to teach the enemy that your steel would react and he would have to believe that.

A shell fired at this steel not only does not dent this steel, but instantly is catalyzed into a blow-back and sails in the same trajectory through the air and goes down the muzzle of the same gun that fired it and explodes therein. Now, that would be *real* armor. [laughter]

Well, that's how your overt-motivator sequence sets up. That's how reactivity sets up with regard to these items. It all comes under these various relatively simple rules, relatively simple laws.

How you get a fellow fished out to a point where he can look, well, that requires a considerable technical accuracy, but you should know in using that technical accuracy what you're trying to do. You're actually just getting an individual out to a viewpoint. And that's all you're doing. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Well, there'll be no lectures next week. You will get a chance to study. And I'm very happy about that because the number of passes you've been getting are terrific. But I expect you all to be classified by next Friday. [laughter]

So you needn't worry about it tonight. You can have a good sleep. And remember: sleep is sacred. [laughter]

Good night.

AUDITING

A lecture given on 17 April 1962

Thank you.

Thank you.

Are you making it?

Audience: Yes.

Listen to those. [laughs, laughter] That's what you get for getting yourself in such lousy shape. That's all I've got to say. What a dirty look. [laughter] Well, who got you in that shape? Yeah, that's it. That's just the whole thing. That's the whole thing. Somebody else is to blame. All right. [laughs]

All right. Good enough. Now, my auditor at the moment is probably sitting back there. Where is he? Where is he? Yeah, there he is there. He's probably sitting there nervously because he said to me last night, he says, "Well, that's something that you can tell the students." Actually, he's very nervous that I'll make a comment on his auditing.

I haven't gotten any hammer-and-tongs auditing for quite a while, straight on through and I'm going for broke now. And let me tell you, it's a terrific sensation to be audited by an auditor that knows his business. You know, will follow through and does do his business. You know, it's terrific. And absolutely nothing compares to it at all.

The standard of auditing – just from – just from a subjective viewpoint – the standard of auditing of a couple of years ago and the standard of auditing now, they're absolutely no comparison of any kind whatsoever. The auditor's predictable, the rudiments we have, when they're in, the person is in-session, so forth. The auditors are getting careful of the pc. They're auditing the pc, not the chair or something. And it's – just makes – it makes a heck of a difference. Terrific difference.

And this has been quite an experience last week and this far this week. And from a standpoint of subjective reality on just exactly what you are doing. Nothing very fancy. Phil was auditing me a couple of hours a day and it's pretty good. And I was impressed with this fact. I was impressed with this fact, that all an auditor has to do today is do exactly the processes, the Model Session, the exact routine that you're doing – and if he doesn't vary from these things, if he's careful on each point and so forth, that it's absolutely marvelous. Absolutely marvelous. We really got this thing grooved in and a pc could not help but be impressed with just good standard auditing. He just couldn't help but be impressed right down to the ground.

I was thinking it would be a wonderful experience if all auditing in Scientology were of that caliber. If it were all predictable. See, if it never got any funny business going on and if the auditors more or less stayed in two-way comm with the pc and carried on exactly what he was doing and never let the pc take the session out of his hands and so forth.

This – particularly a new experience for me because the auditing I've had has been pretty varied one way or the other. And auditors suffer from the fact that every time I sit down as a pc, why, they think I'm going to instruct them and they want me to instruct them. So halfway through a process or something like that, they ask for some directions or something. That's pretty grim, believe me, you know.

And I got so I couldn't – I didn't dare make a remark to an auditor, you see. They'd do something about it, you know. I mean, I say, "Well, I had a somatic there," you know and the auditor would do something about that. We wouldn't go on with what we were doing, don't you see?

And this – this in itself, just a non-Q-and-A in the auditing department is a fantastic thing to experience. An auditor never Qs-and-As. Pc can say what he damn well pleases. Gives you a terrific area of freedom.

You can say, "Well, you goofed," you know. You don't have the auditor all of a sudden blowing, you know. Auditor goes on with his business. In other words, you don't have to sit there carefully as a pc to keep the auditor in-session or something. [laughter] And it's really been a terrific experience. I really appreciate it very much. We're going right on with this at a couple of hours a day.

It's been about seven sessions, two items listed and found, the terminal and oppterm of a package on a discovery list and tone arm action through the two items has been 1.75 to 5.0, as a breadth of range, constant motion. And we're having a ball. That's no – that's no kidding. I really appreciate the auditing I'm getting.

And I'm here to tell you something. I'm here to tell you something. You probably have fantastic ideas of – particularly if you're just coming in new on it or if you've only been at it two or three weeks here or something like this – of, "Exactly what frame of mind do I get into in order to audit?" and so forth. And, "How do I best overwhelm this pc?" or some such questions, see?

And I can tell you that the most impressive attitude for an auditor is simply calm competence and go on and do his job. Come hell or high water, just go on and do his job. And the greatest certainty the pc can have is that the auditor will keep on auditing and not take up something else every time he starts in auditing something.

And when a pc gets that idea, why an auditor then has terrific altitude. An auditor, actually, in an auditing session, has altitude for no other reason at all.

All right. Well, let's see. What's the date?

Audience: 17th.

By George, it is the 17th. 17th April AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture on the subject of auditing.

We're only hitting two processes today – two packages of processes – on which we're going to count for steady, continued case gain. We're going to count on these processes. And that's the CCHs and 3D Criss Cross. And we're going to count on those processes. And the reason we're going to count on those processes is because those processes have been working and because they take a case all the way south. And because there are a certain number of skills which are packaged up into the CCHs and 3D Criss Cross which auditors have been able to learn, auditors have been able to apply. Auditors do well with these. They are very precise drills and they are carried out in a very precision manner. And auditors can do these things.

Now, that's the first test of a process, is can an auditor do it, not can I do it. 'Cause, Honey chil', I could audit things on you that would stand you upside down and hang the pc's thetan on the moon, see. But that hasn't anything to do with it at all. It has to do with my enthusiasms for certain processes in the past and it has to do for my misguidedness occasionally on certain processes because I could do them and somebody else couldn't. Something like that, you see. It'd be a limited number of auditors that would have success with it.

You look at these two and you will find out that they are broad success processes. The CCH and 3D Criss Cross. You'll find out that nobody's going to have very much trouble with these processes.

You have to be a terrifically well-trained auditor to run these processes. Don't kid yourself about that. The standard of training is way up. But there is no compromise. There is no lesser grade of processing that will get a pc all the way through and don't believe that there is. There isn't. Not that auditors will consistently do around the world.

Now, what changes my viewpoint on this is that I have had a great deal of success with some rather fantastically, razzle-dazzle processes at one time or another. I remember a girl stumbled into the office one time, didn't even know her right name, audited her, think a couple of hours or something like that and she turned clean and sane and went and got herself a job. And as far as we know never had any trouble afterwards.

Trick processes. Yeah, yeah, yeah, but these are spotty. Next psycho came along. You couldn't audit the same process on that psycho. You see, you had to dream up something else.

Well, this enters in judgment. It enters in imagination and judgment. It enters in a great many factors. And I will give you a resumé now of what can broadly be done. And this is no insult to auditors broadly, but I'm just telling you factually what's the truth about the situation.

An auditor can do any process – that is, any auditor can be trained to do this – which does not require of him more adjudication than can be given to him by an E-Meter. If you ask him for any further adjudication or judgment than he can read off the E-Meter, you're going to find a broad swath of disaster following that process. See, some are going to be able to do it, but the majority are not.

Now, these precision drills of the CCHs require that an auditor observe constancy or change. Now, there we're going to run into a little bit of trouble occasionally. Some auditors are going to look at a pc and say this pc isn't changing when the pc's changing wildly and so

forth. We'll run into a little trouble like that occasionally, but that nevertheless can be borne with and steered into adjudication of it.

In other words, as long as we've got Instructors that'll kick an auditor's head in while he's being trained for a change in processes while the pc is still getting change on the process, we can ride out that one. Auditors can be taught to do the CCHs. There is no mystery about why the CCHs work.

An auditor can be taught to list and read a meter against a list. In other words, he can do any of these CCH drills and he can do any of these listing, meter-reading drills. And those, auditors are having no difficulty doing. And fortunately for us all, it is the main route and the fastest route to Clear or OT or anything else you want to reach. That's very fortunate for us, you see. Now, what it requires is instruction of a precision nature. When you're training somebody to do this, don't yourself get into the idea that there's two ways to do it, because I can tell you right now there aren't. There aren't two ways to do any of these things. There aren't two ways to do the CCHs. There's only one right way to do the CCHs.

And in 3D Criss Cross, there's only one right way to list. There's only one right way to null. You could differentiate a couple of ways, but you'll lay eggs. It isn't a two-way proposition that you're dealing with. So we're dealing with something which is a studied, precise drill and a studied, precise drill which has been successfully, consistently taught to auditors now for quite a while – especially the CCHs. Right CCHs are easy to teach to auditors. Wrong CCHs are hard to teach.

3D Criss Cross – we've been very successful in teaching people to do 3D Criss Cross. Extremely successful. And this is marvelous. And the other thing is, we can train an auditor to do a repetitive process and that's your Class IV. It's just repetitive processes.

So as long as we get a high level of competence in exactly those spheres, you're going to see dissemination go by leaps and bounds. It's terrific. I mean, there isn't anything that you could say that would be an exaggeration, factually. From days of exaggeration when I shouldn't have been exaggerating, perhaps, on enthusiasm, we've gone to a level where we can't exaggerate it. You yourself should learn that and you will learn that in your line of experience, that you cannot exaggerate what you are doing. There's never been anything like it. Auditors can be taught to do this competently. And competently done, it makes a fantastic impression on the pc. He gets a level of security and interest and so forth. Terrific.

Now, you can do these drills without sometimes understanding everything there is to do in them. You actually can do them a bit in the absence of understanding. But it would be much nicer if you knew precisely all of the reasons which underlay these drills. That would make a much more intelligent auditor. And he would not be teaching somebody on the basis of that old, old saw that I have mentioned of the wise man who taught the neophyte all about it. And to keep the cat from running around, before he began the lesson each day, he tied the cat to the bed. So when the neophyte got to be the wise man, why, he got a student in and said, "Now, the first thing we do is tie the cat to the bed" you know. A lot of that bunk can get into what we're doing, you see. A lot of – a lot of magical monkey business, you know.

And fortunately for you, we know why. You see, that's even more important. We know why these things are working. See, and also you could find out why these things are

working. There isn't any reason to go around Robin Hood's barn to wonder why these things work, because it's only recently that I've gotten the facile explanation of why the CCHs work, after all these years.

Now, you're going to ask the question along about now well, what the hell happened to prepchecking? Oh, yeah, you've got to be able to prepcheck. You learn how to Prepcheck and you learn how to prepcheck just as best as you possibly can. Because if you can't prepcheck, sooner or later you're going to run a cropper on some person. They're withholding like crazy. They're – you're missing withholds like mad on them. They're mad at you all the time and so forth. You only got one answer. That's Prepcheck. And that's what Prepchecking is for. And that's all Prepchecking is for.

Now, Prepchecking has gone the whole evolution. It is quite amusing that with Prepchecking we wind up, 100 percent, the work of Sigmund Freud. That's it.

We've left the animal psychologist lying where he belongs in 1879, from which he never advanced. His idea was man is a brain. I, by the way, these days am never referring to psychologists. I only talk about animal psychologists because I want the beast to be known by his right name. [laughter] That's all he is and all he ever pretended to be. Any psychologist is an animal psychologist because the basic theory on which he operates is man is an animal. So we call him animal psychologist. And I think that will effectively take care of that as the years roll along.

Now, don't ever use that word psychologist after this. See, just use animal psychologist, always. And you'll get it around. You'll find the *Times*, sooner or later, will be talking about the animal psychologist. And people will be phoning them up to take care of their horses. [laughter] I wouldn't let them though. And I don't even like horses. I wouldn't let them take care of my horse.

Anyhow, the thing that – the thing that is newsworthy and noteworthy on this subject is that all of the work of Freud and any work by the faculty psychologist has been wrapped up in Prepchecking, which I consider quite wonderful. It's quite an achievement. Really, we ought to get very proud, you see and say this is really marvelous.

Do you realize you can find any of the childhood traumas that Freud thought were there. You can find them all. You can eradicate them. And worse than that, we've wrapped up the work of Freud's, ah, squirrels: [laughter] Jung, Adler. Well, I think it was Jung that traces everybody back to his stuck engram – druids. And we can trace people back to druids. Blow the trauma, too. Blow the whole tree up. [laughs]

No, any of the work that has been assayed in this, any of the work at all. Furthermore, we can probably turn it all around into black Pavlovianism and probably give people enough psychic traumas to make them "slaver." I think you could hit a guy long enough and often enough to make him slaver when he saw food.

Maybe I've got Pavlovianism a little bit wrong, but it seems to me like that has something to do with it that people are supposed to slaver. [laughter] Actually, all the work that has been done by Pavlov was swallowed up by communism. Pavlov's basic work is not available to the Western world and never has been.

And he treats of animal conditioning. The last days of his life he was whistled up to the Kremlin by Stalin and told to sit down and write himself a manuscript of everything he had learned about animals and how they could be applied to men. And he sat up there in the Kremlin for quite a while and he wrote a four-hundred-page manuscript which has never seen the light of day. But we see communism everywhere.

There was a film that was captured in Russia by somebody or another. And it's one of the basic training films on the use of Pavlovian work. And they show a young man going through all of the actions. They show a dog going through all the actions and a young man going through all the actions, you know – slaving over the bell ringing and coughing because of the food or whatever it is, you know.

In other words, they have a human being who was being conditioned the same way that the dog was conditioned in Pavlovian work and so forth. And this was a training film for embryonic Pavlovianists in the communist block. It isn't anything peculiar that people all lay aside the first dynamic in communism and assume only the third, you see.

Those techniques are used politically by the state. And if you were to take any communist and put him over the jumps with any processes you've got, his communism would blow because it's a lot of psychic traumas. He has himself terribly associated with the state. You see, socialism lets you own ... Well, actually, capitalism tries to let you have what you've got if they can't get it away from you. [laughter] A socialism lets you have about half of what you've got. You see. It lets you have about half of what you already own. That's a socialism. But a communism doesn't let you have anything that you own. Well, let's just get off the definition of state ownership, see. Let's just define it for what it really is. It is the *total* games condition between the state and the individual. See, the *total* games condition. And nothing for the individual to the point where he doesn't even exist anymore.

All right, so that particular field of psychology, not particularly important to us – could be, politically, perhaps – but that field is sufficiently vicious that it'd probably have to be undone with the CCHs or something like that. You probably wouldn't be able to get down to the ground with Prepchecking. And in animal psychology itself, the way they have been developing it since 1879, I don't know that you would be able to get down to the ground of *it* in Prepchecking. These are traumatic actions which are undertaken in these particular fields, you see. They contain injury, which they call conditioning and all that sort of thing.

It's efforts to do things to people. So that effort to do things to people doesn't classify with the Freudian and the faculty – early faculty psychology-type work. You see, that was designed to alleviate things *in* people, which is a different goal. You have to recognize that the Pavlovian and the animal psychologist in general, are trying to do things *to* people. So Prepchecking wouldn't cover that.

But all of the work of Freud is wrapped up in Prepchecking. And the outline of how you do Prepchecking in a recent bulletin, wraps all that up. That's it. That is what Freud was looking for.

Now, having gotten that, we put it over on the side of the desk and we say, well, whenever your pc gets upset with you, you know how to do Prepchecking and you address the Zero question of "Who has missed a withhold on you?" see, "Who should have found out?"

"Who failed to find out what?" That's this kind of a Zero. And you'll cheer the fellow up markedly and enormously. And as far as clearing is concerned, that's the sole use of Prepchecking.

You have to know how to do Prepchecking. But the end results of Prepchecking would only be the end results of – well, I don't know twenty-five, thirty hours of Prepchecking would be fifty or sixty years of Freudian analysis.

But the very funny thing – if you knew how to Prepcheck perfectly, you could actually hang out your shingle as a psychoanalyst to psychoanalysts and do nothing but prepcheck them.

Here's the way you'd do. You'd clear the withhold question and just take Form 3 and any other applicable Sec Check and use those as your Zero As. You see, your Zero would be "Are you withholding anything?" and then your Zero A, would be "Have you ever raped anybody?" You see. Any one of the Form 3s or any other applicable Sec Check. That becomes your Zero A. And you use that as a test Zero A. And then, of course, your What becomes the first withhold you get from the pc, if you get a reaction on that Zero A. Do you follow that? That would be the cleanest way to prepcheck.

But it has been demonstrated to me, several things. The first is condemnatory to auditors, so we'll leave that to later. The first thing that has been borne home to me is that it is a shallow approach. Later on, it might become adaptable in Class IV skills to the handling of actual items found in 3D Criss Cross. And be fully prepared to see it respond in that particular zone of action. But as far as clearing somebody is concerned, there is a probability that you could key everything out with Prepchecking. But this is the derogatory point to auditors; is auditors do not uniformly find good skill in Prepchecking. And that's what licks Prepchecking. You understand?

Auditors go in too shallow and they miss withholds. I tried for a long time to convince everybody that this was what they were doing. I worked on it hard. I worked on auditors personally with this and they still went on doing it. And if I can't teach somebody this particular skill a few feet away from me, how can I teach anybody in Perth? You see? They'll go too far.

Honest, I got so I was practically weeping, looking at the Prepcheck folders. Somebody gets off this terrific withhold that they tripped over the linoleum and hadn't told anybody. And your heart would bleed for the absolute blood and viciousness in these – in these Prepcheck folders. Well, that's too bad. I mean, you sit there and weep over the terrible agonies this person had gone through because he had borrowed Joe's necktie.

Pardon me if I seem to sneer sarcastically. It's just too much. I mean, my nerves couldn't take it anymore. It's just too bloody. I use that in an American sense. [laughter] I could just see the sanguine results of these sessions, you know. Gore all over the floor. And it's terrible. Auditor battles through and finally gets this *terrific* withhold off, you see, that once upon a time he had seen one of his mother's shoes mislaid. You see, I mean, gets right in there and pitches.

There's a terrific amount of skill between the Zero Question, the Zero A and the What question. And there's a terrific amount of skill between, particularly, the Zero A and the What.

Finding that exact specific withhold. It requires skill. And it requires more skill than auditors broadly exhibit. And that's my opinion of Prepchecking.

We've wrapped up Sigmund Freud. If you want to get to be an expert in Prepchecking, please do. You've got to know how to prepcheck to get missed withholds. You won't have any trouble getting missed withholds. You can't help but get the missed withholds that are making the pc unhappy. So you can get those, follow them through and clean them up because you're after a specific target: missed withholds. Fine. Cheer everybody up.

But withholds, no. Oh, it's very little skill in withholds. Plowing up new virgin territory in withholds, they exhibit too little skill. They settle for too much pale, skim milk. I mean, the quality of the porridge ... See, here you are sitting there ready to see the river of fire go tearing across the cliffs and destroy the cities, you see. And there's this little, little trickle of milk runs out underneath the door and this emaciated kitten walks for it. [laughter] You know that isn't what's wrong with the pc. You know it goes so much deeper than that. And auditors will settle for a null needle. And prepchecking for broke, if it's going to do anything with the case, has got to be a stirred-up case. You've got to stir up the case all the time. Stir up the case all the time.

Auditors will always quiet a case down. You see why the skimmed-milk effect? They will always quiet the case down. They will always get that needle null, only to get that needle null right now, see. That's fine. Shows considerable skill in getting the needle null. And that's just what you need to do in doing the rudiments. But Prepchecking is a reverse action. You've got to get in with a spade and pickax. You unfortunately got the question null. That's your attitude. "I must have slipped someplace. I got it null."

See, we got a nice, greasy fall, you see, on the subject of "Have you ever robbed anybody?" You know.

And the fellow says, "Well, I – I took a – ha, I got a knife one time and I got a penny out of my brother's piggy bank. *Ha-ah-ha.*" You know and it goes null.

And the auditor says, "Well, that's good. We certainly got that one null." See and they go off to the next one. Well, he got a null. He didn't miss a withhold. But what it requires in Prepchecking is an excursion about this point, you see.

"Have you ever robbed anybody?" You see?

And he says, "Well, I took a penny out of my brother's bank." And now it's gone null, you see. The auditor doesn't experience horror that the thing has now gone null. He experiences quite the reverse. He experiences relief.

No, no. About that time, "*Well, what else have you robbed?*" You see? Yeah. Well, all right. And it doesn't do anything.

"Have you robbed anything else? Have you robbed anybody else?" And so forth? "Ever robbed anybody else? How about school?" you see, "Well, how about school? How about the rest of your family? How about your father? Your mother? How about the church? How about God?" You know. "Your friends, companions. You were in the service once – you ever rob anything in the service?" – *clang!* "*What was that? Heh-heh-ha-ho-hor-ho.*"

It frankly requires a highly punitive and accusative frame of mind. And because you've got to use an accusative frame of mind this whole while, keeping the pc in-session while you ream him out for it, requires an enormous amount of skill. I would say that it can be taught straight up and with great ardure. But that does not guarantee that it will ever get as far as it may. Do you see that?

Now, there's no doubt about it. You've got to learn how to prepcheck by rote, to get up missed withholds and be able to sit down with somebody who is boiling over. You know, how bad it all is and how bad you've treated them and how bad everybody's treated them, how bad their families treat them. That's all you hear about in this pc, you know. How bad. How bad, you know. How b-. You know.

Well, we've got the absolute positive cure for it. "What did they fail to find out about you?" See, that's all you have to find out. Yeah, "What they – what should they have known and didn't?" That's all we've got to clear. And you clear that with a Prepcheck approach. And that's easy because you're trying to get the needle to null. And you're really not trying to stir up anything.

We've got the whole mechanism of the missed withhold and that's the most important mechanism. So just relegate for the moment Prepchecking to that, well realizing that we're just abandoning the fact that it's totally wrapped up Freud.

I mean, my God, the old man would be standing on his head. He's in school someplace. Let me see, what grade's he in now? Anyhow, if you – he'd actually, practically stand on his head. He'd say, "Wow!" You know, how that man worked. You know, how he worked to get out psychic trauma and find out how to handle them and that sort of thing.

And of course our technology is so extensive in this particular field that it makes Freudian analysis look almost in reverse. But the final analysis is, you've got all these basic psychic trauma keyed out by the time you prepcheck somebody.

You go for broke on Prepchecking, you could change their lives. There's no doubt about it whatsoever. But you have to be continuously *punitive*. And you have to keep stirring up the case and you have to work at it and you work real hard at it. And it doesn't happen to be in the direction of clearing because it's just key-outs. Key-outs, key-outs, key-outs, key-outs, key-outs. You got the idea? The hell with key-outs.

Don't forget we've wrapped up Freud and don't forget you should know how to do it. It'd be terribly impressive, you know. And any time you really wanted to put on a full parade in this particular direction it'd be shocking to anybody that knew Freudian analysis or something like this, to see you handling with ease, something in a – in an hour or two, that an analyst might very well require – *oh, God* – and maybe never get handled at all, you see. It's a superior skill, but it no longer belongs in your lineup as a process. See, it's a patch-up process.

If you don't know how to do it, then you're going to have pcs get mad at you and you're never going to be able to straighten them out. See, that's the – that's the penalty for not knowing how to prepcheck on missed withholds. See.

Sooner or later, somebody's going to get mad at you or mad at your family or mad at your organization or mad at something and you yourself are going to be powerless to do any-

thing about it. Because the *only* thing that you can do about it is a Prepcheck against missed withholds. And that is the only thing that works out of all the sun, moon, stars and firmaments. That's the only thing that works.

We have pushed it right up to the point where it's terrifically workable, too. Guys get mad over the darnedest, smallest, tiniest, little things you ever heard of.

But you're far more likely to find out what is basically wrong with the case – far, far, far more likely to find out what is basically wrong with a case – with the CCHs followed by 3D Criss Cross.

Now, you're assaulting the basics of the case. Now, you're assaulting *whole packages* called circuits, valences. You realize that it might only take you six or eight hours to find one of these items, see. Find the whole package. Another six, eight, ten hours maybe to find the other side of it. I'm talking about long lists and extreme jobs and all that sort of thing, you see.

Now, what's this make? This makes twenty, twenty-five hours. Oh man, by the time you have found one hot item on a case and opptermed it, you have gotten two personalities, *two* valences, *two* chains of lifetimes. You see, one of those 3D Criss Cross items is not just one life. That is not John Jones, the evangelist. See, we found the evangelist, you see. That is not John Jones, the evangelist. That is John Jones, Henry Smith, James George Wesley, you see. And that's in America.

Now let's take up the number of times he was an evangelist in Holland, you see. Now let's take up the number of times that he was an evangelist in the Marcab Confederacy. Now let's take up the number of times he was an evangelist earlier on the track, before he got out of the habit and then later on keyed it in and became an evangelist again, you see.

And do you know that any one of those lifetimes require about 150 hours to be prep-checked and cleaned up. Interesting computation, isn't it?

Let's just be casual about it. Let's thoroughly clean up one of those lives as John Jones the evangelist. A hundred and fifty hours, but then there's Henry Smith and then there's George Aloysius Wesley or something. And then there's the times in Holland. And we're getting 150 hours and 150 hours and 150 hours and 150 hours and a hun- . Hey, what the hell are we doing here, see.

Well, now we're up to a thousand, twelve hundred, sixteen hundred hours' worth of Prepchecking and we've – we've only gotten one item, an evangelist. Oh, well, there's the other side of it. There was the devil. Oh, well, of course, he was the devil on the early track. He was a devil in the Marcab Confederacy and he's been numerously a devil in Holland. And, of course, he was quite schizophrenic as George Wellington Aloysius Wesley, you see. And was an evangelist all day and a devil all night. [laughter]

Now you got two packages, so you just have to double the amount of time in Prepchecking. We're up to maybe thirty-two hundred hours. Well, if you could do it in twenty or twenty-five, I'd say you'd better do it. You better not bother with the thirty-two hundred unless you've taken to looking at the long track and gotten into the frame of mind that you have an infinity of time. Perfectly all right if you have an infinity of time and look at the long track. But it seems to me that something that could be done in twenty or twenty-five hours

shouldn't have thirty-two hundred hours devoted to it. Because the funny part of it is, is you wouldn't clean it up in the thirty-two hundred hours. Isn't that terrible?

It's purely the mechanics of postulate-counter-postulate, mass-counter-mass, see, goal-counter-goal that you find in the Goals Problem Mass that keeps it hung up in the first place. And if you've got it going *zzzzt* this way, why, of course, it starts spreading out along the track anyway.

I speak with good reality on that. I've mentioned this, but I didn't realize it till I walked away from the session, something very peculiar. Items three and two that went out on the list, were another package. And they were a package that was some collision out here. And they came apart and blew before we found the final item of the second list, which collided with the first item we had found which, of course, blew. I think this is rather fantastic, you see. I mean, there's – there's a bonus package. See, there was thirty-two hundred hours blew off while we were trying to find the first thirty-two hundred hours' worth, see. Took a couple of minutes. Anyway, hardly anybody noticed it passing.

But here's what you're into. You've got a bank that can't hang up. The mathematical probabilities of a Goals Problem Mass item hanging up against its opposition terminal and staying suspended in time and space are just a million to one, that's all. It's almost impossible for this accident to happen. By the time you found both sides of them, you get this kind of an effect. How can I do that again, you see. He hasn't got a prayer of doing it again, that's all.

And you've done it. You haven't pulled apart somebody's miserable sequences of lives and all the times he did kiss the landlady and all the times he didn't kiss the landlady, you see, and got that all disentangled one way or the other. Just his bank wouldn't hang together is what the horrible overt which you have performed at that particular thing, you see. So the reactive mind is blowing up. This other way, you're still going to have the reactive mind around. Interesting, isn't it.

So that's why you prefer 3D Criss Cross. And you will come to as you operate with it, why you will prefer 3D Criss Cross over Prepchecking. Of course, that doesn't forgive you for not knowing Prepchecking.

I would like to see anybody be able to do a good job of Prepchecking if he could. Somebody wants to get rid of his lumbosis or something of the sort, well, prepcheck it out of existence. You can try anyway. Somebody will get a 3D Criss Cross item on him, it will come right back, but that's all right.

You understand that in Prepchecking you *must* do an expert job of Prepchecking to handle the temper and temperament of the *pc* on the subject of missed withholds. Because you're going to run into missed withholds and I guarantee that a case that is really plowed in on this is going to get missed withholds tomorrow if you don't prepcheck them today.

In other words, you could just spot a missed withhold and spot another missed withhold and say, "Well, that's fine. He's happy." Oh, yeah, he'll be happy for hours. You get what I mean, because you didn't go in – you didn't go in down the chain of these. See, you just clipped off the last two – locks. Well, tomorrow those are going to key in again. Ha.

See, you, the auditor, are going to once more wiggle your right ear more than you wiggle your left ear and that is the key-in, you see. So that's an – then he thinks this thing again and then it becomes another missed withhold and you have to pull it all over again.

Well, by the time you get tired of doing this you will come to realize that Ronnie is telling you sooth. *Pull the whole ruddy* chain when you pull a missed withhold, see.

Well, you're gonna – you're going to handle missed withholds, handle them in two frames of mind. One, in rudiments, just to get them out of the road. When you're doing 3D Criss Cross, you're doing 3D Criss Cross. But the temper of a pc sooner or later is going to become recognizable to you as very *badly* needing some Prepchecking, by which you mean you want to get off the missed withholds and stop this nonsense so the rudiments will stay in.

You see, we found the common denominator back of all rudiments is withholds, see. And then the common denominator back of all withholds is *missed*. So prepcheck missed withholds. You sit down for a session or two with some pc and say, "Well, this guy's acting up. It's just hell to keep rudiments in one way or the other," and just go for broke on the Zero Question, "Who's missed a withhold on you?" you see? And then just carry on from there and develop these withholds – what people should have found out about, what they shouldn't have found out about and all that sort of thing.

You can cash in on a lot of processing this way. Case can't seem to get it going, it's having difficulty moving and even though you've done CCHs it isn't getting the sufficient tone arm action and his CCHs are apparently flat but really not and 3D Criss Cross and nothing much is moving and so forth. And all of a sudden – all of a sudden, like a *bolt from the blue*, this *terrific thought* will occur to you. "*This case has missed withholds.*" [laughter] "See, every time I put this case through the rudiments – 'What withhold have I missed on you?' – he's always had one, hasn't he? I'll bet there's a chain now."

Just take time out on whatever else you're doing and sit down and do a whole missed withhold session. And then maybe you have to do another session because you didn't get all the chain clean. You'll get all that type of missed withhold and you'll find out what he was missing withholds and who should have found out and God help us. And all of a sudden the case presents an entirely new aspect. And you get tone arm action where you didn't get it before. That is the one way I know of whereby you can promote a case into tone arm action with a strong arm.

Now, most auditors have been able to pick up missed withholds. And very few auditors have done a skilled job of Prepchecking on virgin, stir-it-up withhold type of mechanisms. That fact, that it's difficult to teach, is – already makes it a questionable subject. And then the other fact, that it only keys out and a 3D Criss Cross does so much more – the conclusion is that it becomes a junior process. One that an auditor must know how to do.

Oddly enough, this junior process is senior to all other processes. Show you where we've gone. See, we're now calling a junior process "Prepchecking," which is senior to any other process we ever had, you see. Well, where does that put the CCHs, run *right* and 3D Criss Cross done properly? Well, it puts them in the stars. That's really where they belong.

Now, you see how auditing stacks up? You see how it lines up.

A little advice. Once more I repeat this advice. If your CCHs don't seem to be just what they ought to be and the pc just sort of sits down and he's doing them all mechanically and they all appear flat and... Yeah, CC... Yeah, he hasn't grown any wings that you can see. You know, you haven't had a good change on the case. You know. No cognite. No cognite, you know. He's not said anything about it. *Let's get smart. We're dealing with a missed withhold case.*

And sit down for a session, check him. And after that do end rudiments on him. You'd be surprised. At least half of the pcs you're running right at this moment have their – on CCHs, have their end rudiments out on half-truth and untruth.

"Are you satisfied that you did that?"

"Yes. Yes. Oh, yes, yes, yes. I duplicate it. *Woo-woo-blyaa.*" Damn liar. You stack up enough of those and the CCHs become nonfunctional. You get your end rudiments ... Beginning rudiments aren't as important as end rudiments, frankly. And you get your – you get your missed withholds and half-truths and untruths stacked up in CCHs and your case will cease to gain because we're using the CCHs now on the sane people. Now, in the old days, yes, you could bull it through and go for two hundred hours and you would have gradually overridden it, you understand, Upper Indoc style. We're not doing that same type of CCH.

And I would say, on a person that could articulate and talk to you, that if they gave you any trouble or you really ever had to put your hand on them to guide them around or force them into a session, I would say their rudiments were wildly out.

I wouldn't spend much time wrestling. I don't mind wrestling. As a matter of fact I'm fond of wrestling. But it doesn't seem to me to be the thing to do in an auditing session. It seems out of place. The simpler way to go about it is flatten whatever you're doing or finish that session and come to the next session lugging a bulletproof E-Meter, you see. Let's find these missed withholds. And you're just going to do a Prepcheck-type activity. Get the idea? You find out a lot about it that way.

Don't keep probing when you're doing this. Don't keep probing for missed withholds because you don't have to probe for a missed withhold. The only thing you have to do is maybe guess who's been missing. See, who's been missing the withhold. Well, we know this fellow has a dog and a wife and has a Central Organization that has been near him and he doesn't like that very well. He's got a couple of friends and he has a mother still living, see. And he has a job someplace.

All right. Well, you've got these few items, see. Just very smart and do one of these – do a very careful resumé of the Preclear Assessment Form on him, you know. Go over that very carefully and so forth. And notice what makes the tone arm shift as you're doing it, you know.

List all these things and people up and so on. And then find out *who – who* amongst these people, you see, has missed withholds on him. What should they have found out? And you'll all of a sudden have a resurgence of case, don't you see? That's – it's an easy one to do. There's hardly any difficulty with it. But that will very often give you tone arm action which you're not getting any other way.

And the individual is sitting there. Boy, he's really braced. He's really braced. He eats with his knife, you know. And he never dares go into a nice restaurant because he eats with his knife, and so forth. And he actually never dares go to a restaurant because he eats with his knife. And he never dares take you out or be – let you invite him out to dinner because he eats with his knife, you see.

And this is pretty bad socially. And this is something that's pretty grim. And as you're doing the CCHs on him, you know, this really starts stacking up. He eats with his knife. And you mustn't find out about it. And on such shallow delicacies, you see, his whole case starts hanging up.

So in doing the CCHs on sane people, why, you ought to occasionally sit down and clear up them thar missed withhold. Clear them up on as much track as you can clear them off of. And you'll put the guy in a much happier frame of mind.

And a fellow who is showing no good increase on the CCHs should always ... You just start getting the habit of finishing up the session with the... Sooner or later we'll have to do it for everybody. Otherwise, you see, to those people that are not getting increase, it's an evaluation. So everybody will have to be able to do ... But I'll tell you, the truth of the matter is, is you only really need to do it on those people who are showing no increase of response.

And then you ought to do your end rudiments. And the most important end rudiments are simply the missed withhold question and the half-truth, untruth. And occasionally, when you've had a wrestling match, the damage question. He's been trying to damage you, the auditor. And this'll hang him up like mad.

Well, now, the extent of auditing as you see it there... Prepchecking and rudiments are something which are relegated to letting auditing occur. See, these are the tools with which auditing can occur. You permit auditing to occur with these things.

Keep your rudiments in, auditing can occur. Pick up your large gobs of missed withholds off the pc and smooth him out in his relationships with his family and of course your rudiments will smooth out. The only difficulties he's going to have is with his environment and if you cleaned up all the missed withholds with his environment – just sat down for a couple of sessions, you know – you're not going to have any trouble with out-rudiments.

It's very well worth doing. Instead of spending half of the 3D Criss Cross session everyday, you see, putting his rudiments in, just take *two* sessions and run *missed withholds* on him on any part of his environment you think might be out, you see. Get the idea?

It's much happier to do it that way because then you've got it done and it'll stay pretty well done, too. And then you can keep it in with ordinary rudiments. Do you follow the use of that?

Well, to get something done with the case – the CCHs, they will get something done with the case if they're done right. And 3D Criss Cross, well, my God, that just doesn't get something done with the case, that takes the reactive mind and pours it down the sewer. That's it. 3D Criss Cross well and accurately done – marvelous.

You recognize that the CCHs are a precision activity. You recognize that meter reading is a precision activity, that Prepchecking, even for just missed withholds, is a precision activity. And CCHs, more than ever, is a precision activity. That preciseness in it is simply your ability to give the auditing commands, to stay in communication with the pc, to ask the right questions for the Prepchecking. And as far as 3D Criss Cross, just *reliably make sure* that your *rudiments are in* and *reliably make sure* that your *list* is complete and that you differentiate it fine and that you null it perfectly and that you wind up at the other end with the item, that you check it out right. It's all very precise. It's all very precise. It's almost got the words and music all written down. I mean complete. And any auditor can learn those.

It's a marvelous thing that you could today, with such ease that it would hardly be worth mentioning, identify the well-trained auditor and the poorly trained auditor. The ease with which you could identify the well-trained auditor just by looking at his pc's progress you wouldn't have to look at his auditing at all.

You say, "Well, there he is." And actually a well-trained auditor really never gets in trouble with a pc. It's nothing extraordinary that's being requested of the auditor today except just an atmosphere of competence and accurate rendition of a certain finite number of things. He just has to do those things, make sure that he always does them and does them thoroughly.

You're not reaching for an unattainable, in other words. Nobody is asking an auditor today to do something that is impossible. That might have been true yesterday, but it is not true today. And it can be done and it can be done well.

And the results which you get for doing the exact textbook solution, see, are just fabulous. The results don't match the sudden divergences and brilliancies and new ideas, you see, that you get in the session and so on. The results don't match that. The results match the textbook solution today. Probably the first time in the history of this planet, that that has ever been the case.

If you ever fought a war, according to West Point textbooks, you'd lose it. If you built bridges according to the engineering school manuals they would all fall down. If you repaired machinery by the maintenance and operation manuals, that you're issued for engines and things like that, Lord knows *what* would happen. They have one grease cup going three years, but you have to change the oil in the crankcase every fifteen minutes or something, you know.

Well, I'll give you an idea. The car you drive – if you're driving a car – the oil people tell you, you should change the oil in that car about every thousand miles. That's what they tell you if you read their advertisements. Factually speaking, nothing *possibly* goes wrong with the oil for the first five thousand miles.

And you see motorists all over the place busy following these rules and regulations, you see, and changing the oil every thousand miles and they grease it every twenty thousand. And their cars just fall apart and they never can understand why.

Probably a car needs to be greased every thousand miles, but it doesn't get its crankcase changed every... It all depends on the climate you're running in, of course. How dirty and gritty the country is or something like that, has a lot to do with it. These things are practically done in reverse, you see. See, you're so used to the textbook solution not working, see, that

you tend to believe that something new and extraordinary and beyond this will be demanded of you.

Well, I can tell you straight from the shoulder right now, that that is not true of Scientology today. The textbook solution gets you the whole distance. And the only reason you won't get there is because you don't follow it. I know. I know. I just had about... I guess it's been about fifteen, sixteen hours of nothing but textbook solution. Working like a dream. Working like a dream.

Well, that's auditing today. That's what's expected of an auditor today. An auditor can do these things, fine. If he can do them with understanding, wonderful. But he won't get any results at all unless he does it with complete precision. And that's what it depends on. Okay?

Thank you.

How And Why Auditing Works

A lecture given on 17 April 1962

Now, this is still the 17th of *Abril* after the coldest March in seventy years. On twenty-two days last March, the thermometer was below 30. This seldom happens here in January. I'm sorry, maybe you won't see a display of rhodies that you would ordinarily see here on the grounds – most gorgeous sight you ever saw, rhododendrons, here – because we were out looking at them and many of their buds had been frozen. But we still have hopes that they will manufacture some more.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

[part missing]

Now I want to tell you some very important facts of life. Now and then – now and then, when you're growing up... It reminds me of a Marine sergeant. Marine sergeant came home, and his little brother had been having a bad time. So his mother – Marine sergeant's mother – said, "Why don't you take your little brother out back and talk about the birds and the bees?"

The Marine sergeant says, "Okay." So he takes him out and he says, "Now look, Joey," he says, "you know," he says, "you get out your scooter, go along the street, you pick up a goil, you run her along back of a hedge, you know, you know, that kind of thing?"

And Joey says, "Yep."

He says, "Well, birds and bees, same way." [laughter, laughs]

And I want to tell you why auditing works. Reference: any publication or bulletin which discusses the two-pole nature of the universe.

There's a whole mathematics based on this, by the way, by a man that I was very happy to meet one time, Buckminster Fuller – Bucky Fuller. He invented Dymaxion geometry. He's a stress analysis-type man, pure mathematics and that sort of thing. Dymaxion geometry proves that the universe couldn't exist without two poles. Everything has two poles. There is not one of anything in this universe. You've heard me mention this before from time to time.

Now, in a recent lecture, I described to you the lowest level of observation. Or it get – it's so low that it's nonobservation. And that is "being something." Remember?

The fellow couldn't see it because he *was* it. That's your lowest level of observation.

Now, you see this in human behavior all the time. The fellow can't observe what he's doing. If he knew he was doing it, he wouldn't do it. But he actually can't observe what he is doing. And that's to a limited extent because he cannot observe himself.

Now, "know thyself" is an old philosophic saw. And I think it was basically and originally introduced as a trap for thetans. The only way you could know yourself, of course, would be to view yourself.

Now, the Goals Problem Mass contains in it anything you know about problems. Why does a problem hang up? Because it's postulate-counter-postulate, intention-counter-intention, goal-counter-goal. And these two things being of equal strength hang up. When they're not of more or less equal strength, they don't hang up. An overwhump occurs one way or the other and you don't get a hang-up.

It's never any problem to be shot. You're just dead, and that's that. You see? I mean, if you're going to be seriously shot. See, it's not a problem to be shot. It is a problem to be shot at while shooting at somebody. Now, that is probably a primary problem, and that is why war is protested against and why it stays with us – because it's a bunch of guys shooting at a bunch of guys.

Wars which happen suddenly on a total overwhump basis, one really never hears much about them. Probably they'd never be objected to either, and they certainly wouldn't hang up on the time track.

But these wars, particularly static warfare, hang up because you've got balanced forces. And it hangs up in time. And the more balanced the force, the more hung up in time. That's all.

You want to know how long a war is going to last? Just estimate the force of Nation A and the force of Nation B and of course, in view of the fact that we're dealing with general staffs when we're dealing with war, we have to equate the stupidity of one as compared to the stupidity of another. And this is a balancing factor. Now, if that stupidity were equal, and the forces of both nations were equal, and the destructions accomplished were equal, that war would go on forever. There must have been something like this occurring during the Hundred Years' War. And that must have been the way it was, you see, and so it went on and on.

Now, a Goals Problem Mass means that the intentions of a type of beingness oppose the intentions of a type of beingness more or less equally. To hang up and become part of the Goals Problem Mass, it must be *exactly* equally. That of course is nearly impossible which is why you have so few items in the Goals Problem Mass.

You have to have equal opposition, just as we've really only had one Hundred Years' War in the last many, many, many centuries, you see.

Why, it'd be very rare that you would get a type of valence exactly against and balanced against a type of valence. Don't look at this as a going-on-forever, don't you see? Because a person has been many more beings than are contained in the Goals Problem Mass – many, many more beings. And why aren't they hung up?

Well, they just weren't at that delicate opposition of one versus the other which gave us the fist against the fist which balanced it so as to make it drift in time.

And we get equal forces exerted one against another, and we get an illusion of no time. And so it just goes on forever in time. And that is why a Goals Problem Mass stays with the person, and of course all there is, all you've ever learned about a reactive bank, all that we know about mental energy phenomena and all the rest of it, it just is contained in this thing, Goals Problem Mass.

Now, there's free track where a person has not had an opposed lifetime and, running engrams, you run this free track. Of course, it's available, it's free and it erases.

But what he's up against is this non-free track. That's what's really rough – where the valences versus the valence. You see? The type of identities versus the type of identity. He has lived many lives as a waterbuck and has opposed in those lives the tiger and has lived a few lives as a tiger and has opposed waterbucks. And you get this kind of a *grep-rrrr-rrrr-rrrr*, and there's going to be nothing happens then except this stays there in the bank totally opposed to total opposition, you see? And it's just balanced in time.

Now, frankly, it is so difficult to make two of these valences bash up against the other, it's almost unheard of. You see, the chances against it happening are just fantastically remote that you get a hang-up over trillennia – trillions of years, you see, of two types of identity. Oh, it'd go away sooner or later, don't you see. It'd slip, it'd wear out, it'd get erased.

But those things in the Goals Problem Mass have not worn out, have not slipped, have not gotten erased, have never become overbalanced and are there in that delicate balance which maintains them in present time. And they're maintained in present time and they *are* the reactive mind.

Now, in view of the fact there are tremendous numbers of minds available for these – you see, each type of personality, of course, becomes a mind – you have tremendous numbers of minds in the reactive mind with tremendous numbers of retrained responses.

Then for each one of these that is hung up, you have an accumulation of locks. And these can number into the hundreds for every one of these items. Now, let's say – well, this is not an accurate figure, but let's just get some idea of it – let's say they're average two hundred items as lock items for each valence that was hung up. That would make four hundred for two valences, wouldn't it.

And let's say there were twenty of these packages. Do your own mathematics: any one of those is a mind. See, the locks are as effective as the keystones of the GPM. See, it's just the locks derive their power... Just because they've got – you've got two of these things hanging up one against the other, now the locks can become just as effective on the individual as any one of these hung-up things.

And before you get it straightened out, every one of those, see, in their thousands, are a separate mind capable of thought, capable of action and reaction, with set solutions and now-I'm-supposed-to's to all existing problems connected with them. And they can be pretty dopey. They got everything in them, in other words. And that composite lot is the reactive

bank. If you add to it the few areas of free track that hang on both sides, you've just about got the lot.

See, this lifetime has certain areas of free track and other lifetimes didn't happen to get mixed up in this, and you get free track, and the individual can run this free track.

Free track, oddly enough, explain a lot of things to him but never quite unravels it all. There is always that reservation. It didn't quite unravel everything. Do you see what this is all about now?

In other words, the fellow galumphed along, and he was very fine and he was doing wonderfully and he was a polar bear. And he went for a long time as a polar bear and he went swimming in the ice and everything was marvelous and he ate fish, and so forth. And you're not going to find that. He didn't have any trouble as a polar bear. He's never posed anything as a polar bear. He went on being a polar bear. Of course, he got engrams as a polar bear, but that's fine, and then one day, one day he decided – one day he decided all on his own, you see – to start being a seal. Up to that time as a polar bear, he had never eaten any seal because this is early on the track, you see.

And he accidentally knocked a polar bear, you see, off of an ice pack and this started getting very complicated one way or the other. So he decided, "Well, the devil with that. I don't want to be a seal. I don't want to be a polar bear. I'm going down into the warm latitudes and here's an interesting looking animal: a waterbuck."

Up to this time he doesn't have any reactive bank to amount to anything, see. Oh, there are incidents and oppositions and so forth. But here he goes.

Now, he's a waterbuck and he runs away from tigers, and he antagonizes tigers, and he has a hell of a time with tigers. And one day he becomes a tiger, and he eats waterbuck and antagonizes waterbuck and has a hell of a time with waterbuck. And one day he becomes a waterbuck and has a hell of a time with tigers and just messes up tigers. And pretty soon this is getting pretty gloomy to him.

And as a waterbuck, he's *blang-bang* concentrated on nothing but tigers. And as a tiger, he's *blang-blanc* concentrated on nothing but waterbucks.

He's been a waterbuck more often than tigers, but nevertheless he's mocked up the counter-emotion of tigers and the counter-force of tigers often enough so that this is perfectly balanced. And from that time there on, "waterbuck" can collect minds; "tiger" can collect minds.

This probably went on for a long time, and nothing much happened and he got into another sphere, and one day he became a priest.

And then he was mean to the vestal virgins, and the vestal virgins were mean to the priest. And he was a priest, and then he's a vestal virgin. And he got to be a priest some more, and he ate more vestal virgins, and then he was a vestal virgin and ate up more priests. And we've got another one. But there could have been – could have been millions and millions, hundreds of millions, billions of years between the time the waterbuck and the tiger got together up to the time he became the vestal virgin-priest package. You see?

But because these packages exist, they tend to lock up the rest of the track. Other pieces of track run into them, collide with them, and so on. So the whole track begins to look like a snarly mass of something or other, but right internally in the middle of it, why, you've got these two poles: the waterbuck and the tiger. And just up adjacent to those, you've got the vestal virgin and the priest. And then you have got the god and the devil and you've got all kinds of wild oppositions.

But these oppositions, each time they are perfectly balanced, make a new Goals Problem Mass package.

And then these perfectly balanced opposing forces or opposing identities accumulate to themselves any other identity that's hanging around and you'll get collapsed track.

Now, these are represented in the bank by spherical masses. Inside this spherical mass are compartments of thought. There is an internal compartment of thought because the fellow usually had a head, and he did his thinking in the middle of the head. So the Goals Problem Mass tends to approximate a head. And it's got a think-think-think in the middle of the head and it's usually empty. And there's a lot of little compartments all through the Goals Problem Mass which have ideas in them. And you have the idea of force encl – you have force enclosing ideas or force enclosing thought – the trapped thought, in other words.

And these can be dramatized. They are not stretches of track. They are crumpled up pieces of – they're crumpled up track in spherical shapes and that sort of thing.

Now, where these things are exactly counter-opposed against other spherical shapes – you see, you got the waterbuck, the tiger proposition – these things are hung up one against the other, *clank*, to such a degree that neither one can go away.

Now, all this comes down to attention, of course, doesn't it. It comes down to all of the other factors, you know, but this is the final material form which it takes, that we call the Goals Problem Mass. Of course, what's a waterbuck do all day long but look out for tigers? And what's a tiger do all day long but prowl around looking for a waterbuck? And it's just concentration, concentration, concentration, concentration. And eventually, these two identities just get smashed together by this fact. And you've got the dramatization of a problem. It floats in time all sorts of other dramatic – or dramatizing factors here.

The individual is – years, years later, he's busy selling – he's busy selling boats, you see, and – oh, oh, trillennia later he becomes a boat salesman – and he shows somebody that it is very, very easy to paddle this little ski contrivance, you see.

And he says, "You just slide over the back of the thing, you know and kick your hoofs, you know."

And he goes on, and after a while he – the customer says, "You kick your hoofs. What's that?"

And he says, "I didn't say anything like that."

But he did. See, it'd be a hangover. Just a momentary restimulation. They revert to this type of pattern. You will find some person's been a dog, and a dog and a cat. And they've got the dog-cat Goals Problem Mass package of some kind or another. Very equal balancing

there. If you've ever seen a cat lick a dog, why, you know that can be quite equally balanced. That's why they've always stayed foes.

And this dog has been a dog a long time ago. And he hasn't been a dog for ages; for trillennia he hasn't been a dog. And he's living a life as a human being and everything is going along fine, and he goes to bed.

And his wife thinks it's fine. He's fine. His wife thinks he's fine, but of course, he turns round and round and round and round and round [laughter] before he goes to sleep. He has various explanations for this. But these explanations are all just based on the fact he's been a dog.

Now, all of this is very obscure to the person and to the auditor and you actually would be amazed the intricacies you'd have to go through to figure out what the fellow had been by observing his behavior.

But after you find a few of these items in 3D Criss Cross, all of a sudden you say, "Oh, you know. Oh, I see. Yes. Ooooh, yes. It all now becomes clear." And it wouldn't be clear because, frankly, there were thousands of possible choices from which this sudden habit of [makes noises with his lips – laughter] came from, you see; been most anything.

Now, the two-pole character of the universe is something you should keep in mind. Electronically, no power can be generated in this universe in the absence of two poles. You have to have two fixed positions in space before you can have any electrical current of any kind.

That is something that you would learn the hard way in physics. You can take two poles and put them smash against each other or one inside the other, and you could grind away with little wheels and all sorts of things for, well, trillennia without generating any power. There would be no electrical current of any kind whatsoever. There'd be no electrical masses of any kind whatsoever, if there weren't two poles. There have to be at least two poles.

Now, maybe you could have a three-pole, five-pole, six-pole, twelve-pole type of arrangement, but remember the basic is *two* poles. You could add new poles. You could do all sorts of things, but you've got to have two poles and that's fundamental and basic.

Now, the mind is composed of energy which exists in space and which condenses down into masses. In the reactive mind, there is no time. All time is now. That's because of the poised character of these valences.

We must assume that if we have current, standing waves, electrical masses, flows and other phenomena which are very easy to demonstrate in the human being, there must be two poles involved. You're about to learn the facts of life here. There must be two poles involved. Otherwise, you'd never have any flows, would you?

A person would never have any ringing in his ears and, frankly, would never have a somatic. It requires two poles even to hurt. It's the two-pole nature of things that – from which all else proceeds.

Now, this sounds very intricate and I can see somebody now saying, "Oh, no! Not about electricity." Well, I'll tell you all you need to know about electricity: Take your two

fingers, shove them into the mains. You will learn all there is to know about electricity at that moment because you can actually put one finger in one prong. And you can sit there and hold it all night, and you'll never get a shock.

You don't notice any reaction there until you put *two* fingers in there, one on the other prong. And then you'd know all there is to know about electricity. You would have a subjective reality on the fact that it required two poles to have any electricity go anyplace or anything happen. And that's a fact.

All right. Now, what's this got to do with the CCHs? Well, it has *everything* to do with the CCHs.

Auditing is effective only in the presence of *two poles*. Effective auditing is two poles. Now, there can be more poles scattered around, but it requires at least two poles for auditing to occur. This doesn't say that it's impossible to self-audit. This doesn't say that it is absolutely necessary always everywhere to have an auditor. That is not the case because you yourself at one time or another have run a burn out of your finger and have done a Touch Assist on your left ear or something and had it work.

But in that particular instance when it worked, you were operating with two poles. You were observing something. You might have been being a mass while you were observing the other mass, but you had two poles going. Do you see that?

And one of the things that's been a bugaboo to auditors from time immemorial is the pc who never cognites. He just stirs on and *on and on and on and on and on and on and on*, and he'll run processes and processes and processes and if he was processing himself, he would go on and *chew and chew and chew and chew and on and on and on*. And he'd get ideas occasionally, and they would come and they would go and they would erase and they would go on and on. What an arduous activity.

The individual is running on one pole. Now, the pole that he's running on happens to have thought in the middle of it and energy – standing energy waves – outside of it. Well, he's in the thought area, and he keeps running through the energy as a thetan and he's just chewing on this energy, you see.

And he gets into the thought zone and he only gets the ideas that are packaged inside that thought zone. You see, he's *being* that mass. He *is* that mass. He is not viewing the mass. He *is* it. So, of course, he can't view it because he *is* it.

And being that mass he is not viewing another mass, so he's being himself and nothing else and not looking at anything else. And there he could chew and chew and chew and chew forever. You see how that would be?

Can you imagine this glass, now – now we're going to show you something graphically – now, just imagine this glass here as a mass of energy or a mass of mass or anything else, well, just as a glass.

And now we get the idea – get the idea of a thetan *being* this glass to such an extent that he would never say "I am a thetan," he would only say "I am a glass." You see, he couldn't conceive of being anything else but a glass.

And now let's say he's a very introverted glass and can never see you. This glass isn't looking at anything. Never see the table. Never see me. And let's say he went on chewing on this glass. Would he ever make any gain in processing? Well, the probabilities are he wouldn't. And there is the picture of the no-cognition case. That's your minimum tone arm, no-cognition case. The person is being something; observing nothing.

Now, it would be perfectly all right for this fellow to be this glass, providing he could also view, as a glass, something else. He doesn't have to view anything as a thetan. He could view something as a glass. He all of a sudden gets the idea, "Well, I – I can – rrr – glass – I'm a glass, you see. And I'm a glass and I can look at this cigarette lighter."

And here he is, see. Here's a glass and here's a cigarette lighter. Oh, well, we've got two poles now. And as a glass, he can look at the cigarette lighter.

He can as-is this cigarette lighter. Things can happen with regard to this cigarette lighter. He can do some control of it. He can do some other things. And you're sure going to get tone arm action. And there's also something going to happen to the cigarette lighter, that's for sure.

But, you see, as one pole, the glass and being only the glass, you're never going to get any tone arm reaction because you're never going to get any energy movement. How can there be energy movement?

For energy movement to occur or diminish or increase or anything else, you've got to have two poles. And if the individual only is one pole and he's *being* that pole – see, he isn't a thetan being a glass – he's a glass! Why, of course, he could chew forever. And if he was getting no tone arm motion while you were auditing him – of course, he would get no tone arm motion while you were auditing him because there's no flow. But as a glass, he is made to audit up against the cigarette lighter – ah, you get tone arm action. Ah, you get change. Because the cigarette lighter is also going to react against the glass, let me assure you. You see that? You're going to get case change.

You're going to get a change of these masses. Therefore, you're going to get a change of ideas. Do you see this?

You must never have in an auditing situation a one-pole situation. That's all. The individual is *being* a man, see. He's not ever – he has no masses. He has no ideas. This is your poor psychologist. The poor guy. He is a brain. Never looks at anything. Never does anything. *He* never does a thing, you see. He's – he's being a man, and that's all he is being. He couldn't be anything else but a man.

And if he's a relatively introverted man, why, he's had it because he never sees anything else. Never gets any changes of potential; never gets any anything. And that's why the psychologist concluded that man could not be changed.

He concluded this as a scientific conclusion. And several years ago, we were always being held up to scorn as Dianeticists or Scientologists because we said man could change. And now he teaches in his universities nothing else but that man changes. He's tried to disprove testing to get rid of us. He's tried to do all kinds of things to himself to get rid of us. He keeps doing things to himself hoping we'll go away.

And now, today he more and more realizes what he is. Well, he's a Scientologist. He hasn't found it out yet, but that's what he's being. You get the idea? We're probably terribly good for him. He's probably the first – we're probably the first thing he ever looked at since 1879.

Now, get the idea here of a glass. No action; one pole. The glass and the cigarette lighter. Two poles – action.

Now, we see this easily in the auditing situation. Here is the auditor; here is the pc – something on that order – or here's the auditor; here's the pc. See?

All right. Ah! If we can get the pc to look at the auditor, we've got a two-pole situation. Two-pole situation; that's all. So you're going to get change. But the pc who never finds the auditor never has any change. There's the CCHs at work. And they're only as good as that occurs and no better.

When you don't have a two-pole situation in the CCHs, if you don't have the pc observing the auditor, *ah-ha*, you get no change from the CCHs.

Has to be a two-pole situation.

All right. We'll go into that a little bit further. But let's go on, now, to 3D Criss Cross.

What condition must exist for 3D Criss Cross or some think process to exist or any think process to exist? Ah, the fellow is being one mass in his mind able to look at another mass in his mind.

The fellow – it's perfectly all right for the fellow to be a mass in his mind, but he also has to not only be that mass but be capable of looking at another mass in his mind. And then you get tone arm action.

Listing, nulling – you're going to get tone arm action.

But if he's only being one mass in his mind and can't view any other mass in his mind but this one mass, you're not going to get any tone arm action. It's as simple as that. Don't you see.

So at the stage of the CCHs, the auditor and the pc furnish the two poles.

Actually, the auditor does not have to constitute solely the other pole. There is the whole present time environment to constitute the other pole, or any other pole or many other poles. Once in a blue moon, we have taken a person who was having an awfully hard time and said, "Look around here and find something that's really, really, really, really *real* to you." And they looked around the room, and they eventually – one person found a silver teapot. And, my God, she went over and she grabbed a hold of the silver teapot, and heaven and earth couldn't get that silver teapot away from her.

That was a one-shot command. She turned sane on a silver teapot. She found out there was something in the environment beside herself – a silver teapot; so she got a big change. See? One-shot change. Do you see how – why that would be?

So it isn't just the auditor in the CCHs that can constitute the second pole.

Now, is there anything in the pc that can constitute the second pole? Well, there's two ways that the CCHs could be run: dumb-ox style, which is – well, a great deal of study of the steam engine would be about the best way to achieve this style, and all you do is observe this steam engine, and you observe the fact that it does nothing but have certain wheels go around and certain shafts move and a certain *hiss* come out the exhaust pipe.

And the auditor gets so that he can make his arms go around and his piston go and hiss at a proper Tone 40 and he thinks he's doing the CCHs. All right; that's fine. Odd part of it is, there's enough mechanics built into it that even then it'll work. The CCHs go from bright white to gray. They do not go from bright white to black.

So this flaw in the CCHs might not be observed. Some auditor might think the CCHs were absolutely wonderful and he was doing it at the lowest shade of gray that you could obtain. CCHs will always produce a change on a case one way or the other. So you never observe the fact that they can be done completely wrong. You see how that is? I mean there's a gradient scale of wrongness, and it doesn't ever get to black. You can't be absolutely wrong in the CCHs.

But the degree that you drift from white is measured by the length of time the pc spends under CCH processing. And the more gray it is, the longer the pc is under processing. Do you see that?

In other words, the less properly these are done – they can be done totally mechanically and in five hundred hours everything is wonderful with the pc, you see.

They can even be done totally mechanically and half-wrong most of the time, and you'll get some sort of a result. You see, CCH is, actually – it's almost – if the guy was as bad as shook the pc every now and then and said, "I like you," you know, occasionally, or something like this. Something's going to happen after five hundred hours – something. Because you got a two-pole situation. You're working with a two-pole situation regardless of what point of the Tone Scale.

Now, let's now do it right. This is how to really speed up the CCHs. CCHs are a matter of bringing the pc to present time. Now, why do you want to bring the pc to present time if what you really want to do is get him back down the track into the GPM?

Ah, that's because the GPM is upside down, backwards, locked in, crossed up and there's so much keyed in in present time that it takes you quite a while to get to these masses unless present time is more or less (quote) (unquote) "achieved" by the pc.

In other words, you can do a lot of keying out of masses before you do 3D Criss Cross and make 3D Criss Cross much more workable.

So do the CCHs for a while and key out several of those inverted loops. See, he's got stuff keyed in from the year zero, you know. Well, let's get that, you know, lined up a little bit. And he's got the vestal virgin where the waterbuck ought to be, and so forth, and it's all messed up.

In other words, locks are all curled over into present time and he's dramatizing some lock on the early track so hard, you see, that you can't even get to a real piece of the Goals

Problem Mass, you see? The locks are so active. He's got a lock terminal, you know. A murderous husband. Got a lock terminal, see.

It's just a lock! It hasn't anything whatsoever to do with the real terminal. But it's locked up on it. The real terminal isn't even a murderer, you see; it isn't even that close.

The real terminal is probably a bad wife. And he's got this keyed in and somewhere or another – a murderous husband. It's all keyed in.

Well, it's nothing that you would even want to come near in a GPM because it isn't even part of the GPM. You see, it's just locked up on it.

You do the CCHs, that'll fall into line. Otherwise, he's got a problem with his wife every couple of days, see. He's restraining himself from killing his wife every couple of days. So he gets a big GPM every day – every couple of days – he gets a big PTP. Every couple of days, he just has trouble. He's just having trouble all the time. Well, you do the CCHs, you kind of lay this stuff back on the track, you see. Get him up to present time. Get him out of some of these things.

Well, how do you do that? How – what's the expert, smooth way of doing that?

First thing you do is bring his attention over onto – you do the CCHs two ways at the same time – you get his attention over onto the auditor, and of course by utilizing communication, control and havingness of the environment, you, of course, attract the pc's attention to the environment because these are the mechanics of communication and duplication, and that sort of thing. The things that you're using, you see.

All right. And at the same time you're doing this, you handle the double-mass factor in his mind. See, you not only handle the double-mass factor in the environment – here's the pc being a pc looking at the auditor and looking at the environment – you also handle this in his mind. How do you handle this in his mind at the same time? By maintaining two-way comm with the pc, of course.

How do you do that? Well, you treat the pc's every twitch as an origin. Every time the pc does something – you'll notice that the pc doesn't notice most of these things that he does – you call the pc's attention to it, by querying. Say, "What was that?" you know. Any way you want to say – you could say "How does that feel now?"

"What?" the pc, is the common response. See?

Why did he say what? Why hasn't he noticed it? Oh, well, that's because he's being the single mass. He's being a somatic, for God's sakes. He's being a habit. He's not even being a being. See? And because he's *being* it, he *does* it!

And you say, "What was that?"

And the pc has to go back up here and look at what he's doing. And he says, "What?"

And you say, "That."

"Oh, oh, *that*. *Ouch*." In other words, you exteriorize him from this manifestation. Do you see? It's actually very easy.

Every time he does something, you exteriorize him from it. If you fail to do so, oh, pass it on. Catch it next time.

Now, what are you doing in the CCHs? You're setting up a two-pole situation between the pc and the environment, which includes the auditor. And you're setting up a two-pole situation in the mind by *insisting* that there is *something* there – except you'd insist very gently by asking, "What is that?" – that there is something *else* there besides the pc all the time.

And the pc has *no* choice but to slip out of the somatic so he can look at it. And then you get a two-pole situation going in the bank. And so you get change, change, change, change, change, change, change, change.

Now, what happens in 3D Criss Cross? This again is an elementary situation. You're finding what the pc has been. And when he sees it, he ceases to be it.

You recognize that when the pc is listing – oh, let's take a five hundred item list. You know he's been every one of those items – every single blasted one of those items. Just the business of listing.

You know, two hundred trillion years is a lot of years. If you don't believe it, why, just think back sometime. Anyway, he's been every one of those items that he's listed.

Well, let me say this: He's either been them or raised hell with them. He's had an intimate acquaintance with each one – that's for sure.

Well, look, how many – you've made him differentiate five hundred times. You made him exteriorize five hundred times. Oh, this begins to look like Route 1, doesn't it? You made him exteriorize to some degree from five hundred identities less the one, two or three he's being so obsessively, he can't see them. And the last one the pc thinks is it, is always it. *Why?* Because if he weren't being it, it wouldn't hang up and keep reading. If he knew which one it was, accurately, he wouldn't be in it.

That's where we get the idea of if the pc knows what's wrong with him – that isn't what's wrong. That's for sure because if he can look at it, he isn't in it. See? What's wrong with him is what he's *being* so obsessively that he cannot observe it.

So you've exteriorized him from five hundred items to some degree except the last – the last one. And when that finally exteriorizes – *ooh*. That was the one that had all the charge on it. *Ooooooh*. That's a bum one. He gets cold. He gets this and he gets that.

Of course, you've walked him back to what he's being. Now, you find the oppterm and that's what he's concentrated on. While he's being this, he's concentrated on that.

And you start getting this whole package start blowing up right in his face because you've got a two-pole situation sitting right there in the bank and it starts discharging.

Now, the thing that makes the GPM hard to tie down and 3D Criss Cross a little bit difficult to do is sometimes he is so obsessively being the internal items that are close in and so slightly being the first items that you find – you see, he's still being them – but not to that obsessive degree which you might expect later – but he doesn't come close sometimes – this is not always true – but he sometimes doesn't come close between the terminal and the oppterm.

You think you've got a package like this, but you very often don't get your terminal package like this. You get a terminal package – this is the commonest, early package – is you get a terminal and then a plausible opposition terminal, only there are twelve in between before they meet each other. See?

If you're lucky, you'll hit them dead on the nose and they just go *poof*. But when they don't go *poof* and they hang up, you've just got many more packages intervening.

I'll give you an idea. A pc finally finds the item "child," and then we opterm this item, and it's "badness." *Ooooooh*, see. That was right at the end of a long, long intensive on a pc, by the way. That's not quite what I said, but to protect the case...

Well, you see, we just fell short of getting the *phfft*. We had all the items all combed down here to where there's only about two items left holding the whole bank together, and we got the item *next to* the item that opposed the child. That was a sad day because it meant we didn't have time to give the pc any more auditing, and it meant that we had to do more lists to get in close, you see.

What we had was this kind of a situation, see. [demonstrates something] See? That isn't going to blow, because that is the package. See, just the – see, that's the package there, see. And we found this. Leave it there. What's there? Well, that's exactly what the pc's being, is what's there. You see this? You got to have a two-pole situation.

Now, anybody that knows anything about exteriorization should really roll up his sleeves.

When we were telling people to bop out of their heads and go sail about...

By the way, you're going to be about six minutes more, you're going to be about ten minutes late for this evening. Is that all right with you if I finish the lecture? Or should I stop right now?

Audience: No! [laughter]

[laughs] All right.

The pc has got a "no-knowingness," really, of his beingness. We look at this fellow; he's being a man. No, he isn't being a man. Actually, in the – way down deep in the reactive bank, the most reactive thing about him and so forth and it makes him do this, that and the other thing is a waterbuck or something, see.

And the reason a waterbuck is hung up is because it's a tiger. And sometimes he dramatizes the tiger, you see. And he – the last thing he'd recognize this... You say to little Johnny, "Why don't you stop biting your fingernails?"

And little Johnny says – his first reaction is – "Do I bite my fingernails?" see, "Wait a minute," you know. He's gotta – starts worrying about himself because he never noticed he was biting his fingernails before, you see.

He never asked himself who or what would bite fingernails, you know. [laughter] He goes around thinking there's something wrong with him because he shouldn't bite his fingernails.

Well, we don't know why he bites his fingernails. Somebody says it's an absence of calcium. I'd say it was a prevention from scratching out waterbuck's eyes. Splendid way to keep from scratching waterbuck's eyes out. Keep them all bit off, see. Real good. "Now, if I don't develop claws, I won't get that nasty – into any of these nasty situations whereby I suddenly get pulled into the water, you know, and drowned like last time I was a tiger or something." You know?

You got something wild going on, and Lord knows what the explanation will be, but a person starts worrying about himself... That is such loose language. [laughter]

What's he worrying about? Well, you have to step back to take a look. And all of the CCHs, straight through to the end of 3D Criss Cross, should simply be a succession of stepping back to look.

And early in the game, one steps back as a beingness or an object or something to look at another object. And later in the game, one simply steps back as a thetan to look at a mass. You still got a two-pole situation. You've got a thetan and you got a mass. In all of the processes you're doing, from CCHs right on up through to the end of 3D Criss Cross are exteriorization processes.

Now, when we originally told somebody to be three feet back of his head, do you realize how often he came out as a mass? He went back in, too, didn't he? The only thing we were doing was we were just overshooting his ability by about a hundred thousand light-years. We were exteriorizing a somatic. [laughter] We were doing all kinds of wild things.

In actual fact, your 3D Criss Cross from the word go is an exteriorization process. You're exteriorizing out of his past – his past identities, if you please; his past energy masses, if you please; his past problems, if you please – all of these things you're exteriorizing him out of – one after the other. He's not ready to come out of his 'ead! Why man, he hasn't been in a head for – well, incalculable.

So in CCHs, if you run the CCHs very smoothly, you'll have present time sufficiently quiet and inviting and orderly and positive, that the individual will start exteriorizing out of bits and pieces of the past. We don't care what bits and pieces of the past he exteriorizes out of or if – if he does no more than say, "Oh, that somatic. Well, I wonder what that was."

You see, he was being it an instant before it turned on. It's been there all the time, but he couldn't feel it because he was it. He can only feel it when he wasn't it.

Now, as your individual is processed on the CCHs, he goes through a sequence of exteriorizations. A little past this and a little past that and a little past something else and something else, and he keeps exteriorizing and exteriorizing. We don't care anything about what from. We're just trying to make him look at present time and it's going to shift the bank, that's for sure.

And of course, we don't get him really, basically, all of him, anywhere near present time. But it feels like it to him; it feels better to him. And when we've got him up as much to present time as we can make it with the CCHs, why, then we ought to kind of clean him up so his rudiments will stay in and get him over on to 3D Criss Cross.

And then, of course, we start exteriorizing him out of all the beingnesses he has been and all the whatnesses and so forth. Sometimes you get lots of whats and conditions that the person exteriorizes out of before you ever get a beingness.

And you get these things, and you exteriorize him out of them – wholesale lots. And of course, if you're hitting these things on the button, and you're doing a good job, why, he's just coming out of mass after mass. Of course, he's coming out of a mass as a mass. And as a mass, he is inspecting other masses.

You will only get tone arm action to the degree that the individual is looking at something and you won't get tone arm action unless the individual is looking at something. We don't care what he is being while he is looking, but he has to be looking at something.

Now, of course, a substitute for looking, a lower-scale lookingness, is a feelingness. And you can sometimes do a bunch of feelies and get someplace with the CCHs where you might not.

Now, knowing that, knowing what I told you there and so forth, you actually, you've got all this; you could dream up a whole bunch of CCHs. You dream up a whole bunch of them, you know.

You could take your various drills of communication and to the room, to you, to this, to that – you know, and treat them all repetitively, you know. Good duplication. You could dream up CCHs like mad. But of course, they wouldn't be any good if you didn't keep calling the pc's attention, not just to present time, but to his bank because he wouldn't come out of his bank, would he. He'd just lock up. He'd slide out of his bank accidentally.

No, you can actually kick him out of his bank, you know. You say, "Gimme your paw, mate." And "Thank you."

And he gives you his paw, and as he does this, he says, "*Oomp.*"

And you say, "Well, good." You thank him, you see. You finish your cycle. That's a moot question whether you finish your cycle and ask or just ask. But you say, "What happened there?"

"Well, what? Oh – shoulder. Oh, yeah, the shoulder. *Ooooh.* It – it – it raised hell just a minute ago. Yeah, it kicked. Yeah, it did, didn't it?" Big win, see. Exteriorize him out of a somatic.

Of course, these somatics will turn on and off kind of automatically without ever calling his attention to it, and to the degree that you never call his attention to it and keep him in two-way comm on the subject, and keep him calm about the whole thing, to that degree he won't progress. See, so you've got a five hundred-hour CCH staring him – in front of you.

You could extend the CCHs to the degree that you didn't make your drills precise and repetitive. And follow the rules of the CCHs in general – just the basic rules. And to the degree that you didn't keep present time attractive for the pc – all very important, see – he wants to do it for *you*.

And, keep his attention on what's happening to his somatics or twitches or something of this sort, see? If he did those two things, hell, those – the pc will just *sail* on the CCHs. They are *not a slow process*. They are a very *fast* process.

3D Criss Cross is a *fantastically* fast process if you get the idea of how many exteriorizations per unit of time the pc is doing, man. It must look like the telegraph poles going by, to him.

You can exteriorize him one after the other, one after the other, and exteriorize him, exteriorize him, exteriorize him. You do a list. Differentiate the list. Null the list. Well, you've exteriorized him very well out of 497 and indifferently out of two, and found out he was stuck in one. And he keeps forgetting the one. It's hard to remember the one. How does he re...? Yeah, yeah. Can't look at it. He's just remembering it. You told him, so he remembers it. Get the idea?

And then you find the other side of it, and maybe everything goes *clank!* you know or *smash*. *Ooooh*. Or maybe it's been going *smash* the whole time, you see. And he eventually is the one, he can look at the other, and so on, and he's – and you'll find him, for days he's likely to go around trying to be the waterbuck looking at the tiger and the tiger being the waterbuck, trying to say, "Well, I wonder how it really feels to be a waterbuck. Well, I wonder how it feels to be a tiger. I wonder how it feels. I wonder how a waterbuck would think of a tiger. How would a waterbuck think of a tiger – I can't conceive of being a waterbuck; can't conceive of it. And frankly, I can't make up my mind about a tiger." [LRH is mimicking something during the last few sentences, audience is laughing at it]

He won't even know he's dramatizing them, because he's obsessively being them. Well, when you'd get into that combination, why, you'd need a little higher boost, but again it's just exteriorization.

But to summate very rapidly, it's a two-pole universe. Unless you have two poles, you don't have TA action. If you don't have TA action, you don't have two poles, so you must be doing something wrong. That's simple! [laughter, laughs]

If you got TA action and you're getting items, and you're calling the pc's attention to it, and ARC exists – no matter what you're doing, you're exteriorizing him from things, and you're straightening him on up and bringing him on up the line as a case. That's for sure. And that's basically all there is to the theory and practice of auditing.

Now, if you did that very neatly, you could actually figure out ways by which this could be done. See, you could take almost any pc and exteriorize him out of something even if you had to kick him in the head.

Say, "Look at my boot," you know. [laughter] Kick him in the head, say, "Look at my boot." And I tell you, sooner or later he'd see your boot, man. [laughter] I'm not advising that sort of thing. It's much better – sometimes a pretty girl sits there and audits this fellow for five or six hours and all of a sudden he gets a kind of a dazed look on his face, and he looks across from him and he realizes a pretty girl is sitting in the other chair. First gain. Ten hours later he knows it's an auditor. Maybe that evening he finds out it's an auditor. [laughter]

Okay. Well, that's – that's what I wanted to tell you about this. That actually is the first time I've been able to phrase accurately and precisely as a communication unit, exactly what auditing does and exactly what you're doing as an auditor.

And it's a fairly brief, comprehensible summary I think you'll find out and it possibly will make your auditing a lot easier to do.

Thank you very much.

Good night.

Gross Auditing Errors

A lecture given on 19 April 1962

Well, how are you tonight?

Audience: Fine.

Well, you're progressing anyway. Some of the people who were sitting at the back are now sitting at the front. [laughter] Must be some progress indicated here.

[Part missing]

Well, we have a couple of interesting things to go into tonight on these two lectures. And the first and foremost of them concerns rudiments and the demonstration which you saw last night.

And this is what? This is the 19th – 19th of April, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. You can always tell it's a Briefing Course lecture because somebody's knocking at that door over there. [laughter]

Now, you saw a demonstration last night and most of you understood what it was, although one of you thought it was a demonstration of CCHs. [laughter] But it wasn't. That was a demonstration of checkouts.

Now, first and foremost you should recognize that one of those demonstrations was not a good pattern. That was the one I did on Wing. And that was not a good pattern because it tended to invalidate his items even though it instructed the auditor to get the invalidations off of his items, you understand? Going over his items at that stage, when he's just now beginning to win – where are you Wing?

Male voice: I'm right in back here.

Yeah. Ah-ha, you retreated. Going over his items at that particular stage was not an optimum action, you see, because the difficulty really did not lie with the items. But there were a couple of false items on the list. But it won't upset a pc all that much. You see? Couple of them weren't proper, because he's still in the state of getting items to join up with items, you see? And there's still a lot of things between, you know, and around, and he hasn't quite got the Goals Problem Mass item versus the Goals Problem Mass item that causes a fizzle down and a blow, you see? You see, when you get the two adjacent items, one against the other, it all tends to deintensify like mad, you know. It takes tremendous – thing to hang up. He's still getting items which are distant from items. You got the idea?

Now frankly, the recommendation I would have made to the auditor – and this is the one thing you didn't see last night – you see, you didn't see the recommendations I would have made to the auditor, nor the inspection of the sessions. Now, those are quite important.

The inspection of the session would have followed each one of those. And I could have gone in and asked the pc more of what was going on in the session. And the way I would have done that is after I'd found what rudiments were out, I would have made a searching inquiry, perhaps, into it. And possibly the whole thing could have been located that way. I would not prefer to do that however. On auditing supervision, I would prefer to observe then, the session itself.

Now, I probably wouldn't do it the first time I found all the rudiments out, you see. Following that inspection of the pc and the discovery that the rudiments were out, I would have tipped the auditor off. See, I would have told the auditor to do so-and-so and so-and-so and get the rudiments in, you know, before he went on doing something and I would have been very pleasant about it. See? Gentlemanly; pleasant – at that stage. And then I would have, however, kept this – the GAE list – see, if I were running clinical actions, and so forth – a gross auditing error – GAE, you see? We haven't got enough mysterious terms. We have to invent a few more, you see.

And I would have taken this and I would have laid it aside. And after a couple of days I would have seen if I was getting a recurrence, see – three, four, five days. You know, was I getting a recurrence of all this. How long was this person staying on the GAE list? See, are we still getting a no tone arm action? That's all I would have adjudicated about it. See, in studying the report – the next day's reports – I would have looked for tone arm action. I possibly would have been very nice and given him two auditing sessions in which to get the tone arm acting, see? And by the next session after that, if I didn't see some tone arm action on that case, then I would have gone further than to have been polite with the auditor.

The next thing I would have done would have been stuck my nose in that session. Because I don't care how covertly you stick your nose in a session, whether it's by a microphone situated in the room in a listening post or simply walking in and letting – while the session goes on, you see. Because I would have assumed by that time that the gross auditing error was so gross that no advice I gave the auditor had anything to do with what the auditor was doing.

See, I would have assumed by that time this is *terribly* gross, you see, this is enormous. Any of you can get a pc with the rudiments out. Pcs' rudiments go out. You know, session ended a little bit early, they were three-quarters of the way through the list, they felt like mad. They went out of session after that and they nattered about the auditor and they ran up some overts against this and that, and they cheat-cheat on something of the sort and that made them call up their ex-wife and give her hell, don't you see? And then they decided that night they felt so bad that they'd better have a few drinks, you see? And havingness went down, don't you see? [laughter] And by the time we check this pc, why we've got out-rudiments. All right, fine. Yeah, sure. But tomorrow you get the rudiments in and the pc gets to sailing again.

Now, I'm talking about when the rudiments don't go in. See, then we start to get police-doggish. Now, we don't have to bark and bite and gnaw their legs off just because one time this was slated for a possible gross auditing error, you see, because we weren't getting tone arm action. Any auditor is liable to run a session with no tone arm action. See, that's liable to happen to the best of us. But three in a row without doing anything about it, no, that's

not liable to happen to the best of us. One and one-half, maybe. Two – and certainly not three. See what I mean?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Because an auditor would be a perfect stupe, he'd be a perfect knucklehead, to sit there with no waggle tone arm, and just go on and away and away it was running and feet on the window sill, you know, and having the pc light his cigarette. The thing is – the thing that must be just totally crazy, see. I mean a – because, look, look – you audit the pc in front of you, you don't audit a textbook pc, you don't audit a pc I mocked up for you – you don't audit any pc except the one who is sitting right in that chair.

And you have an oddity today – a great oddity. This has probably never happened before on the history of Earth, where the textbook solution had anything to do with reality. See, I mean, in all training – you will find all training has the common denominator of the textbook solution is never met. I rec- remember training generals in Egypt. It was difficult. You say, "When fighting Numidians, you inevitably and invariably make very certain that your flanks are secure, because the Numidian – because of horses and that sort of thing – can very easily collapse your flanks. So one of the first things you do in fighting Numidians is make sure that both flanks are very secure. And the best way to do this is to put one flank against the seacoast. You see? And the other flank against a wadi. You see, that's the best way to do that." No general you ever taught ever fought any Numidians on the seacoast. [laughter] You see, you run into these small difficulties in training.

That's typical of Earth. They're always telling you in navigational schools that what you do is go out on the bridge and you take a shot of the star, and then you take a shot at another star. And then you come back in and you put down accurately the times and angle, and then you figure it out by some navigational system, and then you've got a position. And it's always a textbook solution. The only trouble is, they never bother to tell you that the horizon can vary at various times because of heat mirage, you know, and it can vary because sometimes you have big waves, and if a fellow isn't terribly experienced in all this, he can get as much as a thirty-minute, fifty-minute error. Oh, just like that. And that, you see, is thirty to fifty miles. And – and that's on a good day. And on other days, when – that aren't so good he can get an error up to three and four degrees, and every degree is sixty miles. This is something on the order of finding yourself in the middle of the Sahara when you're going through the Straits of Gibraltar, you know?

Textbook solutions. They're marvelous. It disgraces all training on Earth actually, on practically every subject known to man. Because the guy on the job is always meeting conditions which are entirely different from the conditions which he has been taught to meet. Wars are full of these sort of things. All men's pursuits are full of these things. Women in all of their varied actions collide with these things.

You take a cookbook, you go into the kitchen, and it says – and somehow or another they just never – well you get this thing about a "pinch." I saw some textbooks on cooking once and you had "pinches." Please tell me how much a pinch is, you know?

Now, out in the gold rush days they used to hire bartenders with big thumbs because a drink went for a pinch of gold dust, you see? And the miner would put his poke up there to

buy a drink and the bartender would reach in and take a pinch, you see, of gold dust and serve a drink. So they always got a bartender there with a thumb like a spade. [laughter] How much is a pinch, you know? It comes down this far. And you get all these variations of one kind or another.

Well, it happens at this particular time and state in Scientology that you are actually up against this same textbook-solution proposition. You're not up against the same solution. The textbook solutions do. It's actually when you depart from the textbook solution that you get in trouble.

Now, in view of the fact your total experience on this planet is: God help you, if you use the textbook solution. The Marines had a song of somebody – I think Toby McFlynn, or something like that, he died with a grin, because he'd used the textbook solution, you see. And he was a great man, this is very – made it – heroic death, you see? Nobody else had used the textbook solution.

Now, here's your bone of contention. You always expect to encounter something different. See? You always expect to be – have some variation in front of you, from the textbook solution, see. And you really don't expect it to work out. And because you don't, you approach all such solutions with a little bit of variation and deviation – just a little bit. And you're always looking for something else. And that's about the only mistake you can pull in auditing today. You've got to audit the pc in front of you. That is to say, when he has cognitions they're his cognitions; those are all different. When he originates physically, he originates physically in his own peculiar way. They will all originate differently. You see?

When you get a string of 3D Criss Cross items, these items all have different names, see, they – from the next pc. See, they go together differently. It takes them longer to get a gain on some particular process, you see. One fellow, he really gets somatics on CCH 1; somebody else gets somatics on CCH 3.

This tends to give you the idea that you are looking at differences. Yeah, every pc's different, see. But truth told, what the auditor does is always the same and you miss that looking at the differences of the pcs. And you start varying much from the auditing which is being done right now and you will get into trouble because it's a tightrope walk. It's a tightrope walk that's been mapped now for a great many years. We've been getting closer and closer to walking the exact tightrope. And you've got now a situation where there are textbook solutions to everything that comes up – doesn't matter what you meet. You follow through the same way.

The amount of imagination which is required is minimal, actually. The amount of ability to communicate, almost, is the only thing that regulates the difference amongst auditors. One auditor, he's heard by the pc better than another. He's got a better ability to reach or something like that and a pc will receive these variations.

But, let me make my point here, very cleanly. We're used to having to think up some unusual solution in our old-time processes. See, get bright. You know, exert some real hot judgment right about this point. And man, you're going to be wrong every time you do. You take my word for it; you apply the textbook solution and you'll come up on top every time. And this is – makes it quite different from any training that's ever been done on this planet. See what I mean?

We're going against a series of invariables and these invariables probably look much more variable to you than they are, you see? Because you see them in different guises. Auditors wear different colored suits and pcs come up with, you know, different origins and they get different items, and so forth.

Now, it used to be we'd say, well, every pc is different. That's right. Every pc will have a different set of items and he'll have different things that he reacts on. But today we're up against the fact that every auditor has actually a limited number of things to do. And you just learn – one of the first things you got to learn – is that it's those things that you do. See?

Now, I put 3D Criss Cross out to grass. I wrote it to somebody who's ordinarily a very good auditor, on class what-do-you-call-it – Class I Auditor – always been getting good results and that sort of thing. And I put 3D Criss Cross out to grass by just writing it to this person and having this person have a crack at a pc. You know, how well could this thing be done by minimal information? Well, oddly enough, this auditor did splendidly. That's quite remarkable, you know? Did splendidly. And the pc wound up very satisfied. Auditor got about six or eight items on about three lines and the pc did splendidly; wrote a very congratulatory letter concerning all of this and so forth.

However, you get a report of these sessions, you know, and it stands your hair on end. The only thing that went wrong is the auditor did practically everything but 3D Criss Cross. I don't know when they found time to do very much 3D Criss Cross. But the auditor sat there inventing processes to cope with the pc. And the pc kept getting ARC broke and bitching around about this and that and being upset about this and that. And the auditor would just sit there and in the middle of everything keep inventing processes and doing different things in order to cope with the pc. Well, of course, this is the reason the pc was ARC breaking.

This was one of the processes that was used. This is not derogatory of this auditor; I'm just showing you this auditor was perfectly willing to do this but didn't get the idea that you didn't do anything else. See, that idea was not communicated. Don't do something else, too. See, it's like the pc always sitting there – he'll do the process alright, but he's doing seven other things, too.

All right, and one of these processes was, "Invent a worse way of baiting an auditor." Oh, these processes were off theory of one kind or another, kind of cross-pitched one way or the other. "Invent a worse way of baiting an auditor," to run out an ARC break. And there's apparently – the thing is salted down with dozens of these processes. I may exaggerate, but there's just dozens of these processes interlarded amongst the 3D Criss Cross all in an effort to keep the pc in-session. But, of course, the auditor never realized she was driving the pc out of session.

And probably none of these goofball processes are flat. They're all sitting there amongst 3D Criss Cross, all of them gorgeously unflat and everything else.

Now, even the best of auditors will all of a sudden do the banana peel. You know? He'll say to himself, "What the hell did I say that for?" You know, "Why don't I cut my own throat?" You know. He did something or other. The best of auditors will do this. See? The commonest difficulty amongst auditors is they don't realize that when the pc has said it, it is

blown. See? They take up – this is the commonest difficulty – they take up what the pc said and that is very bad.

And that is why you think you're always up against something else than a textbook solution, you see, if you're doing it.

The pc said – you say, "Well, what is this present time problem?"

And he says, "Well, my mother-in-law is coming to stay with me."

And the auditor, God help him, says, "Well, how do you feel about your mother-in-law?" See? *Oooh*. No, no, his question was present time problem – did the pc have a present time problem. The pc told him the present time problem. Now, the auditor's only job at that stage of the game, whatever the pc says, particularly in rudiments, whatever the pc says – it's just whether it blew then. You see? Auditors don't give pcs credit for blowing something on mentioning it. They don't know – always are underestimating the power of two-way comm. See?

"Do you have a withhold?"

The pc says, "Yes, I was out with your wife last night." Well, that's startling enough, you see, for the auditor to go over the hills and far away, but usually it isn't quite that pertinent or peculiar.

It's usually something very innocent as, "Oh, yes I have a withhold, I – uh – as a matter of fact – I'm not supposed to be drinking during this intensive and when I killed a quart of Scotch and I – last night, and I ..."

Hm. Now, the auditor doesn't go back and ask the meter, see, "All right, good. Do you have a withhold?" See? The auditor comes in and says, "Well, what about drinking Scotch?" Now, he's wound it up so it won't blow! See, he's killed his own release. See, that's the commonest difficulty in rudiments. The auditor won't let them blow.

This is commoner than you'd think. You've got to have something whereby the pc says what it is. The auditor has to assume, until he tests it, that that has blown it. It's that simple. You get yourself in more trouble assuming anything else than I could very easily count in terms of hours of processing and so forth. See, you get yourself in endless trouble with this thing. It all comes on this one basis: You ask the pc if he has a present time problem and the pc says, "Yes, I have a present" – of course it fell off the pin – "Yes I have a present time problem."

And the auditor says, "Well" – he can prompt the pc – and say "Well, what is it?" You know?

And the pc says, "Well, I don't know how I'm going to pay my room rent."

"All right, fine." The auditor should acknowledge that extremely well, because his acknowledgment is part of the blow mechanism, you see. And then he should ask the pc again if he has a present time problem. *Not* can he think he'd pay his room rent now! [laughter] See, what we got going here is the pc gets rid of it and the auditor keys it in again!

And that's really the chief reason why you're not cleaning rudiments easily. You're keying them in faster than the pc can key them out. You follow me? That's a commonest auditing error. I don't care whether you call this Q&A or whatever it is. But actually it inhibits the pc from blowing anything.

Now, the correct procedure is this:

"Do you have a present time problem?" Clang! goes on the needle here. Clang! All right.

"Good. What was that? It fell – what was that? Anything you care to say there?" That it ... "What was it?" See?

And the pc says, "*Yow-yow-yow-yow-yow*," and that is the present time problem.

And then the auditor says, "Good. Thank you. Swell. Fine."

I don't care if he feels like he blows the pc out of the chair with acknowledgments – acknowledge the hell out of this thing, you see. Ends the comm. And the auditor should look at that moment satisfied that he's handled the whole thing. That's the little schoolbook tricks of the trade I'll probably never let you in on. I say there are no tricks of the trade and then I give you one, see?

But, let's sound awfully satisfied along about that time. Just acknowledge the living daylight out of it, even relief that you've gotten rid of this present time problem. See? I can put a pc over the roly coaster on getting rid of out-rudiments so fast he doesn't know what happened.

You saw me beat one pc to death on a missed withhold here last night. I bet that pc right now knows she got rid of that missed withhold. I was – sat there because I was very happy she got rid of the missed withhold. Did you see that last night? Did you?

Audience: Yes, hm-hm.

Well, she actually did tell me what the missed withhold was. We did actually go over it. But we didn't spend any time on it, did we? Part of getting rid of it was communicating it to her, that I'd got it. And she got real convinced about this. And I must have gotten it in full, otherwise I wouldn't be so satisfied with it. Get the idea? See that? That's just auditor presence.

So, we say, "Oh, good!" Don't repeat the present time problem after him. Don't say, "Oh, well good, so you, can't pay your room rent this week. Oh, well that's fine. Good." [laughter] Don't do that, see. Just say – you've got to impart it without repeating it. You see?

And the pc says, "Well, I got a present time problem, I can't pay my – don't see how I'm going to pay my room rent this week."

And you say, "Well, all right. All right. Good. All right. Now, we're going to start a brand-new..." Another use of the acknowledgment – "Well, we've gotten rid of that." See? "All right, now. Now, we're going to – we're going to get on to the next thing here. See? Do you have a present time problem?"

And you find out ninety percent of the time it's gone – ninety-five, ninety-nine percent of the time. There's no ghost of a clip on that thing.

If you expect it to be there, if you expect it to go on being there for the next hour or two, it'll stay. This is how you do that: "Do you have a present time problem?" And the pc says, "Uh – uh – uh – yes, I do. Room, room rent – I don't – I don't know how I'm going to pay room rent."

"Oh, your room rent. Uh, well now," – the auditor is worried about it, too, see? – "Well, now – yeah, well, all right, now. Do you have any particular solutions on this? I mean, been thinking..." and so forth, "Who's that problem with? Oh, yeah, yeah. How much – how much money do you make? Oh, well, uh – you ever had this problem before? You had difficulties with it? Oh, yeah. *Hm-hm-mm-mm*. Did you ever have trouble with money?" [laughter]

Man, we can go on by the hour! Don't you see? See, fix it up man, you can just hang up there and you'll never get any auditing done, you know. You can go on and on and on.

Well now, that one percent, that one time out of a hundred, and you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" You get a knock, and you say, "Well, all right, what is that? What is your present time problem?"

Fellow says, "Oh, well, I can't pay my room rent this week."

And you say, "*Hm-mm*. All right. Okay. All right. Thank you. Thank you. All right now. Do you have a present time problem?" Clang. "All right, what's that?"

"Well, it's my room rent." [laughter]

That's the one time out of – out of a hundred. See? All right, well now, don't let that defeat you so the next ninety-nine times you run into the trick you run into the same chasm. No, the thing to do at that stage of the game – I'll give it to you absolutely right this time – "Do you have a present time problem?" Clang! "All right, and what is it?" And he tells it to you. And you say, "Well all right, all right. Good. Thank you. Fine. All right. Now – do you have a present time problem?" Clang! "All right, what's that?"

"Well, it's my room rent."

And you say, "All right. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. All right, now, do you have a present time problem?" Tick. "Good. All right. What part of that problem could you be responsible for?"

And the pc says, "Oh, most anything," so forth.

And you say, "All right. Now, what part of that problem could you be responsible for?" And you notice you're not getting much kick, see. And you say, "All right, now. Thank you. Thank you. Now, do you have a present time problem?" Nothing. You say, "Thank you very much. Is it all right with you now if we get on with this listing?" – or this Prepchecking, or whatever else we're doing. You got the idea?

Don't start a process. Don't have the Horse Guards come out, and then the Queen's own, and then marshal the Coldstream, you see? And then get a band. And then write a letter to the Times because the Queen didn't come down and – and inspect the troops. You get the idea? That's not the place for it! That's not the place for all that. That all belongs in the body of the session.

See? So let's not start and end, and mess up and so forth. You can give the last two commands for Havingness or something like that; because it isn't something you have to catch on the fly. The reason you could do that best as a present time problem or something like that, and just – you just start the process, you just end the process – that is all there is to that, is you're not giving it very much importance, don't you see. It's downgrading, and it's something you just say, "Well, this is – hell with this, we'll get it out of the road. It's good, it's important, yet at this particular time we got onto something else we're going to get. That's good."

You know, that's the whole atmosphere under which this thing is audited. Not, "Oh, well, gee-whiz you've got a present time problem. Oh, well that's too damn bad. I mean, God almighty, how am I going to get on with this session here, you see? Oh, I don't know whether I ought to take it up with you or not because, you see, we've got an awful lot of listing to do today for 3D Criss Cross. And I hate to get detoured by this present time problem, you see, because it's going to cause us so much trouble!"

If you're going into it with that frame of mind, you're going to have trouble. I can guarantee you will have all kinds of trouble, have it by the bushel-basketful .

But by just downgrading the whole importance of the thing, you see. Ways of downgrading importance is just to brush off process. You get the idea? If you're unlucky enough to have that process not work, I don't know, you must have been doing something else in the session that would be wildly out. I mean, it'd be – have to be some invented-something-elseness, such as not reading the E-Meter in the first place to find – or trying to run a present time problem that isn't there, or something like that.

Now, you could get that all involved, you see. Now, that's the simplest form, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" Well, I guarantee he's got a different problem. You know and I know he's got a different problem on the second time you ask the question. And the third time you ask the question he's got a different problem than that. And the fourth time you ask the question he's got a different problem than that. And then sooner or later he comes up to present time and has the problem of getting on with the session.

All right, well clip that one out and get going. But you see, you don't have to give it any importance. Weight: the way the auditor puts weight into the processing – w-e-i-g-h-t, you see, not: w-a-i-t – the way you weight the processing. You know what you're supposed to be doing in the body of the session. This is weighted, this is heavy, this is what we are doing. Oh man, dress parade, you know – plumes and cuirasses. Let's go on with this. Let's start that process and let's keep it going, and let's keep a terrific auditing discipline the while and get in your middle ruds once in a while when you have to and give it two more commands before you end it, and – you know what I mean? Oh, that's all just as precise as hell, you see? Very important.

Get to your end rudiments, see? You've ended the body of the session. Make damn sure that those rudiments are null. See? "Have you told me any half-truths? Untruths?" You see? Make sure each one is null. It isn't, "Have you told me any..." Somebody was doing it this way the other day, "Have you told me half-truths? Thank you. Have you told me any untruths? Thank you. Have you..." That's too much importance. See, "Have you told me any half-truths? Untruths? Said something only to impress me? Tried to damage anyone in this session? That's all straight." You tell the pc, "That's all straight." Got away with it; that's all straight.

All right, "Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?"

"No."

"Good; clear."

All right. Get the idea? "All right, have I missed any withholds on you? Have I missed any withholds on you? No. Good. Well, let me ask that again: Have I missed any withholds on you? Oh, I haven't. All right that's fine."

You can actually con-game the pc straight down to null end rudiments, you know?

All right. "Now, don't wiggle your neck but look around, just wiggle your eyeballs." [laughter] "Good – I got no reaction!" [laughter] "Fine! All right! Good! Ah! Good. That's fine."

Now. We ask about the goals and we ask about the gains, and we slide it out of session, and that is the end of it. Get the idea? And you know, you, the auditor, can actually sort of hold the rudiments in, but only, only if you do this, only if you do this: give a flawless session.

Now, all of us make goofs in session sooner or later. And they're always regrettable. They're completely forgivable. They only become *unforgivable* if you *continue* to make goofs. See, nobody's too interested in the absolute perfection. But we are very interested in an infrequency of goof.

Now, we want – we want confidence on the part of the pc. And confidence on the part of the pc is born by consistency on the part of the auditor. And any time an auditor becomes inconsistent, any time an auditor Qs-and-As, any time an auditor all of a sudden puts an odd, weird, cock-eyed variable into the middle of a set procedure, confidence goes down because consistency has dropped out. And those two things are blood brothers – Siamese twins. Confidence is born out of consistency.

You give the same session to the pc over and over, he will become very, very confident. He'll be very happy with you. And that happiness drops every time you vary the situation, every time you Q-and-A, every time you refuse to let him blow something.

See, here's a mousetrap sitting there and the pc comes along and he says, "There's a mousetrap." Well, ordinarily this mousetrap just moves away. He'll say, "Well, there's a mousetrap," and he's happy about it and he goes on in his session all right.

When you Q-and-A and insist on going on and on, in rudiments, over this same con-founded mousetrap, you're insisting he put his fingers in it and trip it. And then he does and then you're in trouble and then you never seem to be able to straighten out rudiments.

And the reason you can't get rudiments straight on the pc has very little to do with the pc and has everything to do with the auditor. It is actually the tone and attitude of the auditor.

An auditor's lack of consistency brings about a lack of confidence; and then your ru-diments start out.

Now, there is nothing like consistency of the exact procedure which we are doing at this moment – not subject to any changes to amount to anything – consistency in exactly what you're doing will breed confidence. So actually in along about the third session, the rudiments would just go in – just like that.

A pc notices the care that is taken with him. See, he notices this. "Do you have a pre-sent time problem? Good. Let me check that again. Do you have a present time problem? Thank you. All right, that's clean." See? That's the auditor being real careful. That really makes an impression with a pc.

You're not sure this item is in. We're talking now about bodies of sessions rather than rudiments we – at this moment. This item, you're not sure of it, you know? And you say, "Cat whiskers. Cat whiskers. Cat whiskers. Let me look at that now. Cat whiskers. Cat whiskers. Cat whiskers. Yeah, well, that's out. That's out. Okay. All right. Mules. Mules. Mules. Dogs. Dogs. Dogs. Dogs. Dogs. Dogs. That's out. Okay."

Care. Get the idea? He isn't saying, "Cat whiskers, cat whiskers, cat whiskers." [laugh-ter] For some peculiar reason the pc gets the idea that the auditor doesn't know what the hell he's doing.

So you can put another "c" on your confidence. And confidence is aided by careful-ness. It depends absolutely on consistency, but it is certainly helped by carefulness.

Now, rudiments go out when unconfidence is born. You get this pc nervous about what you're going to do next. You do the unexpected. You suddenly rip a new process out of your whip – hip pocket in the middle of the pc's run. Oh, no. You do this two, three times and, my God, you couldn't keep the rudiments in with bulldozers! I guarantee it. You just couldn't keep the rudiments in. That just couldn't – wouldn't work.

In other words, we all of a sudden we're running along, we're running along and say-ing, "All right. What part of a government would you be willing to attack? Thank you. What part of a government would you be unwilling to attack? Thank you. What part of a govern-ment would you be willing to attack? Thank you. What part of a government would you be unwilling to attack? Thank you. All right. Now, how do you feel about my auditing there? Got an ARC break or anything of the sort?" The pc went a little groggy for a second there. "Got an ARC break? All right. Now, invent another method for baiting an auditor." [laughter] "Invent another method for baiting an auditor." See? And then the pc says ... [laughter]

And I tell you, the more you drive rudiments out the harder they are to get in. And they are driven out just by inconsistency, that's all. Now, I don't care how carefully you ended

the process off – that you had run it at all... See? And we find out that isn't working too well and the tone arm has gone up to 6. So, of course we'd better shift it over and so forth, and say, "Well, have you ever tried to make an auditor guilty? Ah, good. Thank you. Well, have you ever tried to make an auditor guilty? Good. Thank you. Have you ever tried to make an auditor guilty? Thank you. Thank you very much. Have you ever tried to make an auditor guilty? Thank you very much. All right then. What government have you been unwilling to attack? Thank you." [laughter]

Pc will get jarred, man! And I don't care what pc it is, after a while, after you've done this, just in a few sessions – it's best done at different times for different periods and sometimes for a good reason and sometimes for no reason at all. That's what's best. And then nobody can get the rudiments in on this pc. The pc is a bundle of nerves. He's run up against a – you know, what the hell? What's going to happen next? He doesn't know what's going to happen next.

You give him three sessions of Model Session and they're all nice and consistent and everything is fine. There's a few little surprises in there; he didn't know you were going to ask things in that order. By the time you give him a third session, he expects them to be asked in that order. And oh, dandy, great. And along about the fourth session, why, those rudiments are awfully in. And the fifth session the rudiments are, well, they're just in, that's all. And the sixth session, well they're very well in. Seventh session, beautifully, beautifully in. What's happening? It's just the consistency is putting the rudiments in for you, that's all.

I don't care how normally... You've always thought the rudiments as being out natively in the pc. [laughter] And the auditor has everything to do with it. And you can get the most nervous and flighty pc in the world and if you were to audit the pc perfectly with perfect consistency, making no gains that would amount to anything, you know, but not getting upset about it, and just go on and give him that perfect routine. It's the auditing routine itself which is smoothing him down. After you've audited him for a little while, all of a sudden, auditing session? Well, that's dead easy, do that standing on his head, see? When he comes into the auditing session he's got tone arm action, but you didn't do anything to get him to get tone arm action. You just went over the rudiments and took up the routine process and always ran the same process with him for the out-rudiments, you see, and ran it briefly, and got him... And then you ran the body of the session just the way you're supposed to. By the time you've done this a few times, you don't hardly have to put them in. You check them; they're in. You see?

That's the magic of the game. That's where the textbook solution is the solution. And you'll find these rudiments do cover almost everything that can happen to a pc.

Now, of course, a pc's rudiments go out in the middle of the session. Well, actually, you want to know if he invalidated anything, and you wanted to know if there are any half-truths, untruths or tried to impress you or damage someone or if he's trying to influence the E-Meter. And that's just about all you want to know about him in middle rudiments and that's to get a list to start reading again, see?

But normally, you're the one that kicked it out. You did something. You're doing something. Either he can't understand what you're saying or he feels he's doing something

wrong, or something or other is going on in the session that he doesn't just get the grip of. You see? But the auditor has done something flagrantly wrong, I'll guarantee you, every time, if you have to keep putting these things in. If you have to keep using middle rudiments, there's something haywire here. See, there's a lack of confidence on the part of the pc.

Well, of course, what I say is taken within limits. There's some pcs that go scrambling off the walls and a pin drops a quarter of a mile away and you can see their scalp rise. They dramatize an old scalping incident amongst the Sioux or the Blackfeet, you see. And their whole scalp lifts off, you know, a pin drops. They can hear this. That's because environment keeps going out on them all the time, environment keeps going out.

Well, actually, environment will sort of habitually start to stay in if the auditor is consistent about what he does. Because more and more the pc will permit the auditor to take responsibility for the environment, and the pc will realize that if something bad happens in the environment, the auditor will do something about it. Don't you see? He gets the idea that this environment is not a threatening environment because the auditor is auditing him.

In fact, you could get him so that the only time of the day he's calm is when he's in session. Got the idea? And then he gets less and less uncalm out of session, but the first calmness he ever discovers is in session. You see what I mean? I mean, this gradually spreads around and he's calm regardless of whether he's in-session or out of session, about the environment. See, because you've remedied a bunch of things about his case by that time.

No, rudiments aren't something that natively out with the pc. They stay in as well as the auditor is flawless. That's all there is to it. You do a perfect job; you'll have a perfect pc. You can't help it, you see? The pc has had it as far as you're concerned. You're sitting there with all the weapons ...

If the number of factors that are being crisscrossed on the pc in an auditing session, you know – the number of factors that have to do with the human mind, contained in Model Session, were counted, you'd probably get up in the hundreds. And every one of them is a powerful factor. And if you do all of these things consistently, of course your pc responds accordingly. He can't help it.

It's something like shooting sparrows with sixteen-inch guns, let me assure you. He'll stay in session and then he'll improve and come up along the line and his case will get straightened out; everything will get very, very fine.

Now, the auditing which you saw last night was research auditing, to that degree. I showed you how to interview a pc, yes. But as far as I was concerned I had a piece of research on this thing. I'm always discovering things. And isn't it interesting that there wasn't a person there who didn't have the rudiments out? Did you see how wildly the rudiments were out? Oh, yes, well probably they were exaggerated in their outness. Very probably exaggerated in their outness by the fact that the pc was on parade. But they weren't exaggerated in their outness because I was auditing them. If anything, that tended to slow it down a little bit. It would only be to the degree that they thought they might have to protect their auditor that would get an influence and I don't think any of these people were trying to protect their auditor.

So it wasn't any more exaggerated in the final analysis – maybe a little bit – beyond what you actually would have seen if you yourself had taken one of the pcs in session and asked them these rudiments questions, see. Did you notice I didn't ask them the rudiments questions with a consistency? Consistency belongs with auditing, not interrogation.

So I just asked them, "How do you like the room?" You notice I didn't use any of the rudiments wording. That's to keep the pc from going into session to me. Because these things become a signal, "In-session." See. So we ask about the room, and, "How did you like your auditor?" You know, that doesn't sound anything like, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

You see. It isn't the same thing. You follow that? So you – I didn't use rudiments on these things.

But I showed you something. Well, I showed you how to interview a pc. And I wish to call to your attention that this – just the asking them the rudiments in some different phraseology, checking them over and asking what they thought about it, and looking at their folder and so forth, that's what you did, you're – originally were inspecting the case because it had no TA action, not because of complaints the case was making – never listen to complaints. It's just no TA action; minimal TA action. All right, so therefore the case was inspected. How come? How come no TA action?

Well, that's why you would interview such a case if you were supervising a lot of auditing. And the next action you would take would be a consultation with the auditor. "What are you doing, mutt? See. What's cooking here?" And very often he'll come down with a violent vituperation as far as the pc is concerned – you know right there that there's no ARC from the auditor. One of the best things to do is pull his overts on the pc and send him back into session. That's right.

And here you can pull all of an auditor's overts on the pc, particularly under supervised auditing, because very seldom are these people of long acquaintance. And you get yourself next day's report and you look at that and see if there's tone arm action yet, and the next day's report and see if there's tone arm action yet. And now, there's no tone arm action the next day, well, God almighty. This is auditing which is being done by the auditor hanging by his heels from the middle of the ceiling.

I mean, the gross auditing error is just by this time so magnitudinous – given any kind of a trained auditor at all – a gross auditing error is so gross that you yourself will not believe it. And then, of course, the only way to find it is not talk to the auditor, talk to the pc. But you actually have got to look at this session to find out what the billy-o is actually going on in this session. You have to look at it; there's no substitute for it at all. Because they can't imagine it. You see? Because it's – this is standard. The auditor thinks he should do this so he's not going to tell you he's doing it. And the pc probably is insufficiently in present time to find out what the auditor is doing, don't you see? You can't get your data there, you've got to get your data by a microphone inspection or by an actual visual inspection. There's no substitute for that because you find the damndest things man, *oh-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho*, wow. Oh, I needn't tell you to. But there's some wild ones will go on. I mean it's gross auditing errors.

But I want to point out something to you. This was the research aspect of the ... Well, gross auditing error is the auditor just isn't looking at the E-Meter; never looks at the E-Meter. You know, it isn't that he has something wrong with the way he looks at the E-Meter – I don't mean there's a – the auditor just doesn't ever look at the E-Meter! See?

There's something like this: "All right. Do you have a present time problem?..." [laughter] "Well that's clean." See? It'll be something wild! Unbelievable. Well, the auditor's sitting there all the time eating candy bars, you know? And the pc's out of session because the crumbs and that sort of thing keep getting on her white skirt, you know? [laughter]

It gets so wild – by the time it's gone four days, there's something going on there that's so wild that I guarantee you, you will not be able to imagine it. You have to go see it. It's like Barnum used to say about a circus. By that time it's getting up into the freak-show class.

Because it's too easy to do this. So a lot of new, different, strange things are happening, you see, that you wouldn't really realize were happening at all. And early in training auditors, they don't realize these things have any wrongness to them at all. So, they just go on doing them until somebody actually spots it.

But I wanted to show you something – in general, completely aside from that. These cases were selected for only one reason: no tone arm action was now occurring that you could call tone arm action. No really good tone arm action was occurring on any of the cases you saw interviewed. Although some of those cases had *had* good tone arm action, but suddenly wasn't occurring. And I ran down the rudiments and did you see how the rudiments reacted? See? All right.

This checkup disclosed to me this fact: that tone arm action does not necessarily take place just because the rudiments are in. But if rudiments are out – this is true, you see, that other isn't necessarily true – but if rudiments are out your tone arm action will not take place, and that *is* true. If the rudiments are out, your tone arm action will not take place. You could get them far enough out so that you could just have a still arm.

This means that tone arm action is proportional to the degree rudiments are in – not proportional to the case. Tone arm action is not proportional to the state of the case. Tone arm action is proportional to the degree the rudiments are in.

Now, of course that's monitored by what is being run on the case, which is the only thing that would make a liar out of this statement because you can run some line that was utterly unsuited to the pc, or some Zero A question on Prepchecking that was utterly unsuited to the pc, or you could go on running CCH 1 twelve hours and a half after it was flattened. You understand? So that's not an unlimited truth. But it's to this degree, that the tone arm action will cease when the rudiments go just so far out. You see. The further the rudiments are out, the less tone arm action you will have on the pc, regardless of the case, but with the understanding that you're running an effective process. Do you follow this?

Now, you sat there and looked at it last night. Now you've got to take my word for it because I haven't shown you the folders on these people. But tone arm action was minimal. It was your quarter of a division in twenty minutes. See? And look at those rudiments, man; they were wildly out. Now, you'd think you had to get some wild and unusual and peculiar

and fantastic solution to handle any one of these cases. And that would be the natural bent. Let's find something new, strange and peculiar to handle these cases. The newness and strangeness and the peculiarness should consist entirely of the auditor doing a very consistent Model Session and getting the rudiments very nicely in. And that alone would have restored the tone arm action on any case I investigated last night – just as simple as that.

That's what I mean by the textbook solution is the solution. Now, the textbook solution of returning tone arm action to a case is to get the rudiments in. You have a reality on this. Probably any of you – many of you have seen a list go null because the rudiments went out. Well, translate that over into, "The tone arm went null, because the rudiments went out," you see, that makes it the same breed of cat. That's a little piece of research auditing you saw there. I just thought I would check across this and see if I could find a common denominator of this particular set of cases.

They aren't consistently no tone arm cases, you know. They were just taken as of that day, why, they were the low men on the totem pole. They had all gone numb just the last day or two, you see, as far as the tone arm action was concerned. Previously they may or may not have had tone arm action. You see that? They were not strange cases in other words, they were just cases of – with the tone arm motion didn't exist on. And we found the rudiments *thuuuh* ...

To restore the tone arm action you would – should have – might have said, "Well, the best thing to do is to – let's see if we can't audit this person with two auditors, yes, two auditors. And let's see if we can't run, uh – CCH 14 – uh – that's really best," and so forth.

And you see you could have gotten a whole bunch of unusual solutions and you could have said, "Well, invent another method of baiting an auditor," or something like that, "Invent a worse method of baiting an auditor," something like this, you see. You could – all these unusual solutions.

Where, as a matter of sober, sober, sober fact, all you had to do was get the rudiments in and the cases would have gone off like a bomb. In other words a greater consistency, not a greater randomness, would have given motion to any one of these cases. Okay?

Thank you. Take a ten minute break.

DETERMINING WHAT TO RUN

A lecture given on 19 April 1962

Thank you.

Here we are, second lecture and this is Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 19 April AD 12. And we're going to talk to you now about processes, recommended – recommended processes. Now, I haven't actually issued an authoritative statement on this – recommended processes – for some time. And it's about time that we did a summary on this particular activity.

Now, you're always going to run into difficulty on an interpretation. Interpretation gives you lots of difficulty, particularly if you do something else that isn't said, but something that is apparently understood in the statement. And nobody else understands it, but – that way and so forth.

But nevertheless, in the absence of a recommended procedure, of course, you could make a lot of mistakes of one kind or another. Now, I'll tell you an optimum method of auditing a pc, more or less, as of now. There's some data through on this and I've inspected quite a few cases in the last two or three months and several things show up. Now, I told you that Prepchecking, we dropped Prepchecking out and we only drop it out in the line of a permanent gain. See, we don't rely on Prepchecking for a long, permanent gain.

In the first place you could make a long permanent gain, perhaps with Prepchecking, if auditors would go deeply enough. And it isn't that the Prepchecking will not produce results, it's just that the auditor isn't producing a long, permanent gain with Prepchecking.

Nevertheless, this does not drop Prepchecking out of your lineup, a long way from it. Let's use Prepchecking at the depth the auditors are using it and that they're being successful with it. Now, this is the basic formula on which I would audit a pc today. I would establish whether or not the pc was getting tone arm action and then would adjudicate my future course on that basis. I'm not even telling you how you would have established this, don't you see? And get into 3D Criss Cross as soon as I was sure that the pc would get tone arm action and that his rudiments stayed in easily.

In other words, I'd get on 3D Criss Cross as soon as I auditorily could. See, I'd get to it as soon as I could. I'm talking now as though you were auditing a pc in an HGC or in your own practice, something or other. That's the way I'm talking right now. I'm not talking about, necessarily, how we would audit a pc here or how you have to audit a pc.

I'd establish this fact and if tone arm action was liberal and present I would get into 3D Criss Cross at once and sail from there, doing just standard, flawless, 3D Criss Cross. And I would get myself at least twenty lines. And in case I forget to mention it, 3D Criss Cross items are most beneficial, apparently, if opptermed at once. In other words, if you get a line, oppterm it so that you don't have lines without two items. In other words don't keep letting them slide. Apparently this thing goes together better and runs better if it's done this way.

That is almost an opinion, don't you see? I mean, that it – it's better that way. All right, it can easily be done the other way, but apparently it's much easier on the pc, gives the pc much better gains. His attention is right there on half of it so therefore you can get the other half rather easily and so forth. And it'll probably save you auditing time, make the pc more comfortable and there are apparently quite a few advantages to doing this. Okay? That's just as almost an aside.

But you get about twenty items – twenty lines rather and then you've got twenty lines, you've got forty items, haven't you? So you'd wind up with forty items. Now, somewhere along this line with this many lines, you would undoubtedly have reached practically every part and parcel of the bank one way or the other.

Now, I'd go back and get the third item for the lot by assessment. See, I'd just go over these twenty items. I'd just read them off to the pc and see which was bouncing the hardest and I would oppterm it. Neglecting that one now I'd see which one was now bouncing the hardest and I'd oppterm that until I had a line – a third rack for all of them. See? Now I've got three for all. See? And then I'd get four for all. Then I'd get five for all. You got the idea how it could go on?

Certainly, with that liberal spread, I guarantee that along about this time you'll be finding the pc. That's a very broad look in expectancy of what would be a complete 3D Criss Cross. It'd get complete along about that time. You'd wind up – you'd wind up with a crosscut saw and it opptermed timber. And then you would get timber oppterming a crosscut saw. And everything would start to cone down to this is what you got. And these were the items. And the pc was being the crosscut saw. And about that time he'd exteriorize from the crosscut saw and he'd be able to get into his body and the... You've got various things that could go on from there, don't you see.

But actually you're getting down – what you're doing is looking for the thing which the pc has been and which he has been interiorizing into as. See, he's been this thing. He's been this thing for ages. And really, it's the first thing he's been. Shades of the Rock. See, the Rock was the first thing the pc had been. You got the idea?

So, of course, if you get the thing – first thing that the pc had obsessively been, that is the last thing the pc will look at and exteriorize from.

Now, that's a theoretical map of 3D Criss Cross without doing any auditing of the items.

Now, you'll find that sooner or later your situation is going to change and your early items will deintensify. They'll start to drop out and the bank starts to fall apart and things that were reading now aren't reading, you know, you get that idea? Only your last lineup reads.

The early lineups no longer read. There isn't enough charge left in the bank to make them wiggle. See?

Now, to do that I would use, basically, Prehav – the Prehav Assessment and lines from the Prehav Assessment. I would use all the suppressor lines – pardon me, then I'd use the flows lines and then I would use the suppressor lines. Any other kind of a line that seemed to have worked out as being a good line, I'd just get a good sampling of others – a lot. But they would be dominantly suppressors, flows and prehavs. See, they'd mostly amount to those three lines – those three types of line. That'd give you lots. That'd give you lots to work on. I can fully expect that I'll come up with some even hotter lines, you know, that you say, "List this," and the pc disintegrates in the chair. [laughs]

But nothing would change with regard to the procedure. The procedure is the same, what you're doing is the same and that's all standard, see. Where you get your lines from, this could remain a bit of a variable, without disturbing the whole lineup at all. All right.

Now, that's – that's like this, see. We set the pc down and we look it over and the needle's live and it isn't scratchy and the pc's rudiments go in and we ask him some questions about this and that and he gets some tone arm action, and we say fine and we just go right into listing and we're off to the races and we get twenty lines and oppterm each line that we get. And that would be the way we would clear somebody, see?

All right, that's fine, that's the way I'd do it. I'd make the test to find out which way this thing went. I wouldn't particularly depend on profiles and I wouldn't depend on anything else. I'd just want to see that tone arm wiggle.

Now, I'm not telling you at this time the best method of finding out if the tone arm will wiggle. Because I wouldn't – I don't know it. I haven't investigated it on a whole bunch of pc's that have never been audited before and found what was the best way to test whether or not the line was wiggling. But fortunately you're not faced with that very often. You generally have a bit of history on this pc that you're doing and if you don't have a bit of history on the pc, why, you could do several things. You could give him a – start to give him a Problems Intensive or something like that. And you're going to find out if that thing is going to move, see? Anything that will establish whether or not the rudiments can be put in and the tone arm will move. See, any way you could establish that would tell you, "That's fine, we'll go on and do 3D Criss Cross," or, "Now, let's get to the crux of the situation – *heh*, we'll do something else, *heh-eh*."

It looks something on the order of a fixed beam. It sits there and it goes beautifully from 4.75 to 5.0 and drops *all* the way back to 4.75 and then goes *all* the way up to 5.0. And this continues on, but as the session progresses the tone arm gradually drifts down so that it's reading a bit lower. But at no time is it moving. Do you see how you'd get the idea then that movement is different than drifting? Well it is slightly. A constantly rising needle, for instance, will get you a constantly increasing tone arm, you see? You can also have constantly dropping needles. It isn't motion. It's just gradual, there's nothing happening.

You might say it's tone arm action without needle read, if you can imagine this thing. These things will drift. During the course of a two-hour session, why, the pc drifts down one division of the tone arm scale. Or he drifts up. That's not what you would call motion. Motion

is regulated every twenty minutes and is usually in different directions. It's going up and it's going down and it's going up a little and it's going down a lot and then it's going up a lot and down a little, you got the idea? It's not just falling, falling, falling and then it finally – this falling needle finally just sits. And if you were to continue the session to four hours it would have sat the last two hours or something like that, do you see – this is needle behavior, tone arm behavior.

The – you can tell, you can tell – it takes a little bit of observation. You can tell whether or not somebody is going to have a moving tone arm, whether their tone arm moves. It's not a very hard thing to figure out. You get used to it. You observe it. You say that's it. That's a moving tone arm and that isn't. That's all.

All right. What happens? What do you do? Well, frankly, it's not enough to just give it up. I wouldn't say, "Well, he's had it." Because we have a much better solution. And that's a combination and an alternation between Prepchecking and CCHs.

Now, you've got CCHs which all by themselves, if you observe the pc's physical origin and take it up as an origination and query it – you can make mistakes on that, you know. I found out an auditor sometimes can't see the pc's physical origins, you know. The pc's head falls off and rolls across the floor and the auditor says, "Give me that hand."

So, there is no vast shift of case while doing the CCHs, because the auditor isn't really doing the CCHs, you know. He isn't taking up the physical origins of the pc and isn't getting the pc exteriorized out of these little somatics and so forth – isn't doing a good job.

We feel a certain delicacy right now because everybody isn't doing this uniformly all that well. You know, it's something you got to get the hang of. I'm sure you can learn how to do it. But you haven't all got the hang of it yet, by a long ways.

But even if you didn't have the hang of it, you would eventually win. You get the idea. So we're operating kind of with a lead-pipe cinch here – if you combine it with Prepchecking. Now, if you combine good CCHs with good Prepchecking, man, you've got a winner! See. But, if you combine indifferent Prepchecking – providing you miss no withholds, providing you don't run up a bunch of missed withholds on the case – and indifferent CCHs, you still got a winner. That's what we've got to count on, see. We unfortunately can't count on a perfection all along the line.

See, even indifferent 3D Criss Cross gets you some gains. And similarly, in not-too-perfect and not-too-searching Prepchecking, plus not-too-good a CCH combination will still get you wins. In other words, you – we haven't got losing processes here which is a good thing.

But it looks to me that the CCHs have to be handled as CCHs and Prepchecking has to be handled as Prepchecking. And you don't combine a session of CCH and Prepchecking. It looks to me like this is clumsy. This apparently is clumsy.

Now, a person who can't as-is things because he is being it all – you know, he's being the whole universe and he can't as-is anything – it looks to me like this person really isn't going to as-is very much on the Prepcheck and at the same time isn't going to as-is very much on

the CCHs. But both of them will have some tiny workability. And they have a greater workability if interplayed.

Now, you needn't be so mathematical as Prepcheck one session, CCH one session, Prepcheck one session, CCH one session, you see, because this ratio would vary from pc to pc and therefore you can't lay it down as a textbook solution beyond this: Just what can we get done in a session? That's the whole thing. What can we get done in a session?

Of course, it'd be a terrible mistake to prepcheck – remember now, I'm talking about somebody you would audit, not here, just – you know, you sat down and you handed them the cans and you started the session and you did something, whatever, to establish what kind of tone arm action they were going to have, even get their past history and illnesses, see. That will establish tone arm action. You know, do your Preclear Assessment Form and keep a good record of the TA action on it – whatever you're going to do. And you said, "This isn't much, man. This isn't very much. When we're talking about the past and his thinkingness, it isn't very much."

Now, you might get good TA action as long as he was talking straight to you and you were doing some kind of a two-way comm basis where he was trying to tell you about something and his attention was totally on you. You might get more TA action than you really deserve to get. So the TA action test would have to be taken on the basis of "think." It's TA action while he is thinking of something, not TA action while he is talking to you. See. So your TA action while he is talking to you doesn't mean a thing except he might have to have CCHs run, see. But TA action while you're asking him to think – that's the important action, you know?

"How many times have you been sick in your life?" You know.

Now, he says, "So-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so." And you've been getting this kind of TA action, see.

You've been saying, well – he's been saying, "Oh, well uh... Let's see. Would I – would I mind talking to you? Uh – well, I – I guess I could talk to you all right. You – you seem to be – you seem to be very – very sympathetic" – the attention square on you. All right, that tone arm action – do – hardly bother – you can note it down for the record, but don't take that as your adjudication.

"Now, let's see, what uh – what – what have you – how many brothers and sisters do you have?" See.

"Well, brothers and sisters – yes, brothers and sisters, brothers and sisters, yes – uh – brothers and sisters. Oh, you want to know how many brothers and sisters I have. Let's see. *Hmmmm*, brothers and sisters, *hmmm-hmmm*, *hmmm-hmmmm*, brothers and sisters – well I haven't got any." [laughter]

"Well, all right. Well, how many times have you been sick in your life?"

"Well, let's see – been sick in my life, sick in my life. *Mmmmmmm*, been sick – oh – been sick – long time ago. *Mmmmmmm*, I'm very healthy. I've never been sick in my whole life."

"All right. Well, good. Now, what goals have you had?", and so on.

"Well, oh, I've had quite a few goals... Not – not many recently."

It doesn't matter a damn what he's saying. Watch that tone arm, you see, when you're asking him introverted questions. That's what will count. And man, if you didn't get any more than that 3 to 3.25 to back to 3 again or if it was just a big drift up, with no confront, you know, just going up, up, up, up – the more you ask him about think, you know and so on. And you notice you have to keep setting the thing and so on. Twenty minutes have gone by, you've gotten 7.75 in twenty minutes, you betcha you have – it's rising. And he's getting out of there. He's just gone past Arcturus by about now. [laughs] And you audit him for an hour and he's up to here someplace, and so forth, and gradually comes on up. See, that's not tone arm action, that's drift. See, tone arm action is this way. Drift is just consistently up or consistently down. See.

All right, you would say: "Brother, we've had it." That's what you'd say because you know several things. One, you know the rudiments are not going to stay in. That's what you know. And if you have to put them in, my God, it's like driving stakes with a candy stick, you know? Trying to lay railroad rails, you know, with chewing gum. *Psssst*. You know you've had it there, see. So you're not getting adequate tone arm motion.

And so you would say that we is going to do two things with this pc. We're not necessarily going to go off and do nothing but slog CCHs. We're going to do CCHs and Prepchecking on this pc. That's what we is gonna do. And we're going to do CCHs and then we're going to prepcheck in the direction of trying to get his rudiments in. And a session of CCHs is a session of CCHs and a session of Prepchecking is a session of Prepchecking and neither the twain shall mix.

I told you a little while ago I didn't know anything much about this. Well, I've seen a little bit about it, I haven't gain – haven't gained an awful lot of information concerning it but it just looks clumsy. I don't know that it's bad. But I have found out that the TA action on the CCHs at first test, appears to be very good in spite of the fact that TA action is probably lessened by the tester jumping in with the E-Meter every few minutes. Apparently it's very good on a case that ordinarily wouldn't get much TA action. We haven't finished that study either, but the first indicators on the thing are that it's very good, your TA action on the CCHs. You don't get a chance to observe it, you know, because you haven't got a long enough lead.

The auditor down in Joburg who kept coming back to the Dir Mat and asking for a longer lead on his cans. Finally they blew up. "Longer lead? What the hell! How many feet do you need?" You know?

"Well, I have to have enough feet, because it's going to have to reach across the room, you know, and so forth. When the pc's doing 8-C he moves across the room, back and forth."

Nobody up to this time – nobody had ever told this poor auditor that he didn't use these, see? He'd just assumed that if it was auditing you had an E-Meter and that was all there was to it. They sure were baffled around there, while he was asking for these longer and longer cords, though. Imagine it was embarrassing when the pc did a turnaround, you know, wrap them around... [laughter]

But anyway – anyway this indicator is here. We've been just handing a pair of electrodes and getting the tone arm position of the pc and then he goes on for a while. And we've been doing it against an arbitrary time period, you see – every three minutes, I think it was. And whatever the pc was being made to do, we just interrupted and handed him the electrodes. And the TA action's pretty good.

Well, that's fine. That's fine. But I have found this out about the CCHs; that if CCHs turn into a wrestling match, the auditor's missed a withhold. Simple. Interesting thing to find out, isn't it? If it becomes a wrestling match, the auditor's missed a withhold. Well, so there you are. How are you going to get a withhold off a pc who is doing the CCHs? Well, you're going to do it by doing the CCHs. If it becomes a wrestling match in that session and you go out of two-way comm with the pc and you can't talk him back into it again, it's a wrestling match, that's all. You finish up the session. And then you go and next session, why, you're going to do Prepchecking – particularly on the Zero question, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" or "Has a withhold been missed on you?" And you go ahead and straighten this out.

Now, supposing you can't straighten this out in one session? Supposing you're leaving him way down the track and all hung up? Well, then you, of course, do Prepchecking for two sessions. And then if you're – got the E-Meter cord all wrapped around your neck by that time and you can't get out of that and it just seems like you're hanging yourself, you'd better go back to the CCHs if you didn't clean it up in two. I wouldn't go running a marathon, here. I think the zenith would be about three before you went back to the CCHs, because you're handling somebody who probably has a poor ability to as-is, see? And you can bury him deep, man. You can really push him down for the third time by doing or making him think, think, think, because he isn't getting much tone arm action.

Of course, you're prepchecking against no tone arm action to amount to anything, so you're liable to be in trouble. But nevertheless, you'll pick up enough missed withholds so he isn't all that mad at you and he'll make enough gain toward present time in the CCH – next CCH session you run on him, so he isn't all that out of present time and that seems to be going along very smoothly. And now your CCHs seem to be pretty well flattened out on this pc. You've done maybe three sessions and they all appear to be kind of – a little bit more even, you know, and so forth. And it looks like you get minimal change. Right? So, let's go back to Prepchecking. See? Let's prepcheck him. And we get something a little bit flat, feeling a little bit easier about it and so forth – actually running the Prepcheck through a change to a no-change, same way. Let's go back to CCHs after that.

Optimum, would be of course, to follow the Auditor's Code and to prepcheck him as long as he was producing change – to CCH him as long as he was producing change. And if you get too involved or too upset on making up your mind *when*, well, just follow the Auditor's Code on it and it'll be all right.

That, by the way, may not be optimum. You may be burning more time up than you should be burning up, but in the final analysis that would get you there, you see. Because if you did that to – *in extremis*, you might find yourself doing 60 hours of CCHs and then 50 hours of Prepchecking, whereas you might have been able to make the whole gain in 50 hours of Prepchecking and CCHs, instead of the 110, you see? It might be that much faster.

In the first place, you're treating them independently, not as two different processes. I say, the theoretical method of doing it would be to flatten the CCH approach and then flatten the Prepcheck approach and then flatten the CCH approach, and so forth. And if you're – if you get too much in a quandary about what to do with the pc, fall back on that one, see?

But you could also run it this way. Pick up a gain – here's another way to adjudicate it, rather than arbitrary times – pick up a gain on the pc in Prepchecking and be happy about it and pick up a gain on the CCHs and be happy about it and pick up a gain on the Prepchecking and be happy about it – making a whole session, do you see? Not running half and half, but making a whole session. If you're going to CCH, do a whole session of CCH, you see. If you're going to prepcheck, do a whole session of Prepchecking. But try to bring the thing up to a gain. And I don't care if it tapers off and he's kind of restimulated at the end of the session or not.

But nevertheless he had a win in that session, see? That's fine, well, let's do some CCHs. In other words, gain, gain, gain, gain. You know, alternate on the thing. You'll probably get it fine. You find yourself sometimes doing two consecutive sessions of CCHs and three consecutive sessions of Prepchecking and one session of CCHs and two sessions of Prepchecking and you see how – what I mean? But you're processing him toward a gain and a win.

Now, what direction are you processing him? You're actually processing him into rudiments in. And that is your goal. Now, if you get rudiments in, you're going to get tone arm action. And that's the secret of it all. Not rudiments beaten in, you see, you're not going to get tone arm action. But, if the rudiments are actually in and he's really happy about being audited and he's happy about the environment and he's happy to have you as the auditor and so forth, you're going to get tone arm action. Because you're not getting tone arm action because the rudiments aren't in.

His rudiments aren't in in life. He can't talk to people, he can't – including you. And he can't be in a room, he can't – including this one! See? And people have missed withholds on him, they have. Not only his boss and his wife, but you, too. See? And also the cops sometimes.

In other words, the rudiments of life are so wildly out that the person never really can slide into session because they're so out in life. So of course, he can't ever relax enough to as-is anything. You know, he can't look at anything else except what he's in.

He's walking around in a mass and he's so fixedly and so constantly in this mass that only the problems of the mass are the problems of life. The problems of life are the problems of the mass, don't you see. He has a certain number of problems. Dogs bite you, wives desert you, walls fall on you, you see? And you've got to tell half-truths, you see, because untruths are vital to the situation, you see? And if you don't impress everybody with the fact that you're sane, why they'll know you're crazy, see. And this is life, to him. And his difficulties are simply a long parade of out-rudiments.

See, they aren't just out in the session, they're out on the street and on the bus and at work and at home and so forth, you see. They're just out. Well, it'd be a pretty good trick if you got the environment quite real to him and got him feeling friendly toward people and so

forth. And you'd say, gee, you know, you've just posed, really, the highest goal – actually higher than any psychotherapy has ever had on this planet. They've never really had that much goal. "Get rid of all of these bugs crawling on me", you see. That's about the highest goal psychotherapy has ever had, you know.

He'll go on believing his wife is putting poison in his coffee. And that sort of thing is just a normal course of human events, you see. But to not only get the bugs off of him, but to get the poison out of his coffee, you see and let him actually sit down to a table, you see, instead of having to stand up at a buffet and a few little things like that.

You never thought about this. That would be awfully high for formal psychotherapy. And now, we're posing this – that rooms, environment, people – he's going to be comfortable in all of this? He's going to be comfortable in space? And he's not going to be bugged up all the time, every time he goes anyplace. And he's going to feel all right in crowds and... Hey, wait a minute! We're getting up to a higher goal than psychotherapy has ever had. Aren't we? And yet you know you could do all those things with the routine I'm laying down for you here, you see, the CCH and the Prepcheck. You could accomplish them all, not even going very drastically into the case, just doing it by textbook.

Take your Prepchecking and take your Zero questions – are simply your rudiments questions. And any subdivision of them that you happen to care about as your Zero A. And then actually find a withhold before you go asking him the What. And then ask the What as a chain and clean it as a chain. You'll find out this will work pretty good if you do it that way, see. I'm not asking you to do some extraordinary piece of this and that.

Now, of course this person is not going to have very much tone arm action the first time you do the prepchecking on him. It's going to be very small. But you're going to follow this with the CCHs. You're going to put in that first rudiment with the CCHs, but good! Going to get him used to his environment, you see? That's one of the rudiments. So you got to get that one going. And then you're going to get these other Zero questions sort of cleaned up, particularly missed withholds. But missed withholds is not really part of the rudiments. Missed withholds is actually something you introduce in at odd intervals.

Now, let's look at this. Let's look at this. We take a pc. We don't care if he's been audited or not been audited, except for this: If he's been audited and you've got accurate session sheets on him, you can look at these session sheets and make a guess at whether or not he gets tone arm action on think processes. And if he doesn't get lots of tone arm action on think processes, we know where this case has got to go. This case is going to go into Prepchecking and CCHs right away. But when I say lots of tone arm action, I mean *lots* of tone arm action. This tone arm action is *good*. See what I mean? He really got good, nice, tone arm action. No monkey business about this thing, you see. It's not mediumly fair tone arm action I'm now talking about, you see, 0.5 divisions. Oh, by the way, in doing his past 3D Criss Cross, he might have had times, let's say, in the fourteen sessions he has had on 3D Criss Cross that you have a record of, in eleven of these sessions he got no tone arm action and – to amount to anything, but in three he got good tone arm action. CCHs and Prepchecking for that boy. He got eleven sessions with good tone arm action and three sessions with no tone arm action, proba-

bly continue him on 3D Criss Cross and see how it goes. You see? Because you sometimes have cases hanging on a certain line.

The line – you're taking it inopportune. There's no motion on that particular line to amount to anything. It's unreal to the pc and so forth. That could cause minimal tone arm action. But, of course, this wouldn't happen very often, would it? So just to the degree that that wouldn't happen very often that's acceptable action for a 3D Criss Cross, you see? Eleven in which he got fine tone arm action and three in which his tone arm action wasn't worth looking at. See, well that's probably 3D Criss Cross. Let's keep it going. For sure 3D Criss Cross – fourteen sessions he has had with lovely tone arm action on all fourteen. Obviously we do the fifteenth session with 3D Criss Cross. You see? The 100 percent would be the lead-pipe cinch.

Now, this is – this is adjudications of what you run. But I'm talking now about somebody that you would run where you are – are out, just auditing a pc. Pc comes in and signs up, you turn him over to a staff auditor. You expect the staff auditor to audit this on him, see. You'd adjudicate this. You'd see the pc had no tone arm action worth beans. Now you'd say, well, let's get real clever here and let's pull this pc up, first by lifting the right side and then by lifting the left side and then by lifting the right side and left side, even though it's one millimeter at a time. We're going to lift it in a somewhat balanced fashion. We're going to get the think rudiments in, balanced against the environmental rudiments, see? Exterior rudiments are going to be balanced against the interior rudiments.

See, extrovert-introvert – the old formula of ACC 1. And they pull up kind of equally. And you'll find out that they'll both come up then. Of course, his havingness will run down if you make him think only. And his rudiments will start going out more and more furiously. You realize that the more a pc is having difficulty, the more difficulty he has. That's a hell of a thing, but it actually snowballs like mad. You realize the longer it takes you to get a 3D Criss Cross item, the longer it's going to take you to get a 3D Criss Cross item. See, the longer, the longer. Works in reverse – the shorter, the shorter! But the longer it takes you to do a 3D Criss Cross item and the longer it takes you to get an overt or something like that in Prepchecking, the less likely you are to get it. And the more likely you are to have the rudiments go out. See, the longer it takes the more the rudiments go out, is what this is all about. That's because length drifts in the direction of no auditing.

You see, it's more auditing to get an item a week, you see, than to get an item a month. That's obvious, isn't it? Well, if you look at an item a month session going – unthinkable enough there have been them – an item a month session – you never saw such a cat's breakfast in your life. It's the most ghastly looking mess. Down toward the end of the last two, three – about the last two weeks or ten days of that the pc's – the auditor knows the pc's rudiments are out because the pc has picked up the chair and splintered it with a crash, all over the auditor's head, you see. He'd say, "Oh, the rudiments are out."

It's a fact! The longer it takes the longer – the more they go out and the more violently they go out. In other words the longer it takes the less chance you have of getting it. This will become recognizable to you some day. You'll get a big reality on this thing. You all of a sudden do an item up in three days. They're all items with long lists, yes it takes a while to do an

item in a long list and so on. Pcs also go *bang* and other things happen and the bottom goes out from underneath them on some things and so forth, all in the line. It slows it down, you see.

Well, when this stretches out to a couple of weeks, you're already in bad trouble. That's getting nasty. That's getting real bad. Because from here on after, I'd say eight or nine days, the rudiments just go progressively out because you're approaching a no auditing, see.

And rudiments are most out on the least auditing. And they're most in on the most auditing. That is to say, the more the pc feels he's getting audited, the less the rudiments will go out. And as a session approaches this no-auditing thing, the auditor's sitting there and the pc's sitting there but nothing's getting done. And as the session begins to approach that *reductio ad absurdum* of no auditing, why of course, similarly, the rudiments go out in proportion to no auditing, see, until the rudiments are – go more wildly out than they are out in the normal operating life of the pc, see? You know, a session can go – rudiments in a session can go further out than they are out on the person. You see?

The degree of responsibility he's accepting for an environment shows that he has to put on a good show while he's walking down the street and riding in the bus and that sort of thing. And in a session he hasn't got that degree of responsibility restraining him and the rudiments go out further than they're out.

Now, if you inspect this carefully, you'll see then, that there is every reason to audit in the direction of wins. The pc at first is giving you extraordinary and extravagant goals. You can almost tell the state of a pc by reading the goals he sets up for the session. Not the goals for life or livingness, the goals he sets up as his session goals. Sets up as a session goal "Well, I'd like to be able to make the sun spin faster." Yeah, that's his session goal. That isn't an LOL, it's a session goal. Perfectly all right as an LOL, but that's what he's set up for the auditor to do! Now, this pc has got the *overt* of setting up *loses* for the auditor. Do you see that? And the pc *equally* will absorb loses from the auditor. See, it's the overt-motivator sequence at play. Not that he has set up a lose for the auditor, but that he would, as represented in the goals, you see, shows that you have somebody who is just a sponge for loses. Now, we get down to the feather brush for the win. This person would at first believe that a good effect, you see, would be the basis of the house dropped on his head. Then he'd know that happened. And he actually will beg to have the house dropped on his head. He wants the big effect. He wants it all to happen now. Got to be instantaneous and it's got to be big.

And do you know, when you get a pc like that the only effect he can have is the feather brushed gently back of his head; not in front of his face, but brushed gently back of his head. He can – he can just get the effect of the wind of that feather. And that will be all the effect he can have. But the funny part of it is he can have that effect.

In other words, the worse off the pc the tinier the gradient of win. And you're actually raising him up little by little. And be perfectly content to raise him up little by little, because you'd be surprised what they consider wins. But they won't actually – you could change the pc that he had the form of an angel. Wings complete! Halo in neon! Just give him an *utter* complete change in the session, where he was in *terrific* euphoria, everything else. Pc would never find out about it. You think I'm kidding, but the pc couldn't have that much effect.

The pc's told you that he has to have that much effect. Don't ever buy it, because he couldn't have it. Pc at the end of the session is absolutely glowing. He has some feeling in his elbow and he hasn't had any feeling in his elbow for some time. Feeling in his elbow. He can feel his fingers on his elbow. Terrific. It's a big gain. You'd be surprised. Terrific gain.

He has actually remembered back below the age of twelve. He has actually remembered something before the age of twelve – terrific win. Of course he tells you he wants to clear up the whole track in just this session. He can't have that effect. Just the fact that he has said that he's got to have that in this session tells you he can't have it as an effect. It's before the age of twelve. And he finally remembers a car that his father had when he was eight. And he comes out at the end of that session, Prepcheck session, absolutely glowing! Marvelous session, you see!

You – you were trying to find a missed withhold on him, you know? You were trying to get something done! No, no. It's that little tiny effect, but he could have that effect. Ah, he's winning. It's all confidence. Confidence. Confidence. And if you continue to be consistent and not surrender to this demand for the tremendous effect. And go on and get – give the pc the effects you know the pc can have and go on and give the pc his wins on the environment and go on and give the pc his wins in his thinkingness, why, man, they'll come up by those tiny little gradients. Millimeter on the right and a millimeter on the left, millimeter on the right and that's how you build the Empire State Building You've got to put up one block at a time.

Pc comes in and says, "I want this building sitting here 13,764 feet and 3 inches high, in this session!" And you get a broom and you sweep off one corner of one sidewalk block. And he says, "What do you know, maybe someday there will be a building here." He didn't ever think so before.

All right, so the best adjudication is win on the one, win on the other one, win on the one, win on the other one.

Now, the worse off a person is, the longer it's going to take to get a win. But I sure wouldn't try to prepcheck the pc session after session after session and then CCH him session after session after session. See, I wouldn't stretch it out real long. I'd settle for little tiny wins, you know. And it might be – amount to a session of Prepchecking to a session of CCHs or a session of Prepchecking to three sessions of CCHs or two sessions of Prepchecking to one session of the CCHs, you see. That's what it would maybe settle down to. But it would be what it would be for that pc. You'd see these little wins stacking up.

Next thing you know, there's two things going to happen. The pc's going to get tremendous confidence in his auditor if his auditor is consistent. He's going to get tremendous confidence in this auditor. And then you're going to see tone arm action. Because he's going to get confidence in his environment. He's going to get some hope that something can happen. What you've done actually is sell him some hope. Done no more than that. He sees that the auditor's consistent, he sees the environment doesn't all of a sudden go out of plumb. This pc's been expecting all of his life for all the corners of the room, you see, to get into a rhomboid tetrascrewdrone! [laughter, laughs] And he knows that it probably won't happen as long as the auditor's there.

Whatever it is, you build this little thing up, stack by stack by stack and the next thing you know, why, your pc has got enough confidence. When you see he's got enough confidence, he'll actually start to look around. He will see that he doesn't have to be all of the things he is being in order to survive; that he can look at one of them. See, out of the 8,000,000 things he is being he can now look at one, while being only 7,999,999 things, you see. That moment you will start to see tone arm action.

See, your tone arm action occurs when he's able to observe. He'll find out that it's safe to look at the auditor. So you'll see tone arm action. This isn't as – isn't either difficult nor complicated and you can make it easily much more difficult and much more complicated than it actually is, because the processes you're using are absolute killers!

I mean Prepchecking just used as Prepchecking, I mean – I mean you're – all you're going to use it for is to build up a little bit of confidence of talking to you about his difficulties. Thing is totally capable, if you dug deep enough and so forth, of practically resolving his case. And you're going to use it to straighten it up so he can talk to you about his difficulties, huh?

And the CCHs which can blow a psychotic straight through electric shocks and bring him up the other side bright and smiling and so forth – you're going to use them so that they can tolerate the auditing room. That isn't asking very much of the process, is it? Something like shooting grasshoppers with atom bombs. You see? And all you have to do is do the processes right.

Now, in this particular class we have not had the consistent case win going up the line that we had while we were doing a lot of Prepchecking. See? We were getting more gain proportionately, while we were doing quite a bit of Prepchecking. There's two reasons for that. Prepchecking gave the auditors a great deal of experience with the E-Meter and getting rudiments in. It had that virtue as a training mechanism. And it also tended to give the pcs a lot of wins of the very small win nature that they could accept. Now, you're running into the difficulty that the pc doing the CCHs is getting his rudiments out. So you better fill that gap with the Prepchecking. That isn't just for training reasons, that's for the case's reason, don't you see.

Now, how often you prepcheck this pc and how often you do CCHs on this pc on this course, we won't adjudicate totally at this moment. But the auditor's suggestions on any particular pc he or she is auditing, you see, are definitely invited on the auditor's report – what they think they ought to be doing next. Be monitored perhaps by space, by room – tend to get routinized more than it ordinarily would be.

The reason we get off of that sort of thing, is we like to have a unit for what is going on. We like to have a CCH unit and we like to have a Prepchecking unit and we like to have a 3D Criss Cross unit, don't you see? But the difficulties of this is, is some people are all ready to do, as cases, 3D Criss Cross. And some people are all ready to grind along, you see, on a – on a Prepcheck-CCH routine of some kind or another.

If we could just get this person's missed withholds off on the number of things which they've done to pcs, you see, and other auditors have missed on them, he'd straighten out and run like a bird, you see, on the CCHs or something. You know? It's the case put-together. Or he'll actually straighten out and run like a bird on 3D Criss Cross. So you can't have a total

relaxation of this thing, because all auditors have to have some reality on CCHs and 3D – and Prepchecking as well as 3D Criss Cross, you see?

You're going to run into tougher cases off this course than you will find on it. So therefore – therefore, it's actually comprised of two auditing units. And the two auditing units consist of the CCH-Prepcheck unit and the 3D Criss Cross unit. So that people are – can be in those grades and pushed from one to the other. And regardless of whether they had tone arm action or not, could be expected to find themselves in the Prepcheck-CCH unit early in their trainings.

Now, what would happen if a pc went all to pieces on 3D Criss Cross and we got no tone arm action? They were all tied up and we didn't know which end this thing was going, we couldn't keep the rudiments in. This would be in your own practice or here in this unit, so forth. The only one thing that you could do with him is put him back on the other routine, isn't that right? You could transfer these things around.

But if you remember the lectures on interior-exterior, introvert-extrovert and so forth, you will see that there is good reason in theory and apparently in practice here, to use the CCHs and Prepchecking as a pair. There's good reason to do this. And I think it would speed up the progress considerably.

Regardless how it's used on this unit, regardless of what you'd walk into on this unit in this particular direction, that is, at the moment, how I would recommend that a pc be processed in an HGC. That's without any training considerations involved, without any auditor skill considerations involved. If we had all that perfect and set up, I would see that pcs were audited just the way I have described in this lecture. Okay?

Thank you.

RUNDOWN ON 3D CRISS CROSS, PART I

A lecture given on 24 April 1962

Thank you.

Well, what is this? The twenty what of which?

Audience: 24th of April.

Twenty-fourth of April? Is that all the further you've gotten along the track? Gee, I've gotten clear up to the 28th today. [laughs]

Yeah. It looks good, too. It looks much better. It looks much better for all of you.

All right. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 24 April AD 12.

Well, tonight we have a very important lecture which I will sail into at once, which is 3D Criss Cross, a complete rundown including patch-ups, everything else. This is all at one fell swoop.

Once upon a time there was a preclear. And he wasn't getting very Clear, so a routine came along known as Routine 3, the history of which went back to maybe '57, '58 – goals, importance of. And by listing a tremendous number of goals – at first just listing a few goals but finding the person's goal, and then listing a tremendous number of goals and not finding the person's goal – we struggled forward to finding the person's terminal, first by listing a few terminals and then by listing a great many terminals and again seldom finding them.

Now actually, old Routine 3 is the – is really the pappy of all of these processes which come afterwards. And the simplification of these processes took place because Routine 3 was too hard to do.

The first thing we found out about Routine 3 is that auditors couldn't run E-Meters. This became alarmingly apparent and so a whole technology of Sec Checking was developed in this direction as first and foremost a method of cleaning up the overts of the individual and secondarily to get people to use E-Meters properly because this is very easy to read the reads of an E-Meter on Sec Checking

That has become Prepchecking merely because of two reasons: One, Security Checking is not popular with the public and it is not an embracive term. It doesn't really say what it's supposed to be doing so this is changed off to Prepchecking and Prepchecking is a distinct, precision system and a very good system. You use Prepchecking properly and you will find

your pc will fly, but only if you dig. You can't get in Prepchecking like you get in rudiments and expect anything to happen.

So Prepchecking remains a vital process and the only process that can keep the missed withholdings from swamping the early sessions a pc has, and becomes a companion process to the CCHs. So that we have CCHs and Prepchecking simply as a preparatory action to the routines – the Routine 3 processes – whatever they might develop into.

In other words, everything today is headed in the direction toward preparing the pc to be run on some Routine 3 Process. And everything in training is channeled today to get the auditor up to running a Routine 3 Process.

And it must be very fully understood that there has been a great deal of difficulty in both clearing pcs on Routine 3 Processes smoothly and in teaching auditors to do it. There's been a lot of difficulty in both of those channels. And now those difficulties are very well ironed away and it comes into an area of: you can do it or you can't. And it's very like, as I've said in another lecture, riding a bicycle. You go out and get on a bicycle even though you haven't done any bicycle riding for a number of years, you'll find out you can still ride a bicycle.

But early, early, why, one morning you couldn't ride a bicycle and one afternoon you could. That was just a mysterious action. It just suddenly took place. You could suddenly ride a bicycle.

Oddly enough, the CCHs, done with mechanical perfection do not necessarily prove very effective on the pc. You understand? You can do them with perfect mechanical perfection as you go along and stay just as an auditor, no pc there, see. And you can go along, and you swell up the length of time it takes to get any result with the CCHs, you see, by a factor of about twenty-five times, which isn't slight. You'll still get some results, you see, but it's – you only get about 1/25th of the result.

You can do Prepchecking in this mechanical fashion. And you again will get a time factor involved, see. You can do it mechanically perfect and you get a time factor involved. You're not really in communication with the pc. You're not really auditing. You really don't know quite how to ride the bicycle but you're going through all the motions. You got that?

And it's similar with Routine 3 Processes. You one day learn how to do it all mechanically. You learn all the mechanical points that you possibly could learn of whatever kind or description. All these mechanical points you know. And it takes you one God-awful length of time to get any result on the pc. You understand?

And then one fine day, you really get your hands on it. And you all of a sudden, on the CCHs, can ride a bicycle. The last bulletin I put out is a good idea of this. It's arrived in Central Organizations here and there through the world and my morning mail for the first time, contained a very small flood of people who, all of a sudden after all these years, could ride a bicycle. Apparently just last week or so, they all of a sudden started doing the CCHs and getting terrific results on the CCHs. And this was revelatory to them.

Well, of course, they had been doing it mechanically for years and they tried this other way, and of course, the other way is just starting to audit with it. And there have been – there's a big resurgence on that.

Well, it's less noticeable on Routine 3 – much less noticeable. One day you are sitting there mechanically grinding it all out, trying to follow all of the rules and trying to do it all exactly right and nothing much is happening but you're making some progress. *Ha-ha-ha*. You've only been two weeks on this list and you're making some progress, and then, all of a sudden, why, everything is going beautifully.

So there is still this factor of integration within the auditor of the applications of the tools of his trade. It is a factor which occurs, so it is not a factor which can be neglected in handling these techniques.

The fellow is all thumbs and then suddenly he can do it. And what that is actually is the auditor integrates what he knows sufficiently so that he is not introverted with trying and becomes extroverted sufficiently to be able to stay in two-way comm and address and audit the pc immediately in front of him. And you'll see this in an auditor instantly. It's a recognizable factor, whether on the CCHs, Prepchecking or Routine 3.

But the good news is that I don't know of one single portion now of the CCHs, Prepchecking, or Routine 3D Criss Cross – which is the final development of this – which needs a sudden and fantastic interpretation or an enormously clever solution. See, I know it all by simple rules now. And these rules are very simple.

You see a gray check mark and you put a white check mark opposite, not a gray or a green or a blue. You see, they're not a bunch of multiple responses. In other words, you don't get situation A and then get a multiple series of choices, see. You get the solution for A – situation A, solution for A, see. And that makes this very easy to learn. So basically, what it comes down to is once one has the fundamentals of Scientology under his belt and his TRs and that sort of thing, he gets an integration of all of these processes. He integrates them within himself. That is to say he's not still trying to remember the rules as he goes, don't you see. He's still not saying, "Well, let's see, when the bicycle starts to fall that way, to the right, you turn the wheel to the left. No, you turn the wheel to the right – is it the right ...?" Crash! You see.

Now, that is the main barrier you have to cross. And you cross that barrier as well as you get the exact mechanical parts of any of these things exactly right. See, as long as you've got these mechanical parts down, then you will find that you can integrate them. See, the mechanical parts are there. They're quite mechanical, too. But an auditor makes them alive when he integrates them.

You could still get someplace, you see, by just doing it mechanically, you see. But after a sudden – suddenly it's integrated, and you know what you're doing sufficiently well that all of a sudden you have a pc in front of you. You know, he just appears magically.

And you aren't saying, "Well, gee, let's see now. Do I do – I memorize this line and then I look at the E-Meter over here, and then I say the line there, and so on ... All right. And memorize this line, and so on ..."

And you all of a sudden find that you can do this particular process – action sufficiently well that if that is the item, you null it on the pc over there, you see. You get the difference?

Well, it's a matter of knowing your business so well that you can extrovert from the mechanics of things and apply what you know without thinking about it. And that's what it comes down to.

You're very fortunate at this time because you're not learning through a tremendous amount of change and hullabaloo in development.

Now, it is not necessarily always good to learn plain facts. See, it's not always good. It is sometimes very beneficial to learn that facts are only relatively stable. Through that you get an understanding of life and you're always auditing livingness. You're not auditing from a bunch of fixed stable data to which you can accumulate an enormous amount of confusion, see.

Now, the auditor was very lucky who went over the jumps as we graduated from Routine 3 to Routine 3A to Routine 3D to Routine 3D Criss Cross. He knows where these things can falter and fall by the boards and he knows their relative workability and he's got enormous skill.

And similarly this group right here, for the most part, the students who have been here for a while, are very lucky right now to have in circulation so many erroneous line plots. That is, actually, you're very fortunate. You're very fortunate because you're going to get an opportunity to see what a straightened – what a – one, you'll get a tremendous reality on what getting a wrong item will do, and you'll get a tremendous reality on the enormous resurgence that you can get by getting the right item instead of the wrong one. And you – a lot of you will get that subjectively and objectively.

And I would say this group right here will probably never have any difficulty after this in straightening out a 3D Criss Cross activity if it's gone wrong.

Students maybe six months from now – well, they had a line plot go wrong and it gets straightened out instantly, and then they teach somebody in Bushville. And the difference is that one of you will say to this fellow in Bushville, "Listen, you bloody idiot you got a wrong item. Have you any idea what that will do? Have you any idea at all what that will do? Now listen you, *GET IT RIGHT!*" And the student six months from now will say, "Well, it's – you just straighten it out and nothing much to getting a wrong item because you straighten it out at once, and so forth."

And the auditor he trained won't be convinced because he's never been subjected to the capital importance of it all, of it all, of it all. Probably won't have any people around who are all gimmicked up. See? You won't have any horrible examples. For instance, right where I sit, I can find one, two, three, four horrible examples of what happens when you run off a line plot wrong way to, and get a wrong item. Probably another one. See, there's something awry here, see. And the net result of that is a turn on of some psychosomatic – "Oh, God, last week I thought I was dying and this week I hope I do." [laughter, laughs]

And an auditor six months from now will go out and you'll see he'll be auditing somebody and they all of a sudden come down with jaundosis-lumbosis of the limburger and he'll – he'll say, "Well, he got sick." So he'll knock off the auditing perhaps till the person recovers or something, you know. He'll have that as a thought. Of course, he will learn, too, eventually.

But that's the net result of any of these three processes run wrong. I can tell you – I can tell you directly how to spot an error in the running of any of these processes without going near the E-Meter or even talking to the person on whom the error has been made.

The CCH error is "touchy." He's touchy. Doesn't like people coming near him. Doesn't like people bumping into him. This is somebody who's being audited. He's being audited on the CCHs, so he's being audited wrong. He doesn't like anybody to bump into him, touch him, or come near him. You brush past a student and he flinches. Well, you say, "All right, CCHs are being run into the ground." See, this is very interesting to spot when you have quite a few pcs around.

Your next one is Prepchecking. A misprepchecked pc is truculent, tough. They're enduring. They're tough-minded. They tend to be more forward and brassy.

You know, you're seeing some fellow and he's standing there and he's sort of hard-boiled about the whole thing, and so forth. And you say, "Well, somebody really dropped the bottom of the E-Meter on this character on Prepchecking." You can spot it just exactly. You'll get used to this.

And on 3D Criss Cross, when it's being run wrong, the fellow's going around and he looks like an action shot of somebody doing the twist, you know. [laughter] But it's frozen. It's 10,000th of a second exposure of somebody doing the twist, you know. They're just all *blaaah*, you know, *mmmmm-mmmmm*. And he looks old. And if he's not in motion you can't examine him very closely. He just looks squashed and old.

You watch. You mind my indicators on that. Isn't it interesting that these three processes pick up three different aspects. You keep an eye on this and you'll see I speak sooth on the matter because it's really – they're quite different.

You notice I always look over a class when I come in and sit down. I always thank you for your applauses and then look you over. And I take – I know just about where you're not, you know, or what you've not gotten at.

Now, we're dealing, really, for the first time in Routine 3D Criss Cross on something that can be run wrong. We've got some material now that is so beefy, it is so capable of overthrowing the normal balance wheels of what people laughingly call their minds that it can throw them wrong. And that's one of the reasons behind this tremendous insistence on doing it right – is because auditing has always been "Any auditing is better than no auditing." Don't you see? And we're slightly over into the fringe here now of "some auditing shouldn't have happened." Do you see that? I don't know that it's true that it's worse than no auditing at all, but I do know that it can get pretty miserable.

When you attack a Goals Problem Mass, and you attack this thing head-on, and then you flagrantly pick up the wrong piece and then you oppterm the wrong piece and get another wrong piece, and then you industriously get another wrong piece and then you oppterm that,

you're way out in the middle of nowhere, and the pc, well, he's certain that it would be better if the world did come to an end, because you're handling such tremendous charge. That charge is residual and it bleeds off the case permanently. It isn't something that charges back up.

But remember if you're bleeding off basic charge off of a case – this thing called charge actually is electronic currents or suppressions or potentials. We use the word charge to represent force. And the interchanges amongst masses inside the bank constitute charge. And if you have a positive and a negative plate on a battery, you've got amperes and volts and stuff, you see. And sometime, if you – you're just fooling around connecting up a lamp or something like that, why, put your fingers into the two prongs of the mains, you know. And it goes *b-z-z-z-z-t*.

And if you're very good at this you'll notice that there was mechanical force involved in this thing. It wasn't anything weird. It was real mechanical force involved in this. Well, that mechanical force is residual in the bank. And you start picking up the wrong pieces of a Goals Problem Mass, and it isn't that you create new charge but you throw into existence old charge. You restimulate charge, in other words.

Now, there's two things that could happen – now, we're talking about 3D Criss Cross – there's two things can happen. You can bleed the charge off or you can dam it up and generate more. Now, this would be the difference between letting the air out of a tire and hooking it up to the compressors and just not disconnecting it. That would be uncomfortable. Now, when you've got the tire up to a 110 pounds when it is calculated to wear 60, you pick up another wrong terminal and put another 20 pounds on the tire. And then you pick up another – oh, unfortunate part about it is, you being thetans, you can't explode. So the analogy breaks down at this point. We can just put another 20 pounds on and another 40 pounds on and then put 100 pounds in the rim. And you see, we're just getting this more pressure, more charge, more potential, until the person feels like he's an animated lightning bolt with no place to go.

And the funny part of it is that these charges are on various terminals, what you call terminals. You call these things items, oppterminals, terminals, the generalized term is item. It's an item in the 3D Criss Cross mass, the Goals Problem Mass. And you find the item by 3D Criss Cross. And if you find the right item, good-o! You've deleted charge. And if you pick it up and find the wrong item you could add charge. And the charge will stay there until you do it right. It doesn't bleed off because of breakfast and a good night's sleep and the doctor's prescription that you should go to the beach and rest for 120 days. You come back, why, the rim's still got 100 pounds in it and you're still going 130 pounds on the tire. You see? The only thing that will undo it is Scientology.

Now, you understand there were part – times on the track when the person did have this much charge going. All you've done is yank it all into PT. And you can keep on finding wronger and wronger and wronger terminals, you see, and pulling more and more charge into PT. And the aspect of this looks like psychosomatic illness and other odd things.

So there's a liability to each of the processes we have today. And the first liability is the CCHs. By making the pc lose through overcontrol, that is to say, we just scream at him and hound at him and overwhelm him and never ask him anything about what's wrong and

never carry on any two-way conversation, and so forth. We do such things as we make a circle with the book and he makes a circle with the book, and we say, "Well, did you duplicate that?"

And he says, "Yes, I did."

And you say, "Well, I don't think you did. I think you better do that square again."

And he says, "It wasn't a square. It was a circle."

And you say, "No, no. It was a square."

I mean you can muck this up so the fellow starts feeling very overwhumped. There's not any great liability to this. He'll come out of it.

Prepchecking, the liability is missing withholds. That's really the only real liability to Prepchecking. Doesn't matter much what you restimulate. For God's sakes, don't miss a withhold.

Missing a withhold is not the pc has a withhold and you fail to pull it. You understand that? A missed withhold is a "should have known." The pc feels you should have found out about something and you didn't. Now that is the liability of Prepchecking, getting into that kind of situation. You should have found out; you didn't. Hell hath no fury like a pc with a missed withhold. All your ARC breaks and so forth boil right to the surface right there. Missed withhold. Bang!

That has a liability. It actually doesn't have the potential of lousing up a pc particularly, except if you miss withholds and miss withholds and miss withholds he'll simply get more antisocial. I don't know there's any liability to that particularly. But that's about all that would happen. He won't like you and he's liable to leave Scientology or something like that. That's – I mean, as far as his personal health is concerned, there is no terrific liability. As far as his behavior's concerned, and as far as his future progress is concerned, yeah, there is a liability.

There's something very easily done. CCHs: very easily done. Just run the same CCHs right, properly, and it'll all come off, see. Same way. Prepchecking: Get off the missed withholds, and it all straightens out.

Now, Routine 3D Criss Cross has its own package of liabilities and those liabilities are: picking up the wrong end of the Goals Problem Mass and pulling it to the wrong end of the Goals Problem Mass and pulling the charge up to present time.

The thing that you can do wrong is start the wrong line and get a wrong item. Now you've exceeded, "Missed withholds are the source of all ARC breaks." Missed withholds and wrong items are the source of all of your 3D Criss Cross ARC breaks.

Your pc under 3D Criss Cross who gets ARC breaky, should be suspected first of having a missed withhold. But if that doesn't instantly pull, then that somebody has gone over the lines and gotten a wrong item and there's something wrong with the line plot. Or you're just knuckleheadedly oppterming something that is wrong. In other words, there's something wrong with items.

You can create an ARC breaky, nattery condition because he's damned uncomfortable. He can get pretty ARC breaky and pretty hard to hold in session and so forth. Well, don't blame the pc and don't expect him to know what's wrong. The probability – the – not only the probability, this *is* what has happened – is he has got – somebody's gotten a wrong item on him or your line plot, in other words, is wrong. And the remedy for it, of course, is straighten up the line plot; and the method of straightening up the line plot is complete the list for which the item was wrong. That's the whole answer, the whole answer.

There is no, no other action. I mean, it's comp – the thing you do is, if you find that an item is not reading even when you get the invalidations off of the thing, you know at once that the list on which it came was *not complete*, and that is all there is to it. And the only action you take is to get the rudiments in and complete the list. That's the invariable action. That's your situation A, solution A. See, it's very neat.

And the rule is that to straighten out a case on 3D Criss Cross, you take the earliest wrong item, get the invalidations off of it, check it, still a wrong item – make sure it's wrong if it's probably wrong, you see. And then complete the list that the item came from – the earliest wrong item that you can find on the line plot and complete the list. That's all. And that's it. This is one of the most magical actions. The pc will think he won't quite know what hit him. It was all so horrible and it's suddenly all so nice.

Now, if it doesn't straighten out it's because in patching it up you – you didn't get the earliest wrong item. If this didn't bring very quick, instant relief to the case, you didn't get the earliest wrong item. That's all. That's it – simple. So there's another item earlier that is wrong. And then you take the list on which that item was wrongly gotten and complete that list and the magic will occur. Simple. In other words, this is about the simplest remedies that you could possibly have.

CCHs go wrong, run them right. That's all you have to do is run them right, see? Let the pc win, keep in two-way comm with the pc. You know – all of those things. But just run them right.

Prepchecking goes wrong, get off the missed withholds, see. That's simple.

Next – 3D Criss Cross. Find the earliest wrong item and the remedy is always complete the list and find the right one.

Now, those are – those are very – it's very easy for me to tell you this. You, in doing this the first time, are going to be all thumbs. That I can assure you. But you have lots of fruitful ground because there isn't a line plot in the shop that is right. They run something on the order of fifty percent wrong items. Think that's pretty good, huh? Fifty percent at least – wrong items. Not very good, was it. Huh? Oh, no.

There's no blame connected with this. There's no blame connected with this with thee or me or anything else. We're on the line and finding out this data and you're getting the data and we're straightening it out as fast as it can be fed. That's all it is to that.

All information on Routine 3D Criss Cross was carefully released on HCO Information Letters. That's because until tonight, you might say, there was never a moment when you

could say, unswervably, that this, you see, is it. And this is what goes wrong with it and this is what you do. You see. So that's just the way it is.

I can tell you now exactly the steps that you go through – one, two, three, four, and exactly what you do with these steps and how you straighten these steps out and all that sort of thing – with one exception. Because of the horrors I have seen on the subject of goals lists, I hate to tell you that if the goal originally found on the pc does not check out that you have to complete and find the right goal on that pc, because I've seen people work for two months. I don't know that it's true. So we will just leave that little question mark sitting there.

But I do know this. Where the person's terminal found from the goal is wrong, you have to check the goal to make sure that it's right. Now, what you do exactly if you find that goal wrong is a little bit out of our province because 3D Criss Cross deals with items, not goals.

Now, how much charge is going to accumulate because of a difficulty of that nature I am not going to go into at the moment. What I'm saying is that we know for sure that you complete the list of the earliest wrong item, and a goal is not an item. And I do not know that you have to complete a goals list.

Now, how do you do 3D Criss Cross? Well, actually, it's quite elementary – one of the most elementary processes or activities anybody ever had really gone into. This is a very easy bag of tools. And there's some of the finest-tempered burglar's tools ever manufactured. They can open the vaults of minds which have been closed for the trillennia.

Well, this is a very fancy bag of tools, but they're actually very simple tools. Now, we have to be absolutely sure that a person can use and handle an E-Meter, is flawless in his Model Session, is excellent in his TRs, before we let him near it. Because all difficulties in the Routine 3s that we've had, have stemmed from just those things.

The person didn't know how to read an E-Meter. That's simple. The person's TRs stunk. Their Model Session was too poor to command any confidence.

Because you mustn't really get in the road of the pc's attention while you're doing 3D Criss Cross. You're going to be fooled because it's not like the old-time repetitive processes, but the pc actually is more deeply introverted than he was on the old-time repetitive processes. And therefore, your application of Routine 3D Criss Cross must be flawless so as not to distract the pc or upset him.

Now, we're going to take pcs who have been prepchecked and given CCHs until they got tone arm action. Tone arm action was easy. And CCHs and Prepchecking will give you tone arm action regardless of what's wrong with the case, except when the tone arm action is arrested because of a wrong 3D Criss Cross plot. And then we cannot absolutely guarantee that the CCHs and Prepchecking will restore the tone arm action. Isn't that interesting? 3D Criss Cross is more powerful than either the CCHs or Prepchecking. The remedy for 3D Criss Cross is 3D Criss Cross.

But for raw meat in off the street, yeah, you got your CCH and Prepchecking. And let's establish the pc so he gets tone arm action and so his rudiments will stay in, because you don't want to be doing 3D Criss Cross while you're trying to force the rudiments in.

The result of this – I mean the auditor is just all thumbs. He's trying to run every kind of a session, you see. When he's trying to do 3D Criss Cross he's running Prepchecking and oh, my God, what a mess. See, what a mess – just terrible.

Instead of that, he should go back to his CCHs and his Prepchecking until he gets the rudiments so he can keep the jolly old rudiments in. But remember this, your rudiments can start flying out because of wrong line plots. So there's actually only one source of out-rudiments, but you don't have them in the CCHs, and that's the pc is never let have a win, see. And there's only one real source of out-rudiments in Prepchecking and that, of course, is missed withholds, see.

But in 3D Criss Cross you have, "Pc overwhelmed and not permitted to have a win," must be included in this. Missed withholds must be included in this. And wrong item can cause the pc to be ARC breaky and forced out. And the pc won't know what the hell's wrong with him. He'll assign it to the Prepchecking he's had, he will assign it to this, he will assign it to that. No, it's a wrong item, see. He's still all stacked up with charge. And he's got charge to the ears and somewhat higher. And he just can't spot, of course, what is wrong with him because what is wrong with him is because nobody let him spot what was wrong with him. Do you follow that?

He never saw the terminal that was bitching him up, to use plain Anglo-Saxon. See, he never saw this, so of course, he doesn't know what the hell it is. Well, that's the trouble, you see. He doesn't know what it is.

He knows though, it isn't what he got. See, they handed him a catfish and he'll go along with this catfish to be polite, but you see, he knows it isn't a catfish. And he feels there's something missing here. There's something wrong somewhere in this porridge. And he looks through the porridge in vain and he can't find where any catfish has anything to do with it, see? Catfishes don't eat porridge, and he goes around and around. The next thing you know, why, he's – he feels totally adrift. He's got a lot of residual charge and the stable datum in the middle of the charge is the stable item in the middle of the charge, and the confusion won't release because nobody's found the stable datum that's holding the confusion in place. It's an incomplete list.

So this is what's got him goofed. So he looks all over the place to find out what's wrong and he assigns it to the auditor. He says the auditor must be wrong. The auditor isn't holding his little finger straight, you see. He assigns it to the auditing he has had. His Prepchecking – he must have been misprepchecked on something. You see, he assigns it to this and he assigns it to that, or he'll goofily assign it to the next line he hasn't done yet. Now, we're going to get catastrophe because if he keeps plowing on further in 3D Criss Cross with a wrong line behind him – it is something like a ship which has gone up on the beach that is trying to get off by running its engines full speed ahead. And of course it just keeps banging harder and harder into the rocks. And it gets more and more roughed up.

So he says, "Well, we ought to find a new item. We ought to list this. We ought to list that."

He'll get frantic. He'll start giving his auditor tremendous numbers of lists and all kinds of things, anything, you see, to straighten out this thing, and the truth of the matter is it

was a wrong item. It isn't necessarily the wrong item that that auditor found. It might be a wrong item that was found earlier than that, you see?

So you see the liabilities of these processes. They are actually very easily, easily healed. But the first way to go about healing them is to learn how to do all their parts right. The first way to get into a state where you can integrate these processes is learn how to do each part of them right.

Now, anybody who can successfully prepcheck can learn 3D Criss Cross. See, that's followed through very nicely. As a matter of fact, it looks to people as though 3D Criss Cross is easier to run than Prepchecking. That's because they've forgotten that the liability of doing Prepchecking was the liability of reading a meter and of sitting there and doing Model Session and other things, you see.

So they've got those things kind of whipped. You know, they're over the jumps on those. So all of a sudden they sail into 3D Criss Cross and they learn these little routines of 3D Criss Cross, and they look so simple. They look very easy compared to how hard it was to learn to prepcheck.

Actually, it's not... If you were to teach somebody meter, Model Session, TRs, and all the parts of 3D Criss Cross simultaneously and never teach them any Prepchecking, see, never teach them anything else with the meter, they would have more trouble than we have been able to heal. And I can tell you by experience that students have been taught, or we've tried to teach, and the teaching has been by experts – people trying to get their goals and terminals and things like that which is a Routine 3 Process – without the benefit of the experience of Prepchecking. And it has been the most unsuccessful activity we ever cared to have anything to do with. It was a *mess*.

While they're doing the process to clear the case, they're trying to get the rudiments in – that should have been gotten in before you started, don't you see. So they were doing everything at once and it amounted to just one awful mess. And it was a bad mess.

Now, wherever we look in auditing today we find out that there is no substitute for a result. There's no reason today you shouldn't have a result. You do your auditing splendidly, perfectly, and of course, your result is tremendous. And you do your auditing poorly and sloppily and your result will be 'orrible.

The process isn't what's doing it, don't you see? It's the skill with which it's being applied that's doing it.

In other words, the processes are there. The activities are there. And all you'll have to learn is these activities flawlessly and you will get the results. Let's not worry about the thing otherwise. It's too easy.

Now, my basic feeling about any auditor has always been that he is perfectly willing to do a darn good job on a pc. He's always been willing to do this, you see. And I feel that we've been moving forward sorting out of the way the unnecessary bric-a-brac and getting a clear view of it and getting better processes – at the same time getting a better parallel of what the mind was all about and what the mind was doing – and we have been moving now for

some little time. Hence, the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course in a zone of flawless application.

We're actually teaching flawless application. It's rather fantastic. People go from here into various parts of the world and so forth, and I routinely just receive the most horrible shocked notes and despatches and so forth, first on their case – they see them get off airplanes and things like that and they make some – somebody makes a startled remark about their case, but this is usually followed through by some sort of a remark on the subject of what they're – being audited by this person or watching this person audit, and they didn't know anybody could do this.

The truth of the matter is the auditing which was being done in the area before that person went into the area was far more complicated. He's actually doing a much simpler job of auditing. And people look at this smooth, simple job of auditing that's going forward, and the pc's sitting there in session as though he's clamped in steel vises, you know. And the guy's mind running off exactly as it's supposed to run off and they – it looks absolutely magical to them. Well, it probably is absolutely magical. The number of items which go into making that final result are numerous, but they are not variables the way they have been.

So we have some invariable processes and some variable applications and we do get invariable results.

And here's the first thing we should know about auditing right at the present time: If you don't get a result, then look over what's been going on – what you've been doing or what has been done with the case – because you could put the case back together again. You see?

If you don't get the expected result, then there's been a departure. And the whole of case patch-up today is the spotting of the departure. See, I've given you the remedies for each departure. We did CCHs on the guy and he never had a win, see? And we screamed at him the whole time or something like this. All right, we run him CCHs in good two-way comm, and the other CCHs run off. That's all there is to it.

We sec checked the guy or did something of the sort, missed a whole blooming stack of withholds, and so forth. Well, the thing about it is, just get him back into Prepchecking and get the withholds.

Similarly 3D Criss Cross: we've got to take his line plot, any item that has been found on him, and we've got to go over those and we've got to get some kind of an order of sequence of when they were found, and we've got to check those things over by getting the rudiments in, the invalidations off – check those things, in other words, over to find out which of those items are right and which of them are wrong, and any early item that's right, we take the earliest and we simply do it right.

In other words, you know, let me show you something here. Any error in auditing today is then repaired by doing the same process right. Do you see?

Now, that's very tricky. See, because we sewed up a pair of snippers in his abdomen, we don't have to take out a molar. See, we – you get the idea? Now, notice that we never undo any of this auditing. You notice we're not up against erasing auditing. At no time in anything we're doing, do we bother to erase auditing. See, we just do it right and that erases it. It's

rather marvelous. If you understand this ... You'll get a good reality on this when you're patching up a case.

Somebody down in, oh, I don't know, south, north, Port Elizabeth, something like this. They've been doing 3D Criss Cross. See, they got the bulletins and so on, and they're doing 3D Criss Cross, and they're just having a good time, and they've got a whole bunch of items, and they've got everything all stacked up, and the pc is in the hospital. And you see, weirdly enough, you don't have to do anything extraordinary to this pc to straighten this pc out.

You get from the pc – we've also bypassed having to have any of the lists. If your pc's lists have been lost, we can still trace up the items one way or the other. And all we've got to do is find the earliest item we can find that doesn't check out and then we do that one right. We don't care if he's in the hospital or the spinbin. This is the same thing we would do, you see. And we don't have to erase Joe's auditing and get Bill off the case and run O/Ws on his Aunt Agnes, see. If his case went totally wrong under 3D Criss Cross, we just find the earliest item and complete the list, that's all, and find the right item. It'll look absolutely, frantically magical to you when you do this a few times.

You won't believe that anything could right – first, that anything could go this wrong or right this fast. And it's quite interesting. So therefore, our processes, as they sit, are precision packages. They are done in exact ways and they are remedied by doing the same process right. So you should certainly be able to learn that. There's nothing very tricky about it.

Now similarly, all past auditing remedies with 3D Criss Cross. See, you're not going to worry about a bunch of auditing flubs or blunders. Past auditing can't be remedied, by the way, interestingly enough, with Prepchecking. It'll only partially remedy and then, with a great deal of imagination on the auditor's part. Interesting.

Of course, we could prepcheck him on his past auditing and his past pc'ing, and we could get the rudiments in easily, you see. And we could set him up to run 3D Criss Cross better, but the whole thing will come back to battery and go right when we get into 3D Criss Cross. We'll find out why he's always had trouble as an auditor. We find out he's always had trouble. We find the 13th item on the case is, "horse doctor." [laughter, laughs] After that, why, there's no more trouble with his auditing.

So now, there is the broad picture, the very, very broad picture of the processes and where 3D Criss Cross fits in and its relative value with regard to other processes.

Now in the next hour, I'm going to tell you exactly what each step – how each step is done bit by bit *painfully*. Okay?

I'll tell you with great, great precision. Okay?

Thank you.

Rundown On 3D Criss Cross,

Part II

A lecture given on 24 April 1962

Thank you.

Second lecture, April 24th, AD 12, St Hill Special Briefing Course and here we are on the particulars of 3D Criss Cross, continued from the earlier lecture.

3D Criss Cross is a process which addresses the Goals Problem Mass. The Goals Problem Mass is constituted of items, beingnesses that the person has been and has fought. And the anatomy of a problem is everywhere present in the Goals Problem Mass, meaning that you have item versus item. And these become suspended on the time track because they are in direct opposition, one to the other, and so tend to suspend themselves in time since there is no motion in the conflict.

So we have a situation where the beingnesses of the person have accumulated unto themselves, mass – accumulated in that series of lifetimes or that lifetime, and are actually composed of masses of energy. We formerly called these things "circuits" and we call them very properly "valences." But they aren't necessarily valences only in the Goals Problem Mass. Actual items would be valences, but these of course, have accumulated unto themselves things that he's been temporarily, people he has known momentarily – appended valences.

In other words, there are a bunch of other valences mixed up in the Goals Problem Mass. These other valences will never show up as items. Just the things he has been, the things he has fought, the things he has avoided will show up as items but these, of course – it's like so much taffy. And they accumulate to themselves all the other beingnesses associated. Any associated beingness to this has added itself to the Goals Problem Mass so that it becomes very large. And it becomes fantastically complex. There are probably tens of millions of valences and lock valences in a Goals Problem Mass. They are just innumerable. That's just a loose figure – that's to give you the impression of lots, you see. I don't think anybody will ever be able to count them.

Now, each valence is composed of a lifetime or a series of lifetimes and has complete within it all of the pictures and energy and standing wave accumulations of that lifetime.

Now as we run back over this lifetime, we find in this lifetime, a time track – at least some of us do – and it contains recorded experiences, conscious or unconscious, of this lifetime. Now, when a person has had this lifetime collapse on him, he's got a sort of a black ball which is all made up of this lifetime's facsimiles. And you have, in essence, the past valence

condition occurring in this lifetime because all of his past 3D Criss Cross item valences are in that condition. They are totally collapsed. It's a collapsed time track – crunch!

Now, we've got a collapsed time track which is fighting a collapsed time track. Interesting, isn't it? And these things usually occur as a couple of black balls or some shape or color or size. They are opposed to each other. And in a Goals Problem Mass, we have the exact opposition for every item. Every item has its exact opposition. If you think of these items as a round, black ball with pockets of thought all through it and made out of energy, you've got a pretty accurate picture of it.

And if you look at the terminal-oppterm combination, you've got two black balls, one pushed against the other one. And they're hard fought. They are avoiding or attacking but anyhow they're enmeshed. And you've got two black balls. It's the basis of the universe – it's the figure two. So it takes two valences to make a package.

Now, to the outside of these black balls you have all the other valences that have accumulated, which makes it very interesting. And in view of the fact that the person may have been this identity for many lifetimes, you've got all of those lifetimes composed into one black ball and then appended to it, all the other little black balls that he has been in collision with in that series of lifetimes and we start getting a large number. And then, of course, the opposition has a whole series of little black balls like warts on the frog that are appended to that. And you've got your two big ones and then each one of them has a few hundred or a few thousand little ones. See. So, let's say that the figure was – the average figure was about five hundred – for auditing purposes you'll find out this is somewhere in the vicinity of correct. There'll be somewhere between two and seven hundred lock valences.

Now, oddly enough he has sometimes been these lock valences, see, as well as the main valence, but it just wasn't all that important and it simply became a lock on the other valence.

So we have every identity the person has ever been somehow or another mixed up in the Goals Problem Mass. In other words, we have these – oh, these big figures of identities you know – just tremendous numbers – and all the identities of the things he has fought are mixed up in the Goals Problem Mass and all the little identities that had been impinged upon are caught in that – these are all appended into the Goals Problem Mass. And when we finally get ourselves straightened out on this, why, we'll find out that at first look, it would just look like a big, black mass. Or it looked like a bunch of broken splinters or it just looked, you know – it was an unsolvable mess. It's pretty ghastly. It's like – it looks like a pile of coal that somebody has melted. It has that much identity.

Now, 3D Criss Cross takes this thing apart. The first thing it takes apart is by listing. And when you list, you're going to get the main item and you're going to get its locks. And the main item stays and becomes your 3D Criss Cross item and your locks, of course, blown, more or less, and they are part and parcel of the list. Do you follow this?

Man! Come up to present time!

All right. Now, I know these things squash you out of present time. Well, what you do, if you can get the idea of two spheres – let's get the idea of two black spheres. Let's take it down in its essentials and elements. Now, I'm not – I've given other lectures as to how they

got to be two black spheres, but let's just take down pure mechanics. Let's take down two black spheres the size of bowling balls and push them into each other so that they are partially interlocked. Because they are held this way against each other, they become timeless. See, they have their own time track and all that but they actually are floating – they're capable of being in present time.

They haven't got any time in them, see, they appear to be timeless. We won't go into it any further than that they appear to be timeless and they float in time independent of time.

Now around each one of these are the lock valences. Now, one of these balls we will call the terminal and the other ball we will call the opposition terminal. The opposition terminal turns on sensation in the pc: grief, misemotion, sensation, coughing – that's right – all that kind of thing. Those are all turned on and are the symptoms of the oppterm, so called. That's one of the balls. You know.

And then the first ball we call the terminal and that will contain pain. What the pc experiences from that will be pain. Both of these balls contain coldness and heat. And one can get awfully cold bucking into a pair of these. They're very cold. And the – each one of these balls can be tremendously encrusted in these lock valences and they look like little balls, little black balls plastered around and impinged upon the two big ones, so we've got this tremendous number of warts. Now, those are lock valences and the opposition terminal can have its lock valences and the terminal can have its lock valences.

Now, the bulk of the charge, of course, is on the terminal and the opposition terminal and the reason the charges remain charged is because they're locked against each other. See, if a person had never opposed anything or had never been in opposition to anything anywhere on the track, then none of these valences would ever be impinged against any other of these valences and you wouldn't get a cross transfer of current.

Now, what are these balls made out of? They're standing waves of electricity which take the form in the mind of actual mass and they appear to have mass. It's measurable mass. And this carries certain potentials. One ball versus the other ball. And then all the lock balls against all of the main ones. Now, you've got that picture? There is – that is not an allegorical picture, by the way.

Now, if we take a hacksaw and saw one of these balls in half – if you could saw this much light-massed guck and junk – it would appear to have some holes in it and particularly in the center and that hole is full of thought. It's full of ideas which are encysted in the mass. These are the now-I-am-supposed-to's, these are behavior patterns. Here's the survival ideas – all of it compressed from the engrams of which this whole thing is composed. But it has a hole in it and that's got ideas in it. And then there's a whole lot of little pockets around through the thing like little air bubbles and each of those has got ideas in them – that's if we sawed one of them in half.

That's why a person can be inside of one of these things and keep chewing and getting ideas from it but nothing ever happens. See, he can chew around inside one of these things and get ideas, and get ideas, and get ideas, and get ideas, and get ideas but nothing ever happens. And he's not disturbing the mass or the balance between these two items. See, he's just

getting the ideas out of them. Now of course, when the pc is being one of these things, he can't see it.

Now frankly, he is being the terminal and is ignoring the opposition terminal and that is exactly where the pc is located. But he doesn't know at the time you address this *which* of these things he is. He could be any of the locks – in his thinkingness – he could be any of the locks, he could be the terminal, he could be the opposition terminal or he could be any of the opposition terminal's locks. He could be something on the order of a thousand to fifteen hundred different identities – just on this one pair. He wouldn't know the difference, one to the next. Now remember though, he is *being* one of these things and that which ye be, ye can't view.

You have no point – viewpoint of those things you're in. So, oddly enough, he will have an idea of this but he will not have a view of this. He's much more likely to see the locks or he's much more likely to see the opposition terminal than he is to see the actual terminal. Now that is *one* package – one 3D Criss Cross package, which is the two opposed whole track valences and their accumulated lock valences – those additional identities. Of course, if we cut one of these little raisins in half, we are going to get the same picture as the big one. See, you cut one of the warts, you're going to get a hole in the middle of it full of thought, and so on.

It's by the business of living that this has occurred. It isn't that anybody has mocked these things up. It isn't anything that made these things. You go charging around through space getting yourself beautifully dislocated and being something, gorgeously, and attacking something and supporting something, protecting something and running ought-to-be's on other people and running overt-motivator sequences all over the place and having a ball. And around where you are at, during that lifetime you is going to get an accumulation of electric energy and that's all there is to that!

Now, if we, by some magic, were to be able to disintegrate this mass, strip by strip, we would find out it was composed of engrams and locks. You see? Let's take one of the little raisins now and let's start taking it apart and we're going to get pictures. They're going to be kind of lousy pictures, but we're going to get pictures – they're engrams. It's like one of these magician's things where you keep pulling pictures out of it, see – pictures and pictures and pictures. Of course, we take one of the big ones out of this mass and we start pulling pictures out of that thing and *whoah!* See? This is going to go on and on, because they may be pictures of a hundred consecutive lifetimes. See here – would have all crunched down and become it.

See, it's not just one lifetime to one big mass, you see. There could be a hundred lifetimes eventually condensed themselves and in that hundred lifetimes you've accumulated even more lock valences. See. So the idea of the unit terminal and the unit opposition terminal and the unit locks for each, do not comprise the idea that that was one lifetime – that's what happens to you in one lifetime. No, fortunately, that's not the case.

All right, that's just one package. There are quite a few of these packages. I would be adventurous to give you an exact figure of how many there was in each bank. That's a complete package. Fortunately, the number of such packages is quite finite. It is not unlimited. That's very fortunate because it's quite tricky.

You get the exact forces of a terminal, exactly balanced against an opposition terminal, it would take some doing. So we haven't done this very often. You haven't gone on doing this every lifetime, you see, it just happened now and then. This, we're fortunate in. And so, for all the trillennia that one has lived, he hasn't accumulated too many of these things which are exactly balanced which are exact packages. But the ferocity and balance of these things is such as to give the whole aspect of timelessness and he's most likely to be associated with, plagued by or upset in or behaving according to such a setup – such a pair of spheres and masses.

And he's liable to think that's the end-all of everything, see, that's the end product to the lot. Concentration will be on that very heavily. Characteristics will be established by that very much. But actually, he's been a lot of things. Let's say a billion years existed between the last time he had a pair and this time he has a pair. See, there's been a billion years of free track. It's not balled up. It's not even crunched up particularly – doesn't even get picked up. Well, you go back and run whole track engrams and you're on free track and you're gorgeously missing the GPM. See, you can just run all the whole track you want to and your case isn't going to get anyplace. Be interesting! It'll alleviate some psychosomatics but it's in the lap of the gods whether you – when you're going to run into one of these GPM valences.

And the probability is, is while you are busy erasing whole track engrams, you're erasing them from the viewpoint of one of these masses. Quite interesting. You're being one of these masses all the time and you keep wondering where that odd somatic is coming from. That odd somatic has nothing to do with anything you're erasing. It has to do with the GPM terminal or oppterm. All of a sudden you'll hit a dizziness or a sensationness somewhere.

And where does this come from? And you could run engrams and run engrams and engrams and you'll still be dizzy. Why? Because you're sitting in the middle of the dizziness and you're erasing the engrams while being the dizziness. You see?

Now, this is actually quite an accurate mechanical picture I'm giving you of the Goals Problem Mass.

All right, let's take – just for a wild guess figure – let's take a hundred of these. I mean, a hundred complete units, you know – the two big ones and the little ones – let's take a hundred of these things and let's put them all in a pile and hit them with a pile driver and then move in on them from the side and so forth, and it would be kind of a ruddy mess, wouldn't it? And that's what you call a GPM.

Now, why is it called the Goals Problem Mass? Well, each one of these things had a purpose. It had something it wanted to do and one of the basic methods of locating these things was to find a goal the person had and by finding the goal the person had, one could then trace down one of these terminals. So, Routine 3 became a process of identifying one of these terminals by first finding the goal and then finding what would represent the goal and we – it would turn out to be one of these terminals. This is quite remarkable. But of course it often turned out to be the opposition terminal. It wouldn't run. you weren't running the right item. The other was right alongside of it – so it had its limitations.

So I began to look around and study this a little bit more. We call it a *problems mass* to keep it plainly in view that a problem is postulate-counterpostulate – valence versus va-

lence, beingness versus beingness. You see? There are two things. You can't have a problem without two masses or two things or two ideas, opposed. So we say *problems* just to keep this idea in mind and so that anything you know about the anatomy of problems – how they suspend themselves in time and all that sort of thing – applies to the GPM.

And then we call it *mass* because it is mass. It's actual mass; it's not imaginary mass. It's quite measurable. Wait till you run into one if you haven't. They're quite measurable mass. All right.

The difficulties of – auditors were having was in trying to find the goal and then trying to find the terminal that located the goal because if anything, that process is too good. That does its job much too well. And the pc goes slithering out of these things and into the mass and around and about it and so forth, in a very dizzying and dazed fashion. He is really upset by this because he's colliding with these things, one after the other. In other words, this is a hard entrance.

Now let's talk in the subject of entrances. How could you find out what these things were? Well, you could observe the pc and find out what he was doing and then figure out what would do that. That would be the lousiest method. Many auditors use this method. I want to point out to you that this *is* a method and that it *is* used. People use it on themselves and auditors use it on pcs. They find this pc galloping down the street on all fours barking every few leaps, see, and they say, "Ha-ha, that's obvious, we'll just run him on a dog, see, because it's pretty obvious that he's in a dog's valence." No, he wasn't in any dog's valence. He was being a frogman. It wasn't the right terminal, was it? In other words, that would be the lousiest method of approach because it's susceptible to the most inaccuracy.

Now, why do we have to be accurate? Well, there's tremendous, tremendous liability to running the pc as one of these lock valences because, of course, it is appended to this great big heavy valence and the amount of charge which you bleed off against the pc is rather fantastic, without *doing* anything. See, it's not going to unlock the real reason this thing is hung up in space. It is only going to unlock, to some slight degree, its impingement against other locks. And he can just chew on this and chew on this and chew on this. All right.

There is this method, as I've just mentioned, of the fellow and you see him going down the street on all fours, leaping along, and so forth. Well, very possibly, there is a dog someplace in it. In fact, it would be hard to find a pc who didn't have all valences – either as main valences or lock valences, you see? But every pc would have different main valences. See? They all have them all but you wouldn't have the picture of the main valences and that's the picture you've got to get. And you mustn't get the pc in one of these lock valences because it will blow off and won't read and that'll be that. It won't stay there, see? Because they're just – pc's really never been them to amount to anything They are not very important in his lifetime.

What you've got to find and what I had to do was find a lot of doors. I had to find doors which would let the pc straight into the Goals Problem Mass, but easily enough so that he didn't get his silly head knocked off, because it's very easy to get your silly head knocked off with a Goals Problem Mass.

Now, there are a number of ways you can open it. It was very difficult to get in by goals. It was very difficult to get in by goals terminals. You couldn't at all get in with a guess

and an assignment. This is – all this is very difficult. You've been finding these for years, by the way. you found them with Dynamic Assessment and you found them this way and you found them that way but, very often you landed on a lock, you see, that didn't audit.

Now, how did you – how can you reliably collide with one of these items? And that is 3D Criss Cross. Any method by which you could get a test item, which would then lead to a main item, would wind you up with this system on one or the other side of a dual-opposed beingness. Now, this is very, very tricky – it's very tricky. It's actually getting an entrance that the pc can be and do, at that time, that he can stand up to and that will blow charge.

Now, the methods of entrance of this are many but the best methods and the worst methods, alike, all consist of certain steps. And these steps are roughly: list, differentiate, null and check. Those are your basic steps. It doesn't matter how you go about this – you still list, differentiate, null and check. And each one of these items is precisely done. There's a precise way of doing each one of these items. "Item" is used carelessly there – doing what each one of these operations – a precise way of doing each one.

Now, these doors, these entrance points, could be many but the best entrance points are established by first establishing some test point by an assessment. So, you have such an assessment as the Dynamic Assessment. Let's make a Dynamic Assessment. Now, whatever – the old-time Dynamic Assessment. Now, whatever we get out of that is just a test item; it's not a 3D Criss Cross item. It won't be until we oppterm it, but when we oppterm it, we will find out – all of a sudden we'll land square in the Goals Problem Mass, see? Bang!

All right. Now, ways of finding these test items are as I said, many. The Dynamic Assessment method: quite valid. Pre-Have Scale: the Auxiliary Pre-Have Scale that was developed for Routine 3D is very successful. Now we can't say, however, that we wind up with a test item when we get that first list item. No, that's a 3D Criss Cross item. Let's see what a test item would be in a Prehav Assessment. We go down the line and find that our level is Control. The pc responds on Control. All right. Very good. We want to know "Who or what would control?" Or any way you wish to phrase it so that it makes sense to the pc. And of course, the test item is "What would control?" No, no, not the result of what would control – no, it's just those words, "What would control?" is your test item. See? You understand that?

It isn't the *result* of what you'd get of all this, you see? It is it, you see. See, you've done a Pre-Have Assessment and you wound up with Control and although you're going to list from "Who or what would control?" and so forth, you've already found a test item and that test item is "What would control?" "Underscore" (quote) (unquote). "That which would control" is your test item. Of course, that's not part of the Goals Problem Mass but that will lead you straight to the Goals Problem Mass because the pc rocked on it on the meter.

So, we're going to go charging down this line, by listing, and there's our first action. We're going to list. Now, what exactly happens in a list? Well, I'll give you that fast enough. We're going to list. All right. "Who or what would control?" Well, we can say, "Things," or, "You," or we can put it together – just so it makes sense to the pc, you see – this seems to be better to him and it seems to be better on the meter, too. It reads better when we say, "Who or what could control you?" It seems to read good. "Who or what would control things?" That doesn't seem to read so good. you get the idea? You kind of dabble this one out so that your

test item there reads a bit. And then you say, "Who or what would (whatever your test item was)," see?

And we list, and we list, and we list and we list and as we list, this tone arm should be moving – ha-ha-ha. And that tone arm should be moving and that tone arm should be moving for every twenty minutes – *optimum* movement would be at least – I mean this is – this is very good movement: three-quarters of a TA division every twenty minutes. Ah, that's real hot movement. Poor movement is .25 of a TA division every twenty minutes. That's poor. Rotten, of course, is zero movement every twenty minutes. There's something real wrong there and so on. you actually, probably wouldn't play along with this 2.2 – this .25. You'd probably start listing and you'd find out that's all that was happening and you'd say, "Skip it."

You'd do something else. you would ask the case some more questions as I will go into in a moment. And you would do some other things – chief of which is if the person has been run on 3D Criss Cross or Routine 3 – any Routine 3-type process – you would complete lists and straighten this case up, but if the case has not been, you would of course, promptly put him on the CCHs and Prepchecking until you established tone arm motion. Okay? Those are the remedies.

But let's say we found Control as a Prehav Assessment, not to get involved with this, and we found this Control and we listed, "Who or what would control you?" and we wrote items. Well, that just consists of writing items. At the top of the page we put: "Number 1, period. Who or what would control you? date and pc's name." you will learn that when you haven't done this, you're going to have trouble because this list may someday be of considerable use.

And you just list. Well the best way of going about this – some pcs try to get economical and they like to give you only six or seven items – and very early on, if you're very ignorant indeed, you will take the six or seven items and you will put them on the page there and you will null them and then – well, this is the wrong way to go about it all. Now, you want – you want lots of items. And this is a paper-consuming activity. It's a paper-consuming activity.

Now, the auditor who writes – tries to write three columns on the same page eventually won't be able to find what he has crossed and what he hasn't and what he's marked and what he hasn't, and so on. And the best thing is just give up – just skip that terminal you have, "paper saver" and just go for broke and start right on down and list one column on the page. Then you turn the page over, and of course, you don't have to write all that data on the backside of it but you do have to write: "2 – page 2" and you'd list on that. It's best to use legal length paper, 13 inch by 8 inch or 8 1/2 inch paper. All right. Now, we come to the next sheet and we write: "3. Who or what would – ? date and pc's name."

Why do we do that? Well, they sometimes get separated, that's why, and we don't know what we're listing. See? So we make sure that every independent piece of paper on which we are doing a list has the *name* of the pc, the date, and in particular the exact question from which the list came. And we turn that one over and write: "4." (and we don't have to label that) and then we take the next sheet and we write: "5. Who or what would control you? John Doakes, 24 April 62." See?

And we go on this way and we finally wind up – we have wobbled the TA fresh out of motion, more or less. It's usually gone to a blowdown and the pc says it's on the list. We ask the pc, "Is it on the list?" But we ask this as though it's a repetitive question. Now this is important to you. I'll go over all these points.

You say, "Who or what would control you?" and the pc answers. Now sometimes he gives you three items without running down, you see, sometimes he gives you five without running down so don't keep interrupting him. See? Don't keep – and stop barking a Tone 40 acknowledgment. Don't you know the purpose of the acknowledgment is to shut the pc up and finish the cycle of action? Well what if you Tone 40 acknowledge every item he gives you? You've ended his list for him every time, haven't you? No, I'm afraid that a "good," is much better than "Good!" I'm afraid that sort of stops the flow.

Your idea is to get a list, see, not to stop the list. And it's not really a cycle of action of an auditing question that you're doing You're just helping him get the list. So everytime he stops talking or slows down, you shoot him the question again, "Who or what would – ?" and so forth and you thank him. But actually, the fact that you're writing it down is acknowledging the hell out of it. He – it must be important, you must be getting it because he can see your pencil wiggling

All right. When we finish up this list, the pc is asked – well, it's slowing down, the pc says, "Well, that's all." First test is: "Well, is the item on it? Is 'Who or what would control you' on this list?"

And the pc says, "Well, I don't know."

And you say, "Well, come on, give me some more." you see? You don't monkey around with the meter or anything You bleed it down.

All right. And he eventually gets down to "Who or what would control you?"

Well he says, "Yeah."

Well, you ask him, finally, you ask him again, "Well, is the item on the list now?"

"Oh, yes. Yes, that's it."

Well, that's great. Now you turn over to the meter and you ask the question on the meter and see whether or not you get a rap. you ask him, "Are there any more items that belong on this list?" And if you get a rap, you first ask him, "Is there an ARC break?" See? That's modus operandi absolute. Make sure he doesn't have an ARC break, an invalidation or an out-rudiment because you can keep stretching a list on the ARC break of stretching the list. This is a big frailty that you run into. If you haven't got any fall on that, then there's always more items so you keep listing until your meter is null on the question, "Are there any more items on this list?" Okay? Make sure that that knock however, is not coming from an ARC break. All right?

Now your list is complete – possibly. It's a pretty good average that your list is complete at this stage. The pc has told you that it's on there, you've asked the meter, you've squared it up, you've added everything to it that you can. Now whether you number them or not, I couldn't care less. I don't care whether you number these things or not. It's all right if

you do, it's all right if you don't, but there's no use for the numbers particularly, unless you want to cross-referral, of something or other. But there's no real purpose for the numbers.

Now, now comes your first actual test. You've asked the pc, you've asked the meter. Your first actual test is contained in the first twelve items. Of course, you make sure your rudiments are in before you start to null. But, look-a-here, the differentiation step is the next step which you do, but let me point out something to you. The differentiation step was done in an effort to minimize the number of items on the line and then tests demonstrated that when you asked the pc whether or not you should keep the item on the list, the pc very often crossed the item off the list because of the suppressor factor.

In other words, the item that you would have gotten on the list had been crossed off by the pc before you got a chance to null. This was too much. So differentiation would consist of, "Would (blank) control you?" (whatever the list item is). And the pc says, "Yes" or "No." And that's all. "Would (blank) control you . . ." Yes or no. See? You don't do anything with it. you just read it. you just ask the pc, staying in communication with him. That would be a differentiation of the whole list. Let me call to your attention something: that it becomes an optional step, because if the list is complete, there is no more charge to be bled off. Do you see?

There has been that alteration. Now we're going to keep differentiation in the lineup. And we're going to do it or not do it to the degree that the pc wanders and the amount of charge you can get off as a result of it. you want to go through a whole list and differentiate 450 items, why, fine. Ask him that question 450 times, that's fine, you might find it beneficial. But if you don't find it beneficial, you'd better not do it. You'd better just go straight to "nulling." Follow this?

So nobody's saying you've got to differentiate at this stage of the game. Nobody's saying this at all. It might look like no auditing to the pc. There have been many complaints from pcs about differentiation – ARC breaks because they were differentiating. They weren't getting closer to finding the items. They had a limited number of auditing time and they thought it was useless. You understand?

But a pc who's getting muzzy and foggy and that sort of thing, you might find that it's a very good thing to differentiate the list in some fashion or other with the pc, but you might not find it's necessary to differentiate every list. Because all it is, is an orientation point. It blows a little more charge. Remember, that a complete list bleeds all the charge off anyhow. You follow this?

Audience: Yes.

All right.

Now, this has left you up in the air – Do I differentiate or don't I differentiate? Well, you'd better learn to make up your mind up about something I don't care if you differentiate or not differentiate. You'll find many a pc goes out of session during differentiation. And similarly, many a pc doesn't know what the hell you're talking about during nulling if you haven't differentiated. Furthermore, you might read the list to the pc back again and all of a sudden the pc thinks of a bunch more items.

You start differentiating and the pc thinks of more items, so differentiation can be used to extend your list. If the pc is being very balky, differentiation could be used as a mechanism

to extend the list. If you did that, you would say, "Would (blank) control you?" You'd ask the pc and the pc says, "Well, really not." Slide one in about that time, "Well, is there anything that you haven't got on the list that would?" See? You make him think about the subject, pull him into the session more.

You could use it this way. I'd differentiate every pc that gave me twenty-five items and said, "That's it." And then I would use it very cunningly in exactly this fashion:

"Would catfish control you?"

And he'd say, "Well, yes, yes. Catfish would control you."

"Anything else there might? Any other item you haven't got on there that might?"

"Control me, control me – well, it was one of those – yeah, one of . . ."

"Any other item that might control you?" And so on. We coax him into that nice, long list. you could use this, you see. So differentiation has its uses. But I do not think it is a must. Okay?

Audience: Mm-hm.

All right. Our next item then is nulling. Now, if a pc tells you that it must go on the list, you put it on the list – during listing, differentiation or nulling. At any time the pc says he wants an item on the list, you put it on the list. you understand? I don't care what it is, you put it on the list. And every time the pc says he wants an item off the list, you leave it on. That's all you need to know about types of items. You don't have to know anything about whether it's proper names, do they or do they not go on the list. It's an item, you put it on the list. Is it any other type of peculiar item, a present time item or anything like that, do you put it on the list? It's an item, you put it on the list. That answers *all* the questions. If the pc wants it on the list and if it is an item, you put it on the list. you see that? And there is no adjudication on the part of the auditor as to whether it is an item or not.

There aren't any items left off the list. If it has occurred on another list as "the item" and the pc wants it on this list, you put it on this list. Okay? In other words there aren't any items you keep off the list. you put everything on the pc wants on the list. That's it. Period.

There should be no question about that. But if the pc mentions something and doesn't know whether he wants it on the list or not you don't put it on the list until he tells you to put it on the list. That's also quite clearcut isn't it?

He says, "Well, I don't know – catfish, catfish *uhh-hmmm*. Catfish? And so on and so on and so forth – No I don't want that on the list – that wouldn't control anybody."

You haven't put it on the list yet, 90 therefore you cancel it. Your response to this sort of thing is to the pc, "Well, do you want that on the list?" And if the pc says "yes," you put it on the list and if the pc said, "no" you don't put it on the list. But once it's on the list, only the E-Meter and the auditor can take it off. Got it? See? It goes on the list quite indelibly. You won't have any trouble. Pcs are very adventurous in putting things on lists. Then they think. They almost never think before they put it on the list.

All right. Now, here's your first test of the completeness of a list. Take the first twelve items and null them. You'll find if you have – you shouldn't be repeating each item more than

about seven times. See? You want to get three null reads in a row to call a thing null on that first list. Okay? That first twelve. And if you've got four or five alive, your list is not complete. The symbols which you use are an X and a slant.

If the item is null for three consecutive reads – catfish, catfish, catfish – you put an X. And if the item is alive, constantly or sporadically, but doesn't go null for three consecutive reads, you put a slant. And you put a slant for every time you test it. In other words, every time you come past that section, you put a slant. If you put an X down, you don't go back over it again except on the checkout step. So, here we go:

We say, "Catfish, catfish, catfish." Here's the way it ought to look: Catfish – read, catfish – read, catfish – didn't read, catfish – it didn't read, catfish – it didn't read. "Thank you. It is out," is what you say to the pc.

In other words, "Catfish," read. "Catfish," read. "Catfish," didn't read. "Catfish," didn't read. "Catfish," didn't read. "Thank you. It is out." Okay? All right. "Dog' next item. "Dog, dog, dog' – three reads. See? "Dog," not much of a read. "Dog, dog, dog," all three of them null. "Thank you. It is out." See, you're trying to get three nulls. See, you've been reading before, only against kicks. Well, this time you can do it three times on a null and you'll come up with a final result. See? In other words, you try to scrub those first twelve and if you can't scrub, oh I don't know, ten of them, you haven't got a complete list, that's all.

So you just put aside the nulling and you say to the pc, take up your pencil, look at it, square it all up, "All right, let's complete the list now." And he's so dismayed by all of this that he gives you items. Okay?

If four or five are alive, oh my, that list was not quite complete. If six are alive in the first twelve you read, oh man – that is nowhere near complete. If ten are alive out of the first twelve, you haven't begun. You just haven't begun to list, that's all. The whole thing is charged up.

Now, before nulling, always check your first two of the end rudiments, and invalidations, and missed withholds. In other words, let's get the half-truths, and the meter, and invalidations and missed withholds. Let's just check these items over and make sure that they are out. That's before you begin nulling in general. Well, let's make sure we got our rudiments in, in other words.

I should call that middle rudiments. But you can always tell whether or not your rudiments are in. Two things are going on if the rudiments are out: (1) all the items are flat or they're all firing equally. I think it will be a long day before you see them all fire equally but I have nevertheless, seen a pc actually so far out of session that every time you, the auditor, said anything, you were charged, so therefore you got a fall on everything, equally. I have actually seen this, so beware. You'd get something like this: "Catfish," half-a-dial drop. "Catfish," half-a-dial drop. "Catfish," half-a-dial drop. See? Routinely, right on the instant read. See? It's because you were speaking. But then you will see this.

There are ways to determine this and you needn't clutter your mind up with them but I'll tell you one just as an amusing thing You say – you say, "Catfish that can't swim." Let's say that's the item see, that you're testing, "Catfish that can't swim," see. Well, it falls on "catfish," and "that," and "can't" and "swim." It falls on everything, see.

Now, if your rudiments – the other way is, if your rudiments are in, the first time you read an item, you're going to get a bark on it. There's some charge on it or it wouldn't be on the list. See?

It's when you don't get any read at all that you start worrying See, what you get is a reducing read. In other words, the first time you read it, you got a reaction, second time you read it you got some reaction, third time you read it you didn't get much of a reaction, fourth time you got none, none, none. you understand that? Your rudiments are obviously in. See, the thing is reading and then not reading. If your rudiments are out, you get a monotonous similarity of the meter that had nothing to do with anything you're doing. See? Usually null. So you got catfish, catfish, catfish, you see – that's null. Dog, dog, dog, that's null. See? Each one's null. you say, "Catfish, catfish, catfish, that's null." "Dog, dog, dog, that's null." "Cat, cat, cat, that's null." "Room, room, room, that's null." "Light, light, light." Improper – improper needle behavior. See? Proper needle behavior goes: catfish, fall; catfish, fall; catfish, tick, no fall. See? You know your rudiments are in if you're getting any reaction. They're always instant read and they always fall immediately on the end of the item. Okay?

All right. You pursue that on down. Frankly, the way your list ought to look is one strike on the twelve – first twelve items and eleven Xs. That would be just dandy. That's very good. That means a very thoroughly discharged subject. And, now your next action – see, is getting very particular, we know how the meter looks on these things better. All right, your next action would be to go over the thirty-seven remaining Maybe we had 450 items, we covered them in one scrub. See, we went over it just once and we had thirtyseven left. All right, so we went over the thirty-seven, we wound up with five. We went over the five, wound up with two. Went over the two, wound up with one. The last two or three surrendering the most arduously. That would be a proper nulling See? You did 450, covered them once and had thirty-seven left. you do the thirty-seven, you wind up with five.

See? Thirty-two scrubbed on just one cross. You understand that's following the system of about no more than seven reads but with three consecutive nulls to be satisfied. Hm? You'll find that's quite a good system.

There's several systems involved with all this, by the way. I'm now using this system because you need a cross-check system for a complete list. And that's why we're departing and using this other system. I think you also – you'll find it a little faster.

All right. Supposing you did the first twelve items and you found that ten of those items were live and you couldn't scrub ten of them. Oh well, brother, you've got two out and ten alive. That list is incomplete and so we are now going to continue listing.

Now, we'll use the next twelve items as the first test. We'll use items thirteen – twenty-four, inclusive, and we found out that five of those items were alive and seven were null. Your list is not yet complete so we're going to complete the list further and now we're going to use twenty-five to thirty-six inclusive, as our next test. Got that?

We're sneaking up on the thing. In other words, we're winning all the time. We're getting more lists done while we test which is pretty clever. See? Always take a fresh sequence. You don't go over the same ones you've gone over. To hell with those. Catch those the next time through. They'll be flat because your charge is bleeding off.

Now, what actually is this list composed of? The list is composed of: a terminal or an opposition terminal and all of its locks. It's one or the other, and all of its locks. Not all the locks of both, just the locks of one. And that list is more or less, a list of all the locks of this thing. And the individual, as he looks around, if he spots them all and the terminal itself, will blow all the charge out of the area and nothing is left in there to do anything.

Now, you optterm – well, now you check. Let me tell you how to check. Way you check is you get your rudiments in. Get them in quite thoroughly and then read the item and then read every item that has kept banging earlier. You can tell them because they've probably got – they should have a slant and an X after them. Where everything else has an X, you've got thirtyseven items maybe in this list that have a slant and an X. So you read this item and the slant and the X item, see, and this item that you found and the slant and the X item – and this item you found has to keep on reading.

What happens if it stops reading? *Huh-huh!* Well, there's two things could be wrong Your rudiments have gone out and the pc has invalidated the item, one way or the other, and you have wrongly knocked out one of these – one slant, X items. And you'll find that the item is one or the other items or you missed or something goofed. But the usual thing is, is the list was not quite complete.

So you complete the list and you only bother to null and check out what you completed, but then you check it against everything that stayed live more than one pass through. You see how you check? You take the item, get the rudiments in very thoroughly and then you check the item against everything that was resistant on the list. And you can tell what was resistance because it's got more of your pencil marks after it. If you've got anything on the list that goes twenty-five pencil marks after it – oh no – my God, that list wasn't even vaguely complete. What are you doing? You know?

But the item itself, when you're checking it, you don't bother to keep slashing it. See? You just check it against these other items. That means your whole list is discharged and the one item is left. And that is what is necessary before you say, for sure you have an item. With rudiments in, that item remains, and there is no other live item on the list. Now, of course, there's no other live item in these ones that went out the first time but there might be some ticks or kicks left in some of these other items. And, if there's too much kicks left in these other items, your list, again, is incomplete. All right.

That list is composed of the names, assignments and generalities that the pc assigns to all these raisins and the big bowling ball. you are going to be left with the big bowling ball. And let me tell you something – the pc gets certain that it is on the list, he will tell you which one it is and he is always wrong Why is he always wrong? Because he is being the one that is right and although he has said it, he usually can't even remember saying it. He never selects it.

If the pc tells you it's it, and that is the item, and he knows that's the item, and that is it – if you were fool enough, without nulling, to take that as an item, then you'd wind that pc up in more hot water than you could easily cool off. Why? You see, the pc least sees that which he is most being. Of course, that tells you that the item is submerged. The pc knows about it, it isn't it. So, you get down to the end of the line and he says, "Well, it's on the list all right. It's that catfish. Ha-ha! Right there at the end. you know – I know that's it." you say, "Thank you very much." you appreciate the fact that he has told you the list is complete but

you don't pay any attention to the fact he says it's a catfish because it's *not a catfish*. Not even vaguely. It is a fallen leaf that occurs eighteen from the end. Fallen leaf – and the usual reaction is, "Did I put that on the list? Is that on the list?" You know? It's that type of reaction. Now, do you see how to check them out? Hm?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Now, those are the entirety of the actions of 3D Criss Cross, except how do you patch up a case? Now, if you've got somebody who ambitiously has a long line plot already done – I've just learned this in the last twenty-four hours, this particular item – you immediately suspect that the earlier items found by a Routine 3 are not on the line plot and these have been omitted. So the first thing you do is find out if there are any earlier items found by any process. Okay? Any Routine 3-type process, goals, terminal, that sort of a thing – we're not too interested in earlier Dynamic Assessment items. See? We only want to know those Routine 3 items. See?

That's the first thing we suspect – that the line plot was started out with 3D or 3D Criss Cross and was not started out with the first career of the pc on a routine that headed him toward clearing. "Any item been found with a goal and terminal? Any item been found running to Clear? Any item been found? Any item that might be important? Has any item been found? All right." Then, we check the validity of the line plot. And you can put that down in letters of fire as your first action, is (1) check the validity of the line plot. I have seen line plots that didn't have a third of the pc's items on them. I have just seen a line plot within the last hour, which omitted the first four items of the pc.

Four items were found and then the person was run on Routine 3 because it now had a name. He was run on Routine 3, more or less, earlier than that. Four items were missing so the line plot is the first thing you suspect. Therefore, you make up the line plot as accurately as you possibly can. And any time you find an item that has been found and run in a Routine 3 manner on the pc – not now reacting – you discover the source of the list and complete that list. And that is everything You find the earliest item that was supposed to have been alive but wasn't, find out what list it came from, complete the list and find that item and then *oppterm*. You always *oppterm*.

This is the other rule with Routine 3D Criss Cross. This rule was sloppy. That's why these things were on Information Bulletins because they were not finalized. That is the rule. If you find an item, you *oppterm* it. In other words, any time you find an item, find the reverse item. you find "catfish" as a result of "Who or what would control you?" You finally find "catfish." All right, that's a Routine 3D Criss Cross item. All right. Now we want, "Who or what would oppose a catfish?" See, we list: "Who or what would oppose a catfish?" So, any pc that had four earlier items before somebody started running a line plot is missing eight items before the line plot even begins. Wow! Horrible, ain't it?

You'll find that any case will patch up and repair if you find the earliest item that wasn't right and then complete the list, and having completed the list, make sure that item is right and then *oppterm* it and the charge will bleed off that case the like of which you never saw before. Marvelous to behold.

If a case doesn't immediately come back to battery by this type of remedy, if it doesn't immediately come back to battery, with this type of remedy, and I do mean right now, just listing it, you see. Just in the session and listing it – oh no, there's something wrong with the line plot or you haven't got the earliest item and so forth. It only takes you about an hour and a half or two hours to find out if the case is going to come back to battery. Because you find the earliest one that was wrong and start making it right and the case will snap back.

Now the reason for that is the Goals Problem Mass is stacked, not in order or in consecutive sequence on the time track but in order of entrance by the pc and hell enter those corners most easily entered and it proceeds from that point. And you'll find there's a squashed whole package between something and something every time you've missed one. And it gets to be the muckiest mess you ever saw in your life. you found – you found this first item and it was all right and then you found another – didn't oppterm it – but you found a second item, and it was all wrong and then you found a third item over here. Well, already you've got a wrong item against a missing oppterm. Well, that's enough to upset any case. The pc will be ARC breaky and so forth.

Now, what if a case has found a wrong item that won't checkout with you – you just check out all items the same way, you see. The checkout, when I say, "check out," I mean this operation of taking the item and checking it against the list. you understand. You'll find out that you don't have to do that ordinarily. You look at the list and it's got thirty-five slash marks after every other item. you say, "Oh, *bluah*," and just start listing again. You don't bother to go over these items that have already been nulled. Two things you can do with a list: You can suppress one or you can null one. And when there's twenty-five items – slash marks after every other item, you've suppressed items. You haven't nulled anything. You've just ground it in. you see. Takes much longer to do that, by the way, than to carry out a complete list. Because a complete list just nulls just like – oh, I don't know, it nulls like brushing down cobwebs. See, it's much, much faster to complete the list even though the list is terribly long than it is to try to grind out a short list.

All right, in the final thing – there's only, maybe, one other thing that you really have to learn before you develop some new mistakes is – one other thing you have to learn and that is: If a list has a wrong item on it, the line has a wrong item, and that wrong item has been opptermed, of course the pc has really been wound up in the soup because you've now done a whole oppterm list to a lock, you abandon that second item on the line.

In other words, it was "catfish," only – catfish is the right item, see, but he's got "dog." It's line A – dog, is right, see, but he had line A – catfish. And then somebody – "Who or what would oppose a catfish?" do you see, and he got a "fisherman." So we have line A reading, "catfish-fisherman." And we find out "catfish" won't check out so we just complete this list, whatever line A was (who or what would control you), we just complete that list, but we've got this item, "fisherman." What do we do with this item? Well, you just chuck it back in the bay, that's what you do with it. you don't do a thing with it. It will all erase and blow off and all will go gorgeously because the next line – it'll all disappear, there's no liability. It was hell – it was hell on the pc to oppterm a lock valence but this doesn't mean it won't blow off easily because now you just find the oppterm to a "dog" and you find out that's a "master" and the "fisherman" disappears and everything else blows. See? Everything is fine. you understand?

Audience: Mm-hm.

All right.

Now, I've told you very rapidly what amounts to, basically the essential operations here, of 3D Criss Cross and I have kept you a little bit overtime but I wanted to cover the whole thing.

Now, I have not told you how you do a Pre-Have Scale assessment. And I have not told you how the E-Meter is set to be accurate for Clear reads. Well, what I have told you is very surprise – surprisingly precise approach to 3D Criss Cross and frankly, you needn't add anything else into what I've told you. There isn't much else to be known that I haven't mentioned. It's terribly easy, but the first thing it requires is that your Model Session is good, that you can keep in these things and that you can read an E-Meter. If you can't do those things, you can't do 3D Criss Cross. That's all there is to it. Beyond that, those answers are precise. Everything you do from there on is precise. Okay?

Audience: Mm-hm.

All right. Well, I wanted to put it all down in one place, all in one gulp.

Thank you for bearing with me.

Good night.

TV DEMO: CHECKING LINE PLOTS

An auditing demonstration given on 25 April 1962

All right. And I've got five people to straighten out line plots for. I'm going to work on this. And we're going to have a sort out to find out what we do to make the biggest possible gain on these cases. And that's the whole extent of what we're doing here. Okay?

LRH: All right. Have a seat over here, son. A little further up. That-a-boy. Grab the cans. E-Meter might even work. All right. That's good enough. All right. And here we go. Okay here. Now you-uns – you had some of this, huh?

PC: *Uh – some of what?*

LRH: What do you mean from some goal?

PC: *Well, it was obviously from some goal, but I'm not quite sure which one it was.*

LRH: All right. Well, here's what I'm going to do with you, Jack. I'm going to try to track this back and see what we run into here and get the best method of straightening out this thing that we can tackle the mostest and best here, okay?

PC: *Very good.*

LRH: I understand you've already listed something here.

PC: *Mm-hm. "Who or what would fail to endure?" or "had failed."*

LRH: All right. And you found "a loser" here.

PC: *Uh-huh.*

LRH: All right. When was that done?

PC: *Last week.*

LRH: Done last week. All right. Be all right if I do this rundown on you?

PC: *Oh, I'd be very pleased.*

LRH: All right. I don't guarantee any results, particularly. Somebody walks up to you and says what goal ... ?

PC: *I have a vague idea what it was but I ...*

LRH: Well, what's the vague idea?

PC: *Oh, it was a sort of a double thing. One of it was to be your right-hand man ...*

LRH: Right.

PC: *... and the other was to be a good administrator or something like that.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *And it sort of fitted in together.*

LRH: All right. Now, how many goals are on that list?

PC: *Um – I don't know for sure. Uh – couple of hundred maybe.*

LRH: Something like that? You know where the goals list might be now?

PC: *Uh – Cape Town. It should be.*

LRH: In Cape Town.

PC: *Um-hm.*

LRH: Did you have any hard time going over that goals list?

PC: *Huh-uh.*

LRH: I mean, go over it many times or ...

PC: *No, we did it all in a day and a half.*

LRH: ... did the whole lot.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: In a day and a half.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Well, it was kind of a double thing.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Mm. A TA action on the goals list, discussion of.

PC: *Oh, I'd better cable for it, hadn't I?*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *I'd better cable for it.*

LRH: Hm. I don't think that'd be necessary.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. First thing we're going to do is finish your goals list. Just for the hell of it. Mean of me, isn't it? It's still charged.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Still charged here on a goals list. And it's heavily charged. I'm swinging here two and three divisions.

PC: [amazed] *What?*

LRH: On the ...

PC: *Oh, on the needle.*

LRH: Four or five divisions. That was a body motion. It's swinging enough on this to be interesting. Just a discussion of the goals list. And this terminal is a "3" terminal, Routine 3 terminal. That's a – "dynamic genius" is a Routine 3 terminal. And it doesn't look very promising.

PC: *No, I didn't have much faith in it myself.*

LRH: Hm. A dynamic genius. A dynamic genius. A dynamic genius. Have you invalidated this terminal? Yeah.

PC: *Yeah. I didn't ...*

LRH: All right. What's your first invalidation of it?

PC: *Well, I thought it was a bit strange because Allison's was found at the same time, and hers was a "dynamic visionary," so I thought it was a bit weird that I should even have the same word in mine, you know.*

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. Any other invalidations on this?

PC: *I just don't care for it very much.*

LRH: Oh, all right. When did you first think that?

PC: *Oh, about ten minutes after it was found.*

LRH: All right. Okay. On these goals – this goals list – on listing those goals, were there any more goals you should have put on that list?

PC: *Oh, I don't know. I don't think so. It seemed complete to me.*

LRH: It seemed complete to you at the time, huh?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Well, what are we doing with all this reaction? Well, this terminal – we're not going to worry about this terminal. We're going to scrub that.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: I'll say it just for formality here. A dynamic genius. That was sporadic.

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: It indicates that the list from which it came is very heavily charged. And that is all it indicates because it's got a sweep and a swing and a dive, and it hasn't much to do with my saying it.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *Fair enough.*

LRH: It addresses the subject.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: For your information, when you see one of these things, when you say an item to somebody and it goes off on *dyn* and *amic* and *genius* and then after you've said it, it – it didn't instantly react, but you got a lat – latent reaction, and then you come back to the subject, and you say it again just for your information, a kick of that particular character is definitely a charged list. But this is not the item from it ...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: ... from that list. This isn't the item. It's – I'll say it again here. A dynamic genius. Also, the reading is occasional. We're getting it about two out of three.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: But it's – it fires on both sides of the read. And it fires tick, and it fires a dial – a division. And it fires a tick of – at two. There's no ...

PC: *Yeah. He turned it up as a genius first. I remember it now. It was just a plain genius first. Just a – just genius.*

LRH: Who added the "dynamic"?

PC: *Well, he wasn't satisfied with the read he was getting on that, so he asked me to scout around and when I got that one, he got a five-division drop.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *So...*

LRH: Yeah. All right. A genius. A genius. A genius. A genius. A genius. A genius. That's very funny, you see. It's sporadic. Now, it's late, it's early. It – well, it's just charged. It's charged. It's got a firecracker worth of charge on it. But that's list charge coming up underneath the item. All right. Now, these goals. What did you say those goals amounted to? What was the goal?

PC: *Well, basically, I think, to be a good administrator.*

LRH: Was that the goal that was found?

PC: *Mm. Basically.*

LRH: Basically.

PC: *I don't – I can't – I can't remember the wording of it.*

LRH: To be a good administrator.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: To be a good administrator. To be a good administrator. To be a good administrator. Oh, "to be a good administrator" was part of the list because it's bumping and diving.

PC: *Mm-hm. Oh, it was definitely part of the list, but I'm not quite sure where we ended up.*

LRH: Mm-mm. To be a good administrator. To be a good administrator. To be a good administrator... The thing goes tick, then it goes fall. All right. Now, I'm going to make a test on this just to be sure, see. To eat pudding. To eat pudding To eat pudding. To eat pudding. To eat pudding. To eat pudding. Well, did you have such a goal on the list?

PC: *No, I didn't.*

LRH: You didn't, huh?

PC: *No.*

LRH: You didn't, huh? All right. All right. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. And we stopped the response to my voice.

PC: *Mm?*

LRH: It's on any goal.

PC: *Oh.*

LRH: So your most charged item, son, is a goal.

PC: *It could be. Very well could be.*

LRH: Yes. So number one, this is a survey of the line plot on 25th April and number one, we're just going to complete

the goals list, whether we have it or not. We're just going to run ...

PC: *There should be a goals list in that file from last year. There's one there, too.*

LRH: Got one there, too? All right. You had one last year?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: You didn't take that one down there?

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: He was already doing an extended goals list then. And you've still got one here.

PC: *Well, as far as I was aware of the goals that I put on the one here were a repeat of what were – of the other one.*

LRH: Well, we'll just go and complete that anyhow, huh?

PC: *Right.*

LRH: Going to bleed that down and just to give us a little more clue of how we would go about that. Are there any secret goals that didn't appear on that list? Secret goals that you didn't bother to impart?

PC: *Mm-hm. There was one embarrassing one that sticks with me a bit, but it was on the list.*

LRH: It was.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Is there any anti-social goals?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Antisocial goals? Antisocial goals? Antisocial goals?

PC: *Got one vague sort of thing, but it wasn't ever a goal.*

LRH: All right. Okay. We get a nice tickety-tick on that.

PC: *Okay. Well, it was to murder somebody without being found out.*

LRH: All right. That's good. All right. All right. Any time you care to, in your own time, to just go start writing a goals list, not trying to remember what you write. But just start writing a goals list, why, that would be perfectly admissible. Okay?

PC: *Yes, surely.*

LRH: All right. Now ... And then we're going to find the modifier for that goal.

PC: *Mm-hmm.*

LRH: Good. And we're not going to let the auditor take all year doing that either, you know. We're going to find the modifier for it, and then we're going to find the terminal or the G plus M, for the goal plus modifier.

PC: *Mm-hmm.*

LRH: And that's how we're going to start you as you were started in that direction. And that's still charged.

PC: *Ready to go.*

LRH: All right. So that's what we're going to do. Now, as far as this one you found, you could actually call this, you know, a Routine 3A Criss Cross. Would be technically correct, wouldn't it? All right. Now, look-a-here, Jack. You found this "failed endure," and you got "a loser."

PC: *Mm-hmm. That's right.*

LRH: All right. Now, we're going to check out this "loser." Okay?

PC: *Good.*

LRH: Oh, you got a nice packet of goals on here.

PC: *145.*

LRH: All right. We're not going on with this "loser," you understand. This time we're going to do this one first.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Just to keep your line plot straight, all right, we're gonna scrub that one. 145?

PC: *I think so.*

LRH: That's right. 145. Nulled not too badly. In fact, it wasn't gone over many times. It was gone over a totality of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 times.

PC: *Yeah, well, most of that was on the last six.*

LRH: I know. For the final items.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: And just let me check these final items, huh?

PC: *Mm-hm. Sure.*

LRH: All right, we will ...

PC: *The only thing that disturbs me about that was uh – um – in your talk last night you said the preclear doesn't know, and I ... that's the one I thought it was a couple of days before we got it.*

LRH: Well, we won't hang you for knowing about it. But that probably isn't it. It's a good thing you're not in-session, you know. I invalidated that.

PC: *Oh, that's all right.*

LRH: We're going to check this goal now. See if we can find something else to check it against here.

PC: *"An unsuccessful person" stayed in until the last. And "an angry man."*

LRH: Yeah, that's what I was looking at over here. "An angry person" was staying in like mad. All right, let's check out this 3D Criss Cross terminal. Okay. Have you invalidated this?

PC: *Not much, I don't think.*

LRH: All right. Is there any ... There's a little slow up there. You invalidated that? When did you invalidate it maybe? There's a tick on that.

PC: *Uh ... I'm not sure. Thinking of it as an oppterm maybe? Does that invalidate it? I don't really think so.*

LRH: That falls.

PC: *Oh, well, that's what I thought of it. And it gives me a sensation.*

LRH: All right. Is there anything that should be found out about this? No. All right. Okay. Any other invalidations on this? Yeah. There's another invalidation on this.

PC: *Mm. Well, it's something I'd hate to be.*

LRH: All right. All right. When did you decide that?

PC: *Uh – well, when we were listing it and I found out what the hell it was before this new one, I thought, "Gosh, no."*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Can't have that as a goal for life.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Good enough. Any other invalidations on this? Ah, that's looking a little bit ... There's just

a tiny halt now. Very tiny. Doesn't amount to anything. My invalidation of it?

PC: *Not really, no.*

LRH: All right. Any other invalidation of it?

PC: *No, there hasn't been. Not that I'm aware of.*

LRH: All right. Let me check the question again.

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: Have you invalidated this? Have you invalidated ... Hey, wait a minute. The word *invalidated*. Invalidated. Invalidated. Invalidated. Invalidated. I have an instant read on invalidated.

PC: *Well, stick it down on the line plot. [PC and LRH laugh]*

LRH: All right. Let me wear it out. May I?

PC: *Mm-hmm.*

LRH: Invalidated. Invalidated. Invalidated. Invalidated. Invalidated. All right. That's cooling it. Now, let's see what we've got here. Have you invalidated this terminal? There's a tick.

PC: *Oh, yes. Yes. I don't know quite how I do it, but I seem to scrunch it down somehow.*

LRH: Ah! Oh, yeah. All right. When did you do that?

PC: *Oh, I was doing it all the time while it was being checked out and while we were ...*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. All right. Okay. All right. Now, let me ask you again. Have you invalidated this terminal? Good. Latent now. So that will check if it ever checks. It will check now. Okay?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: A loser. And the list is incomplete. Okay. Therefore complete line B list "failed endure." Okay?

PC: *Very good.*

LRH: All right. It's probably not very incomplete. Probably. Every time you get a, two or three hang up, you know, at the end, you know, and you're having an awful time tangling it apart, skip it. The list is not complete. I just am scouting through something. It's very interesting. Apparently, if you got three items left, why, you may have two – you may have three masses, but you certainly got also an incomplete list, and you could complete it to a single one with far greater profit. Interesting, huh? Well, all right, Jack. Now, I'm very happy about this because I think this will go very nicely, and ...

PC: *I'll do the goals list tonight.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *I'll do the goals list tonight.*

LRH: Go ahead. Go ahead, because you didn't get much TA action.

PC: *No, I haven't.*

LRH: Where our TA action I think is held up very well may be there. I'll just take a guess, but that's probably held up on your goals because the second I start mentioning goals here, why, you get lots of stuff, and you've sunk away here to 1.75 and – which is probably very unusual.

PC: *It is. Doesn't usually go below 2.0.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *In fact, I don't think it ever has been below 2.0. Oh, yes, it has, couple of times.*

LRH: Yeah. Find out what this is all about, shall we?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Squeeze the cans. All right. Hold them up there, now. Good enough. Squeeze the cans. That's better. Once more. Squeeze the cans. Squeeze the cans. Now, what – you're relaxing them first and then squeezing them, that's what this is all about.

PC: *All right. Let me get ready. Right.*

LRH: All right. Now squeeze the cans. That isn't bad. Third-of-a-dial drop. At zero. Your havingness seems to be all right. All right. Now, has anything happened during this little check-over here that's upset you?

PC: *No. I learned a lot.*

LRH: No. Clean as a wolf's tooth. All right, Jack. Thank you very, very much. That's the end of this checkout.

PC: *Thank you, Ron.*

LRH: You can turn that into your Instructors and you can go downstairs now.

PC: *Thanks.*

LRH: Thank you.

LRH: Good enough. Charles, come over here and take the hot seat.

Okay. Now, we're – all I'm going to do here is check out your line plot, find out what the score is with regard to that. Okay?

PC: *Right.*

LRH: All right. Now, you've been audited at some time or another, assessed at some time or another back here, and he found a couple of goals and items on you, huh?

PC: *Yes. After a fashion.*

LRH: After a fashion. All right. And you've already had "disregarded when you're getting something done" – you've already had that line pulled out here. Well, you seem to be making progress. Well, you won't be losing any ground. You won't be losing ground here simply because of the – of a cross-check. I'm not trying to take anything away from you.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: But let's see if we can salvage any part of these early goals, shall we?

PC: *Good. I'd like to.*

LRH: All right. Is it all right with you if I do this little check-over on you?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. That's fine. Whoever is auditing you is getting your rudiments in.

PC: *Peter.*

LRH: All right. Okay. He'll probably charge you for that commercial. You'll probably be asking him. Let's see. Your goal was "wanting to control things" is that what this goal was all about? All right.

PC: *Well, I couldn't remember the first one for sure whether it came off of "wanting to control things." I think that was the Prehav level. I thought about it since that was found and I think it's the second one about wanting to be more creative, get more done. Ah, get more done. It*

was only about a goal – ah, a list of about eighteen. We did this in about twenty minutes, the whole Goals Assessment. And oh ...

LRH: I'm looking at the meter. It says it's live.

PC: *... and oh ... the whole thing was done very quickly. And then later on, last November, he did another one – and that's what you see on line B – much more carefully.*

LRH: All right. All right. It's still a charged subject.

PC: *Well, as far as item concerned, the goal list was never really finished.*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *Although the goal did seem to read on line B rather – rather well.*

LRH: Mm-hm. All right. Any invalidations on this first terminal, "commander"? Any invalidations on a commander? Yes.

PC: *Um, well, the Prehav level livened up after that and so I figured it was wrong.*

LRH: That's a very good reason. Very good. Mind if I check this?

PC: *No.*

LRH: I'm just going to check it without monkeying with it too much, you know.

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: Because it looks like one. A commander. Well, it's falling a little bit early and a little

bit late, and so forth. And the list it came off of is hotter than a pistol.

PC: *Mm. I'm sure the list is.*

LRH: But it isn't giving a nice, orderly read.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. All right. Well, I'm not going to do anything with line A. We've got it marked here. Not going to do a thing here. We got line A, and we are going to scrub the lot because it's an incomplete goals list and the item here is not a good item – it isn't bang-bang-bang. You know, a good item just goes bang-bang-bang, regular as a clock.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: Looks charged. But he had a second item here. I might as well check, which is line – now line A. And that second item was "to have" – the goal was "to have my body feel good all the time." That was the goal he found on that. All right. Any invalidations on that particular goal?

PC: *No. I don't think of some on that one. Uh ...*

LRH: Well, there was one on something.

PC: *Well, the – well, the item that was found off of it didn't prove out, so that might be – reflect back as a invalidation of that goal.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Now that I think about it.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Any invalidations on this goal? That sprung up. Any invalidations on this goal?

PC: *I don't think of any.*

LRH: Let me get the word *goal* cleaned up here. Shall we? Goal. Goal.

Goal. Goal. Goal. Goal. Goal. That is reading hotter than a pistol.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: "Goal" is reading. Doesn't mean anything particularly, but anybody trying to check this, of course, the last word in any sentence ... Just for your information, if you've got the last word in any sentence hot, it'll look like the item is hot.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: To have my body feel good all the time. To have my body feel good all the time. To have my body feel good all the time. To have my body feel good all the time. It doesn't read too badly. To have my body feel good all the time. To have my body feel good all the time. To have my body feel good all the time. Well, if it weren't banging on its parts, it's banging on "good". See, good.

PC: *Well, I think it – it's a goal plus modifier. I don't know whether that would change the read. "All the time," I – I think, this is my idea, is the modifier.*

LRH: Could be. To have my body feel good all the time. To have my body feel good all the time. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Ceiling Ceiling. Ceiling. Ceiling. Ceiling. Ceiling. Ceiling. Getting a certain amount of needle response here regardless. This goals list was never finished, was it?

PC: *Uh, probably not. It ran about 120 or something.*

LRH: Mm-hm. When did this dirty needle turn on? Just now?

PC: *Perhaps. I don't know.*

LRH: Talking about goals?

PC: *Well, I think there was the subject of goals when you were repeating it.*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *And I couldn't make out, oh – what about goals? And I began to think about it.*

LRH: Yeah. Well, all right. Yeah, we get a response. It's the same response I was getting. Goals. Goals. Goals. Goals. Goals. Goals. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Ceiling. Ceiling. Pencil. Pencil. Pencil. Goals. Goals. Goals. Goals. Goals. Ceiling. Ceiling. Ceiling. Ceiling. Well, they're getting different responses.

PC: *Just don't say wall.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That's one of the found items.*

LRH: Ah, this is – this is just kind of rough here. People been missing withholds on you?

PC: *Mm. Not so much in session.*

LRH: Latent read.

PC: *Out of session.*

LRH: Out of session they've been missing withholds on you?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: How can anybody miss a withhold on you out of session?

PC: *You certainly can on this course.*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *On the course a little bit.*

LRH: Yeah?

PC: *Not too much.*

LRH: Yeah. All right. Have I missed a withhold on you? Have I missed a withhold on you? Well, I don't get anything about that. A little bit latent read. Something there.

PC: *Yeah, something there to talk about.*

LRH: Yeah, but I don't see anything very serious here. Have I missed a withhold on you? Mm-mm. Have I missed a withhold on you? We could develop one.

PC: *Yeah, I could – I could start thinking about it and get one.*

LRH: Mm. Mm. It was latent. I can get it more instant. What did I fail to find out that I should have? ... That doesn't register very much.

PC: *Well, I thought it was a good Zero Question.*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *I thought it was a good Zero Question.*

LRH: Oh, yeah. All right. Okay. We're not going to bother with that right now.

PC: *No, I don't feel upset with you, and any missed withholds are minor.*

LRH: Mm. Yeah, there doesn't seem to be – there doesn't seem to be too much of anything.

PC: *I don't think that's the problem.*

LRH: Anyhow, I'm just curious here... Who just did this item on you?

PC: *Oh, the item was found by Reg. Here. As far as I can tell, it belongs to the goals found on my – the other line. But I've been on Prepchecking this week. But before that, last week, Reg was ...*

LRH: This was last week?

PC: *A couple of weeks ago. A couple of weeks ago, Reg was auditing me on 3D Criss Cross. And uh ...*

LRH: This is what I'm looking for. Reg ran you last week on 3D Criss Cross.

PC: *Couple of weeks ago. Couple of weeks ago.*

LRH: A couple of weeks ago he ran you on 3D Criss Cross? Good. He ran you on 3D Criss Cross a couple of weeks ago.

PC: *Mm-hm. I was taken off of it.*

LRH: Was it an ARC break to come off of it?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Is that registering here? Is that what the registry might be?

PC: *That's the only major ARC break I've got, about the course.*

LRH: You have got that.

PC: *Yeah, I thought it was a – was a misestimation.*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *Maybe I wasn't getting a lot of tone arm action, but uh – uh – it was an ARC break about – uh ...*

LRH: Good!

PC: *I had gotten tone arm action the last two sessions and a good deal of it once I got my teeth into that – that line. It was a pretty rough line.*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *Once I ran it, it was going good, and then to be taken off of it was a – was different from what was real to me.*

LRH: All right. This line's pretty hot. It's pretty hard to get.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *It was a rough go, but Reg did very nicely, I thought.*

LRH: Oh yeah. All right. Good. Good. Thank you... Yep. Now, let's see. Where's the first list out of which we got ...

PC: *Yeah, I think that's it.*

LRH: ..."disregard." All right. Good enough. That's everything I need to know. All right. Well, think you made any progress with your 3D Criss Cross?

PC: *Yes, I got a great reality on what differentiating items in the line would do.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *Tremendous, you know.*

LRH: All right. We're going to complete your goals list because it's charged. We're going to find your modifier on top of that, and then we're going to find your G-plus-M terminal, and then we're going to complete the list for a goal, and we're going to discard "an orgiast" because that obviously is too ...

PC: *That's what the first item was, right?*

LRH: Yeah. You probably came back and maybe you gave it again. It doesn't matter. I'm going to point out something to you, Charles, rather than leave you in the dark. Now, this is no discrediting of any auditor because what we're doing is we're pointing 3D Criss Cross goals, see. And as tough as it's been for people to have terminals, find goals, and that sort of thing, their ordinary difficulty in finding

goals was incomplete lists or listing against ARC breaks. Listing with the rudiments out. You know, your standard flub methods of auditing. And there isn't any particular reason why a perfectly smooth goals list can't come out. You've been started on a goals list. All right. Let's continue the thing, see. And then let's go ahead on this. I'm going to call off this terminal here, just for fun. Oh, I'm not going to pay much attention on this particular adjudication ...

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: ... because again, this terminal might come up on some other line. The Goals Problem Mass, of course, is what it is, and it's composed of what it's composed of.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. A body electrifier. A body electrifier. A body electrifier. A body electrifier. And it shows every symptom of being on a hot line, see. It's belonging someplace on a hot line, but it doesn't go *bing-bing-bing*, see.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: So if we complete this thing, we've got then, we'll get that charge off there, see. And then one thing here is right there, make sure, and then we oppterm it. And then "(5)" that, now, "if dirty needle continues, we complete the line B list, but only if dirty needle fails to fall out doing goals." See what I mean?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Now, what we've got here in essence is going to take a salvage here from the beginning of this thing. And you should have been feeling very heavily pressured. I imagine there's been quite a bit of body pressures and that sort of thing.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *During this, a great deal. It turned on some of the same ones that were on these lines.*

LRH: During this?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Yeah. Sure. All right.

PC: *I was just wondering about those last two items.*

LRH: What about them?

PC: *Whether they were still reading or not.*

LRH: Oh, you want me to check them?

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: I'll check it for you. Oh, it's probably reading. A wall. A wall. A wall. A wall. An orgiast. Oddly enough, an orgiast is reading less sporadically than a wall, but neither is reading like an item.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: Let's just get ourselves a good running jump at it, and you will find yourself fixed up. If you want to do some action of some kind or another, mental exercises, we don't care whether we've got your goals list or not, you can go ahead and write up half a thousand goals if you want to.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *I will.*

LRH: Something's – the reason for this departure is just case speed-up. That's

all. Make it easier on the case and run it faster. We'd eventually get the charge off of that. We can pull all the charge off of that simply by doing a list. It's charged, so there we go.

PC: *Of course.*

LRH: All right. And the GPM will come apart faster. I'm trying to go in the direction of pulling the GPM apart now with less items found there.

PC: *Do the job on some ...*

LRH: ...on less found, you know. That'd be two different ways to go about the same job.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: But sporadic reading is always caused by a charged list. And you have nothing there but sporadic reads. You want something that goes pop-pop-pop every time you say it, you know. You say it and you go pop-pop. And you say "cat," and it goes pop-pop-pop. And it always goes the same amount. It doesn't go fall. It doesn't go cat, cat, cat, cat, see. You don't get any of that kind of action. So you're all right. You're doing okay. Of course, any listing of Goals Problem Mass and so forth is beneficial of blowing something. I'll show you for your benefit – I started to show you this once, before I let you go here. I didn't complete it. You see this – the amount of strikes on this goals – on this terminal – this item list.

PC: *Yes, some of – some of them are pretty long.*

LRH: See, there are a lot of strikes on that, you know. All right. Well, we can wear it down. We can oppterm it, and we can get something else, don't you see, and we can go on through, and eventually by just sheer numbers, the theory is – and it

works this way; it works out – you can fall down to the bottom, you can get a clean list because you've blown the charge and so forth. Sometimes it's quite hard on the pc, but it works. Now both of your item lists found here are like this.

PC: *Yes, they are both similar.*

LRH: That's right. So that is what we will do with you, Charles. We'll (1) complete goals list, (2) we'll find your modifier. And we'll find the G plus M terminal, and we'll oppterm it, and then we'll complete the line B list and find whatever terminal that is, and well just X these out, you know.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: And that will blow the maximum amount of charge off of your case in the minimum amount of time, the way you're going. Understand these other terminals, they turn out eventually anyhow. I'm not trying – don't get the idea I'm invalidating everything you've got.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: But, you see, the auditing has been started. And we have an unflat process on a Routine 3.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Caught a little "What goal have you had?" That's right. An interesting process, too, isn't it?

PC: *Yes, it is. I'd like to finish it off.*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *Uh – especially if that word "goal" keeps reading. And it means to me what goal have I got, you know. Goal. Goal.*

LRH: And here we got it, too ... Goals true and goals, goals, man.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: You know, actually, the goal you find is the thought pocket.

PC: *In the uh – in the goal ?*

LRH: Mm. In the mass.

PC: *In the mass.*

LRH: So you could try – you could find it first as a thought pocket, identify it as a goal, its intention and purpose.

PC: *That's right. It would be a thought in one of the ...*

LRH: And then you identify the mass when you find the terminal.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: That's the old kick around over there.

All right, Charles. Thank you very much. Anything you care to say before I end this coffee shop, here?

PC: *No, just thank you very much, and uh – I'll be right at it.*

LRH: All right. That's the end of check-out. Thank you.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: ...Okay. Pick up the cans, and ... All right. See what you're reading here. Squeeze them. All right. You'll do. And is it all right if I do this?

PC: *Yes, it is.*

LRH: All right. Let's see what you've been up to here. You haven't had very much 3D Criss Cross, have you?

PC: *Not a great deal.*

LRH: What you been doing?

PC: *I've been on CCHs.*

LRH: Are they working?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Anybody missing withholds on you on the CCHs?

PC: *I don't think so.*

LRH: Been missing withholds? Missing withholds? What gives with this word "missing withholds"? It was instant, and now it's momentary.

PC: *Oh, I guess I just feel a little guilty when somebody starts in – what's been missed.*

LRH: Missing withholds?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Oh, you had a lot of trouble finding them? Have I missed a withhold on you?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Have I missed a withhold on you? You. Have I missed a withhold on you? Has your auditor missed a withhold on you? Well, what withhold have I missed on you, Ruth? Huh? There it is.

PC: *Well, I've been busy copying the lists from my folder because I expect to go home next week.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And uh – uh – so I have looked at a couple of the auditor report forms in my folder.*

LRH: Oh, a couple of the what?

PC: *I have looked at the – some of the data in my folder.*

LRH: Oh? What's that? You mean some of the auditor – some of the supervisor comments?

PC: *Occasionally. I get too busy to read much, but I was reading – read a couple.*

LRH: All right. And what was that? I missed the fact that you had done this? Is that right?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. And what should I have – what did I fail to find out about that? What exactly did I fail to find out?

PC: *Well, I understand that pcs aren't supposed to look at their folders, see.*

LRH: All right. You had a rough time here. All right. Did any of those rough you up? Did any of those comments?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Oooh. Oooh. What comment roughed you up?

PC: *Well, I had a rough time.*

LRH: Mm?

PC: *That I've had a rough time.*

LRH: All right. What else? Anything?

PC: *I don't think so.*

LRH: All right. And you're going home next week.

PC: *I hope so.*

LRH: You hope so. So do I. We're going to look at these modifiers here. All right. Have I missed a withhold on you? Yeah. What was that one? It's cleaner now. All right. What other – what other withhold did I miss on you? There it is.

PC: *Well, there's a – letter from – or part of a letter from a girl that audited me last summer in the back of the folder.*

And I read a paragraph or two in it, in this letter that she wrote. And it confirmed the suspicion that I had when she was auditing me.

LRH: Which is what?

PC: *Well, that she was using somebody for a Director of Processing without my approval, and even having denied doing it.*

LRH: Ah, I see. All right.

PC: *It upset me a bit.*

LRH: All right. Now, how did I miss that withhold?

PC: *Well, I guess you – I thought you just should have known it.*

LRH: All right. Okay. All right. Now, have I missed a withhold on you? That's getting better. That's just a little latent. But what was it?

PC: *Well, I'm a little bit nervous sitting here. I don't know how that's a missed withhold, but it's all I think of.*

LRH: Okay, honey. Well, have I missed a withhold on you? That's getting minimal now. Let me ask this again. Have I missed a withhold on you? Yeah, we're getting a dirty needle sort of a characteristic here. It's starting to dance around now. Now, what have I failed to find out about you?

PC: *Well, then, that there's been a dirty needle in the great majority of my auditing since I've been here.*

LRH: There's been what?

PC: *A – a scratchy needle.*

LRH: Oh, yeah, all right. Okay. Good enough. All right. Have I missed a withhold on you? All right. What's that one?

PC: *I don't know.*

LRH: We just say, "missed withhold," and you take off. Now is it I who has missed the withhold? Is it I who has missed the withhold? I don't get any reaction on that. Who's missed the withhold? Well, now, what are we playing around here with? Have you missed a withhold on some pc or something

PC: *Well, that's possible.*

LRH: Yeah?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Yeah, very probable.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: On whom did you do this?

PC: *On Doris.*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *On Doris. Doris.*

LRH: Yeah? And what withhold did you miss on her?

PC: *Oh, I don't know. I have a lot of trouble with the meter going null.*

LRH: Oh, it's a failure to find the missed withhold. Is that what this is?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Hm? All right. Now, let's get back to the original question. Have I missed a withhold on you? All right. That seems to be clear now. Null. All right, honey. Now, I see we've gotten here a whole bunch of modifiers. A terrific number of modifiers, and they're all very heavily charged. Right?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: And we had a goal on you "to be different from other people." Right?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. The original goal that was checked out. And I'm just going to check that goal if that's all right with you?

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: Okay. Okay. To be different from other people. Okay. To be different from other people. To be different from other people. To be different from other people. Now, that's got a bit of a reaction on it. Have you invalidated that goal at any time?

PC: *Well, uh – to a little extent when we couldn't get a modi – an oppterm to stay in.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *And uh – we went on and on and on with that.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *And uh – I began to doubt it a little bit.*

LRH: Mm-hm. To be different than other people. To be different than other people. All right. Have you invalidated this goal at any time? Yes. What? When? Crash! Find it. It falls off. You know.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: When have you invalidated this?

PC: *Well, what comes to mind is that um – the feeling sort of that we were abandoning it when um – I was put on Sec Checking full time instead of working on this package.*

LRH: Oh, I see. I see. And that was an invalidation of it.

PC: *I felt a little.*

LRH: All right. When did you invalidate it? When did you invalidate it. That's it. What's you think of? That's it.

PC: *Oh, it was – uh – who was it?*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Somebody asked – oh, I know. Uh – my auditor was asking me one day whether this would be "being different from Scientologists" or whether this was any different of – whether I meant being just different from everybody or different than special groups or different groups.*

LRH: Mm-hm. All right. And what – what did you do then?

PC: *Well, I sort of decided that I didn't want to be different from everybody, see.*

LRH: Oh, I see. I see. All right. That's what you did.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me ask some more here. Have you invalidated this goal? Have you invalidated this goal? Oh, I don't know. I got a sort of a dirty needle on this thing. All right. Let me read it off to you here now. To be different from other people. Did you have a Goals Assessment done before this one?

PC: *No, I didn't.*

LRH: All right. Did you have a terminal found in any way, shape or form before this one?

PC: *Uh – I was run on the terminal a couple of years ago.*

LRH: What was it?

PC: *I believe it was "a man" or it was in this area. Um – yes, it was "a man." And he was assessed on the Prehav Scale, and a level run. This was before Routine 3 came out – in that period right before that.*

LRH: Mm-hm. That was "a man."

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Let's take a look at this. All right. A man. A man. A man. A man. A man. Well, catfish. Catfish. Catfish. Catfish. A man. A man. A man. A man. A man.

PC: *I want to say something. This wasn't assessed out on a list.*

LRH: No, I know. I know. That's just a terminal. It doesn't have any value as far as that's concerned on your case. Don't worry about it. All right. Now, on the subject of goals, is that the first time you listed anything?

PC: *Yes, I started making this list at home last summer.*

LRH: Right.

PC: *And – whenever I'd think of something else, I'd just add it to the list, and then I brought the whole list over here.*

LRH: Mm-hm. Yeah, I got it. Good. What about this list? You got an incomplete goals list, honey.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: That's the earliest I can find that causes a needle reaction on Routine 3. I'm looking around here for this goals list.

PC: *Ah...*

LRH: Where is it?

PC: *It's in there, I think underneath those papers. It's in all odd-shaped pages.*

LRH: Well, had an awful time – transfer to this final goals list. Yeah, lookit, lady.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: See, strike, strike, strike, strike, strike, strike, strike, strike, strike, strike.

PC: *Story of my life.*

LRH: Huh? Look at these Xs. Look at the tremendous numbers of strikes on this goals list. That was the trouble you've had, Ruthie. No, you're not going home, by the way.

PC: *Oh, I'm not?*

LRH: No.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: I'm not turning anybody out of here with a dirty needle.

All right. Now, I'm going to find the rest of this, going to check out the rest of this. Okay?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: And we had a line here. We have several items so far. Let's see if any of them have any validity although at this stage of the game, I wouldn't X them or not X them. See? Because they've all been found quite independently of all this.

An insincere person. All right.

A race driver. A race driver. A race driver. A race driver. All right.

A failed opponent. A failed opponent. A failed opponent. A failed opponent.

And ...

A wicked person. A wicked person. A wicked person. A wicked person. It's kicking it.

A vindictive winner. A vindictive winner. A vindictive winner. A vindictive winner.

Well, honey, we're going to see how all these look when you have had a goals completion.

All right. Who's auditing you just now on what?

PC: *Um ... Millie – she's auditing me on CCHs.*

LRH: She is, huh? All right. How you feeling on these CCHs? They making any sense to you?

PC: *Well, uh – the one that bit the most was CCH 3, and it's getting quite flat, I think.*

LRH: It's what?

PC: *It's getting quite flat, and oh – smoothing out.*

LRH: All right. How are you feeling about it?

PC: *Fine.*

LRH: Yeah. Is it making you feel any better?

PC: *Yes, it has.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It's helped my duplication on tests and things, too.*

LRH: All right. But you basically had a lose here, didn't you, in failing to find a modifier or a terminal?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: It's a big, big lose. All right, honey. All right. And we have 25 April 62,

and number one, we're going to complete your goals list, huh?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: "...Until no charge is left on any item." And then we're going to find the modifier, and that's going to take somebody just about, I don't know how long, but it won't be very long. And then we're going to find your G plus M terminal. And then we're going to oppterm it. And that's the least I'll settle for before you get out of here.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right?

PC: *Fine.*

LRH: Okay. Now, then we're going to – "(5) we will test 3DXX items found that are not reacting well. After above is done, we will complete the lists." Okay?

PC: *Fine.*

LRH: All right. How do you feel about all this, huh?

PC: *I feel real good.*

LRH: You feel pretty good about it, huh?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: You'd like to get that goal.

PC: *Yes, I sure would.*

LRH: All right. Well, you're a pretty good auditor. You've learned lots about auditing here. And you're lucky we'll be able to straighten this out. But we'll probably come off of whatever we're on here. And you go ahead and ... I don't know where your goals ...

PC: *It's in there. I – uh ...*

LRH: Auditor's form here, I don't see it.

PC: *Up in amongst some of those yellow sheets. The small sheets of paper.*

LRH: Yeah. All right, honey. It's up in here someplace... Shades of – I guess this was Rae Thacker. Yeah, Rae Thacker. She said, "This is not checked again," something like that. This seems to be different from other people. So they're having trouble checking it, see. "This is not checked again although it gets the most reads most consistently. When I read it, her needle was loose and free and behaved beautifully, but by the time it was checked out, everything had tightened up again. Everything goes live after a while then. Should I bleed down for more again and so forth." Should she bleed down for more again. And her note – see Ruth, it says. So oppterm didn't check out. I don't know where the note is for that, but that's quite interesting. I see you were having trouble with the goals. What's historic here is they were – on 21.11.61, the 21st of December. They were having trouble with this goal. And then they got into tremendous amounts of trouble when they tried to find the modifier.

PC: *I know they did.*

LRH: And then they got into an awful lot of trouble when they found lots of ... You get the multiplication of all that? Apparently, your needle was free when they were trying to do it. And your needle needs washing just now.

PC: *I'll send it out to the laundry.*

LRH: All right, honey. You know, we'll take that early correcting action. Okay?

PC: *Fine.*

LRH: And well finish that off and I think everything will be fine. Probably I will ... You got your CCHs flat?

PC: *It's getting very close to flat.*

LRH: Very close to flat. Probably flatten that and flip you over onto the other at once. Okay. Put the cans down.

All right. Thank you very, very much.

PC: *Thank you very much.*

LRH: You betcha.

LRH: Okay. *Sitzen Sie.* I have to learn to speak Sherman now, you know, because I've got a Sherman E-boat. We shust had a German E-boat inspected, and it's in beautiful condition, and of course you can't handle one unless you can speak Sherman.

PC: *Of course not.*

LRH: Of course not. It's obvious, isn't it. All right, Ann. Now, we've been – we've had a resumé here, and the goal assessed is "to see and have things as they really are." And the terminal was "a master craftsman." And the levels run were these, and so forth. Couldn't have been too far off.

PC: *Uh – Mary Sue asked me just to point out that – uh – there's ...*

LRH: ... "at level 'faith,' above, 'a pharaoh' and 'an electric shock machine' were also run on the level 'faith' before going on to 'prevent knowing' on 'a master craftsman.' Then a 12-way bracket was run on 'shock on a body.'" Why?

PC: *Mm. I think that was after the first uh – Clear check when the um –*

shock treatment engram hadn't yet been run.

LRH: The what?

PC: *The shock treatment engram hadn't yet been run.*

LRH: Well, why would somebody do that? I know the fellow that did it is sitting amongst the students right now, but he has provoked my curiosity. Why would we do that? I mean where – who got these terminals? Where did they come from?

PC: *Mary Sue just asked me that, and I don't actually recall where "pharaoh" and "the electric shock machine" came from except that I was running a lot on electric track stuff and then – we somehow got the electric shock machine.*

LRH: Pick up the cans. All right. Are you protecting somebody on this?

PC: *No.*

LRH: You protecting somebody on this? Would it upset somebody if you said why or something?

PC: *Uh – well, my main difficulty was that I couldn't remember where "pharaoh" and "electric shock machine" actually came from.*

LRH: I'd say it was not an item. I wouldn't know where they came from. We found the goal, and we found the terminal. And all of a sudden here's two more terminals show up, and maybe they were assessed out. Were they assessed out or weren't they? Did you go down the list of new terminals or anything like that?

PC: *Yes, I seem to remember doing a list for "pharaoh."*

LRH: Yeah? Oh, I'm not trying to invalidate anybody, I'm just trying to get to

the bottom of it. And what do you think it was? Do you think you made a list ...

PC: *I'm not ...*

LRH: ... out of which we got "pharaoh" and "electric shock"?

PC: *Um – well, if I made a list, it was in a session. I didn't go – go quietly off and make one on my own. And the main one was certainly "master craftsman."*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *The goals list [not understandable] been sent back to Sydney*

LRH: Mm-hm. The goals list has been what?

PC: *Sent back to Sydney.*

LRH: Why?

PC: *I don't know. I just heard it had recently arrived in Sydney.*

LRH: Well, that's just where we need it. I doubt that. There are extra copies or something. These people downstairs are pretty hard to separate from paper. All right. I'll tell you what I'm going to do, Ann. I'm just going to check these things over here a little bit if that's all right with you. Is it all right if I do this?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. You're sure it's all right if I do this?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Oh, there's a tick on this that's answering up. Well, what would be wrong with my doing this?

PC: *I don't think there'd be anything wrong. In fact, I would like it very much because um – after one item, I had a lot of winds of space and deafness for about two and a half weeks. And if there is*

something there that needs sorting out I'd very much like it sorted out.

LRH: All right. Okay. And is there anything wrong with my finding this thing straight and so forth? All right. Good. Have I missed a withhold on you? All right. That's a bit latent. Can you think of anything offhand?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. You sure? Have I missed a withhold on you? That's reading everything. All right. Have I missed a withhold on you? Oh, I don't know. I'm getting a little halt and a fall here.

PC: *Well, what I'm thinking of is the item ah – "psychiatrist" which I got, which is after that that I got lots of this um – winds of space. And uh – oh, to a degree I did invalidate myself on Criss Cross because I didn't feel that the optterm we got to it seemed to be strong enough to take this – this feeling away.*

LRH: Ah-ha.

PC: *And I'd gotten a bit disturbed from that last week of processing.*

LRH: All right. And what should I have found out about that time?

PC: *...Um – well, when the item came up, I – I felt um – that I oughtn't to be auditing ...*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *... an electric machine.*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. All right. Now, have I missed a withhold on you? All right. So just a little tickety-tick. What – what is that?

PC: *Um – well, that time the thought was that I was – I was feeling better because we had started to run out um –*

all right. Doesn't matter. How many goals were listed here, honey?

PC: *I would say over 200. Probably 250.*

LRH: Oh. All right. Well, we've got a bucketful of items here of one kind or another. Were these things found in sequence?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: I'm not going to find any particular fault with your goal. We're not going to be terribly interested in this, but nobody has opptermed "a master craftsman."

A master craftsman. A master craftsman. A master craftsman. There's still a little boot left in this. Microscopic, but so on. It's reacting. Did you get a good case gain when you ran that?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Did you? Did you feel much better after you ran that?

PC: *Yes. I did on that.*

LRH: A master craftsman. A master craftsman. A master craftsman. It reads. Marvelous. Gosh, whoever then started to run "a pharaoh" and "an electric shock machine," of course, needs training at Saint Hill. That's fine. Now, madame, mademoiselle, you got a nice terminal here called "a master craftsman."

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Mm-hm. How did you feel about this terminal?

PC: *How did I feel about it?*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *Um – very real to me. I...*

LRH: It was a very nice terminal?

PC: *Oh, well, well. Before I started to run it, you understand.*

LRH: Yeah. Yeah.

PC: *Yeah, it was very real to me. I mean on this particular life with all to do with it.*

LRH: Mm-mm, mm-mm. Well, we're just going to oppterm that. And that is your next action. It stayed nice. It's a tiny, little tick. *Pang-pang-pang*, you know. Just as nice as you please. "25 April 62. (1) Oppterm line A. And make sure it's a full list. Maybe so – 500 items?" All right. That's fine. I like that. That's good. We had your case in the bag. All we had to do was oppterm line A, and it's sitting right here. And nobody has ever opptermed line A. People have gone on and opptermed nothing – oh, well, they've opptermed line G, and line H, and line I. That's fine. I suppose that was by – by test, huh?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Of course, we don't know that these were found in this sequence, but let's check these over. Shall we? A fanatic. A fanatic. A fanatic. And that's: "To see things as they really are." That's an oppterm to this goal. Oppterm to the goal "To see things as they really are"?

PC: *Um – well, I did Routine 3 on this one. And then later on, uh – I was told to do uh – I was doing Routine 3D in November. And we got a modifier to the goal, and uh – we came out with "a teacher" and "a fanatic."*

LRH: This is the G plus M terminal?

PC: *No, it's the oppterm.*

LRH: I see. It's an oppterm to what? "A master craftsman"?

PC: *Um – we got the goal plus modifier and came up with "a teacher."*

LRH: G. plus M, we got a teacher.

PC: *Yeah. And the thing that would oppterm a teacher was a fanatic.*

LRH: All right. They're backwards. All right. A teacher. A teacher. A teacher. A teacher. A teacher. A teacher. Who knows? Might be. Fanatic isn't. Scrub it. All right. "(2) Oppterm line C, 'a teacher,' this time with a complete list." All right. Because "a fanatic" is not thriving and is not correct. All right. "And when we have these done, thoroughly and well, we will check the remaining line plot." Okay?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Good enough. Well, that's pretty good. Whoever assessed your "master craftsman" did a very nice job. Don't know how he did it, but he did it. Nice job. It's evidently all right. Pretty plain tick. See?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Every time. Just right. And by leaving it non-oppterm at this time, you're heading up trouble so that as you do other oppterm ... And about two-and-a-half weeks ago, somebody did an incomplete list on you.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: So which, of course, has given you ear ring and that sort of thing, but "master craftsman" should straighten that out.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: Good. If it does, there'll be a small fee. [laughs]

PC: *Alrighty.*

LRH: Okay, honey, that's all here. Go down now.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: Thank you very much. Good.

Okay? Have a seat, Jenny.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: We should dispose of you rather easily here. That sounds ominous, doesn't it? [laughs]

All right. We've got a line plot here which is a real staggerer. Oh, I remember this – the horrors we had – trouble finding "a sphinx." And nobody let you have "a sphinx." And nobody wanted you to have "a sphinx." Right?

PC: *That's right.*

LRH: All right if I check all this over?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. And nobody let you have "a sphinx." "A sphinx." And we wrestled around most gorgeously on that. Now what was your early goal, "Not wanting to be found out"? That's right. And we got "a sphinx," right.

Now, we're going to examine that if that's all right. Pick up those cans. If it's all right with you, we're just going to examine this area of track, huh?

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: In this auditing. All right. Here we go. What do you think about goals? What about goals?

PC: *Well, I guess not wanting to be found out.*

LRH: That's very interesting. What about goals? That's fascinating. It's a charged subject.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: All right. Now let's take a sphinx. Good. Sometimes it is here and sometimes it's not here. It gets a nice read.

PC: *Oh, yes, I'm sure it does.*

LRH: It does. It gets a good read. But sometimes it's here and sometimes it's not here. A sphinx. Latent. A sphinx. That's right. It gets the same read latent. A sphinx. Now it gets a nice read. Not a steep read. Very interesting.

Your goal's – goal's all charged up. Maybe never did do a complete goals list. I imagine it's in here someplace.

PC: *Yes, we had a lot of this.*

LRH: Where is this sort of thing

PC: *"To make a perfect sound" was another goal we found.*

LRH: Yeah, I know, honey. "To make a perfect sound."

PC: *I didn't know whether that was the modifier or whether it's ...*

LRH: And then they got mad at you because they said obviously that that was Rae Thacker's goal and you were going up town on Saturday with her and therefore you had her goal.

PC: *Ah.*

LRH: Ah, now you find out. I don't have a withhold from you. Well, actually, this goals list sort of came out ... Maybe this was back in the days when we weren't cutting the slash and slosh out of it.

PC: *Why I thought it was "a perfect sound" was that, you know, I – I had wanted to sing, but if you're going to sing you had to sing perfectly – one time.*

LRH: Yeah, all right. Let's see what list we've got here. Oh, there's where I made probably a nasty remark to your auditor and then cut it off the sheet. Where is this? I don't find much of a goals list here, lady.

PC: *It should be there.*

LRH: Oh, I found a piece of it.

PC: *You make goals and goals and goals and goals.*

LRH: Here's a Dynamic Assessment. Back here somewhere there's goals. What a messy list. That's some kind of a Sec Check. "Sphinx," ah. "Open umbrella." "False teeth." Your folder's gotten reversed. There is somebody sometime or other has gone that route. Well, I have found a piece of this, and I don't find much evidence to support the idea that your goals list is not complete. But our next action on you ... Were you satisfied with these goals? Here's a goals list. I only find about 35. I only find about only 35 or 40 goals here.

PC: *No, I think I made more than that. Because we had a lot of goals with difficulty going on. And that was where they came.*

LRH: Now, you see this kind of thing. That's too much. The terminals list is incomplete. We're going to complete your goals list, maybe. All right?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Mm?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: I'll look at this again here. Goals. Not wanting to be found out. Not wanting to be found out. Not wanting to be found out. Man, that reads now, and it doesn't read now, and so forth. It keeps reading, but there's no uniform read. "Not wanting to be found out." That's undoubtedly a goal. "Not wanting to be found out." See? It falls on "not," "not wanting to," "to be." Then doesn't fall.

PC: *So it isn't my goal.*

LRH: We're getting a nice, long, big charge on this.

PC: *I see. Could it be the right goal with more goals to be done?*

LRH: It's a nice charge.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: There's a half-a-dial drop here on the subject.

PC: *The safest thing I've ever found out. "Not want to be found out." I'd never let that one go.*

LRH: That would be very nice, wouldn't it?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Yeah. What makes you – would that make you feel happy?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Mm?

PC: *Mm. It would. To really let it go. Yes.*

LRH: Well, what we're going to do is we're going to complete that goals list on you just to get the charge off of it. Okay? And "(1) Complete goals list, and get all charge off of it by listing."

PC: *Good.*

LRH: See, we're doing – we can do something new now. You know, we can list the charge off of the things.

PC: *I've seen it work. Gosh, I've seen it work.*

LRH: Marvelous, isn't it?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. And then we're going to find the modifier.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: And then we're going to find the G plus M terminal, and then (4) we're going to opterm it. Hm? Good. And when we've got all that done, we're going to then check the line chart.

PC: *I'm quite sick with relief.*

LRH: You feel relieved? Oh, no. All right. Okay. All right. That's just a charge situation, I'm sure. All right, honey.

PC: *I don't have to pretend anymore.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *I just don't have to pretend anymore.*

LRH: That's right. Put them up there. Put the cans up. Now, is there anything else you'd care to say?

PC: *No, just thank you.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. So here you go. And thank you very much.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: You bet.

Okay! That is all! Good night.

Rundown On Prepchecking Professional Attitude

A lecture given on 26 April 1962

Thank you.

Well, here we are. At least some of you are going to live.

Well, now, this is the 26th of April AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

[part missing]

Well, anybody got a bulletin on Prepchecking. Get me a bulletin on Prepchecking, Herbie.

All right. I'll say a few words while that's transpiring, on something that you should find very important. This is just a very little short lecture all in three seconds.

They found one, all right. Thank you. This is it? All right.

I'd like to comment on something. There are several things that monitor the success of auditing. And one of them is something which has remained more or less understood amongst us, and that is a professional attitude.

The reason healing professions, even when they couldn't heal, have survived is centered around that one fact: the professional attitude. And the substance of a professional attitude is it doesn't matter whether a man is red or black or white or whether he's a Democrat or a communist or a Republican or belongs to the I Will Arise Church or is an atheist or whether he's a friend or an enemy. It's just – that doesn't matter. A professional attitude requires from a practitioner that he is a professional. He is healing and his attitude toward healing is: there is a being and he heals him or her. And that is all there is to it. A good professional attitude simply betokens the fact that somebody is in need of healing and somebody is healed. And there are no additives.

This is a very hard-boiled professional attitude, actually. And it can possibly get you into trouble when you yourself have caused the injury because it'll do a tone curve on you, you see. You hate the man and then you come down to evident propitiation because you're now healing him. That's one of the things that gets this attitude in trouble.

But an auditor is as good as he can assume a professional attitude toward the pc he is auditing. It does not matter whether that pc has overts against him or withholds from him or if there is any personal equation of any kind whatsoever here. That has nothing to do with the auditing session. The auditor is a professional and he applies his profession to that individual, regardless of that individual's condition, opinion, race, color, creed, anything else.

Now, let me call to your attention that that fact alone has brought healing professions through the trillennia. They didn't even have to be able to heal. Witness the doctor today. That poor sod, man, he doesn't know a bacteria from a bacterial, you know. He's got camels and bugs, he wouldn't know which, you know? He's just adrift.

He comes in, if penicillin, sulfa won't cure it, he's had it. He sets bones and breaks them again and he doesn't know what he's doing. The amount of brutality and psychic trauma which he causes in the process of his healing should alone, actually, require that he be hanged. And the field of psychiatry, that isn't – it isn't a medical or healing practice at all. It's a practice of mayhem, pure and simple. It's the practice of mayhem and incompetence, combined. It's not even competent mayhem. [laughter]

The psychiatrist is far more prone than the medical doctor to depart from the professional attitude of the healer. Far, far more prone, because he himself is less mentally stable because he's a fake! He's pretending to be able to do something about something and he hasn't a clue. And the medical doctor can tie up a finger but the psychiatrist can't tie up a trauma, that's for sure. All he can do is create them.

And yet, these professions are respected. Why are they respected? There are many sub-orders of healing. There are many splinter groups of healing that if they ever amalgamated under the one group and laid down a code, professional practice would get a long way. But they don't seem to be able to do that. And these groups are far less professional. But many of them have healing methods which are superior to those of the medical doctor, but they are not respected. Well, that hasn't anything to do with the old school tie, it's just they are not that professional.

What do you mean professional? Well, they fall from grace all too often. They take personal attitudes towards this and that. They sometimes take advantage of their position. And they're not generally as trusted, oddly enough. That's not any condemnation of any of these groups particularly, but I'll just tell you from the ground up, that they have not built this one thing into the public consciousness – that there is a professional attitude. Public cannot send them, their fellow public, to them with a completely free heart. There's liable to be some personal attitude in this. Certainly this is true of psychiatry. I mean, that's not one of the minor groups but it's certainly very true of psychiatry.

A husband cannot send his wife there and expect the home to be preserved, if you get what I read between the lines, you see. There's liable to be personal interest or personal conflicts develop under the guise of professional application. We're very young, we're very new, and we point out to you that there is one blunderbuss that has blazed a wide-open path for all healing activities, whether they're Aesculapians or British Medical Association people, and that was a professional attitude. And they stuck very hard by this professional attitude and made a lot of noise about it. And they stayed by it. So that you find on a field of battle in North Africa, you find the British doctors and the German doctors, after a tank battle, equally treating British and German wounded. See, all mixed up. See, their professional attitude protected them.

Now, that is something you could well acquire. But it is far deeper than this. This is the reason a husband and wife team doesn't work. They don't work well. Oh, they work. You

can get something done. But they don't work *well* because the husband has too much of a vested interest in the mental condition, attitudes and so forth of the wife, and the wife has too much of a personal interest in the attitudes and actions of a husband. There is too much personal concern. There is far too much pitch on the processing session.

The husband processes the wife to get her over some things which he, as a husband, objects to, and vice versa. And they will very often stand squarely in the road of each other's progress if they're covertly mad at each other. There's too much personal attitude, too little professional attitude. Therefore husband and wife teams have a hard time of it. The wife tends to Q-and-A or the husband will tend to Q-and-A with this, or slant the processing in some particular direction, and all of a sudden it is always – the husband has always objected to his wife's cold feet, you see. And this is what they will do. They start running down the list and it's got, "cold feet" on it. And the husband, by calling it out, will weight it. And the wife, by feeling guilty about it, will weight it. And you all of a sudden get a wrong item. It had nothing to do with the case. And then because they're so sure, they won't check it out, see, they know it fits, see. That's the personal attitude entering into a professional activity.

This boy is processing this girl in order to go to bed with her. Now, I myself have been going around with girls and – when I was a boy and with boys when I was a girl for some trillennia – and I never had to use processing to accomplish this particular end goal. [laughter] I've sometimes had to use hospitals to cure myself of the gunshot or dart wounds that – or something like that, but we never needed processing in order to accomplish the fact, you see. We sometimes had to remedy the consequences of the act, [laughter] but never the reverse. Personal – personal curve, personal onus.

Now, there are auditors around HGCs sometimes that the D of P can never trust to audit a young man. Well, not because any sexual activity takes place, just because all you have to do is put this auditor sitting there confronting this young man and he goes mad. He cuts him to ribbons, ARC breaks all over the place and so forth. They very carefully never let this auditor process a young man. See, he might be an old man or something like that, you see. He just can't do it, see. Some other auditor, we don't let – dare let this auditor process an old lady. Cut her to ribbons. You know, won't put up with anything.

Well, you say, "There's case entering." No, there's more than case entering. There's personal like, personal dislike, and it just hasn't anything to do with auditing. There sits a person to be audited. There doesn't sit a young boy or an old lady or anything else, there's just somebody to be audited. And you will find out that as soon as you train yourself into that attitude exclusively with regard to pcs, you all of a sudden start to produce tremendous wins. Because the funny part of it is, is Judy O'Grady, the colonel's lady, young boys and old ladies, they're always the same under the skin. See, it's a case is a case, and that's all you can say about it.

And that's very important to know. And a Scientologist is now coming of age, not that he is particularly a professional on whom the world is leaning, but nevertheless, it's long enough on the road now to lay that one in hard and to handle that factor because failure to do so will get in the road of your processing results. Just for that reason alone. And then push it

home and try to keep it up as far as the public view is concerned. Stand by that one and you will immediately inherit the whole world of healing.

See, where many splinter groups have not, you will, providing you have a professional attitude. That doesn't particularly mean professional appearance. You know, that doesn't mean a mock-up of some kind or another. It just means that this fellow is in need of processing and whether he's red, blue, green or white it doesn't matter, a Republican, an atheist, even a psychiatrist. He's sitting there, he needs processing, you've got enough answers now that you can process him. You can process him you see, directly. There isn't any special treatment needed. And you just sit down and you process him. And all of a sudden you will find that you have a very relaxed frame of mind, because this, too, can become a familiar thing to do and a familiar attitude to wear, that of just strictly a professional attitude.

That's all a professional attitude consists of. Now, don't try to swell it up to a bunch of other things. See, it's just whether or not when you sit down to process somebody you are capable of expressing a totally professional, wholly uncolored attitude toward the pc. So that your attitude toward the pc does not partake in any way of your personal penchants. It isn't that you have to withhold your personal penchants, it's just the fact that you just process the pc, see. We don't even process him *because*, you see. You never process anybody *because*, you just process somebody.

You see how easily we can put additives onto this thing, see? We process him *because*. We process him, in order to – and all of that. No, no, just process him. And you all of a sudden will find your wins go up on a steep climb. And if that is broad and well-handled by Scientologists, you'll find that all by itself, being the sole tool and weapon of older healing societies and so forth, will bulldoze a wide channel through the public to such a degree that you are the only people they trust.

And that is all that trust amounts to professionally. The public doesn't even demand results. They just demand that they can trust a fellow to take a professional interest in the patient. That is all.

How many of you have gone to an oculist or an ophthalmologist and had this ophthalmologist then try to sell you glasses. It's almost impossible to go to an oculist without – and get your eyes tested without them shoving glasses down your throat, see? Well, he's got some kind of a professional pitch right at that moment. You may have had this experience. And right at that moment you feel all is not well. This man has a vested interest in you wearing glasses. And at that moment you cease to trust him. See? He cannot maintain his professional attitude to the degree that if you need glasses he will give you glasses, if you don't need glasses he won't give you glasses. See, he never reads the meter, you see, on the lenses as to whether or not you've got sufficient aberration to need glasses or not need glasses, see. He looks in the till and finds out if he needs some money for a pair of glasses. You see that? And the public doesn't trust them.

That's all, it's just – it's processing without a pitch. Yes, there are commercial arrangements in processing. Those take place before and very well may take place after. But they have nothing to do with the session. I did make a test one time. I may – had to get a man to recover from his aberrations concerning money before he would get well because process-

ing, he thought, was too costly, you see. And because he thought the processing was too costly then he couldn't get well because he couldn't afford it. It was very, very remarkable. It was a test case. Usually has very little to do with it. Somebody isn't paying something for your processing, they don't consider it worthwhile.

That sort of thing has very little to do with it, see. That's something that takes place before, something that takes place afterwards. But during that session it is nothing but a session. The professional attitude is to make sure that it is nothing but a session.

And then if you're very good you can put on a professional hat before the session, run a session, and then put on a livingness hat and not go on being an auditor after the session. You find people will appreciate this too, because your going on looking like an auditor after the session sort of puts the pc back into session. Sometimes it's a good thing to swat them between the shoulder blades, something like that, you know. Anything. Just don't act like an auditor after a session. Act like an auditor during the session.

You see, but there's all kinds of additives that you can put on this thing. If you're going to get people to recover from aberration, if you're going to handle pcs, if you're going to handle ARC breaks, you mustn't have opinions and curves about the case before they are demonstrated in auditing.

See, you mustn't have items selected before the item occurs. You get the idea? I mean you're auditing that case. And then do a very reliable job of auditing. Never pretend that you've seen something or read something that you haven't seen or read on that case, you see. Never give him an item because he expected an item, give him an item only because it checks out, see? You do a professional job, do a very good technical job and you're always all right.

Now we've arrived at a level where a technical job today is marvelous. A person who can do good Model Session, good TRs and so on, is marvelous. One could never complain about this at all. A person is doing a good Model Session, reading the E-Meter well, TRs are in good shape, and he sits there and just gives the session and goes straight through with what he's supposed to do, man, that pc is impressed. Wow! It's the most impressive thing you can do, is to be technically letter perfect today.

Now, Prepchecking is the first moment that you really collide as an auditor – whether in training or early activities as an auditor – really collides with whether he knows his business or not. And Prepchecking is harder to do than Routine 3-type processes. To do an accurate job of Prepchecking and to get good results with Prepchecking is infinitely more difficult than to do a Routine 3 job. But oddly enough, if you can't do a Prepchecking job you will never do a Routine 3 job. There will always be something missing.

Prepchecking is that skill which keeps the pc in-session and which frees up the attention of the pc so that he can be audited. It also transcends this by making enormous differences in the health and presence of the pc. It'll make enormous differences if it's done right and done well. But we're not really demanding that of you. We're only demanding of Prepchecking that it sets somebody up to be in-session and be able to stay in-session without having tremendous number of present time problems and withholds and all the rest of it.

Now, the facts of the case are that Prepchecking today is possible of transcending every result ever dreamed of by Sigmund Freud in a tiny fraction of the number of hours dreamed up by Sigmund Freud. It actually completes the work of any personal catharsis-type therapy, whether that's clinical psychology or anything else.

I was just reading in a clipping somebody sent me – I get lots of clippings and I appreciate them – and this clipping was very amusing. It's a long dissertation on somebody from the University of Florida or New Mexico or northern North Pole or someplace, on the subject of – this will kill you – it's on the subject of making the person create the difficulty he has. And they get him to create – the man is afraid of dying, they get him to imagine and create the idea of dying. And when he can do this enough ...

This is, of course, your Johnny-come-lately psychologist who is desperate. His university has said, "Good God, Higgenbottom! You've never, never, never turned in a paper? Do you realize that you – you've brought no credit to the university. We expect all of our professors to turn out learned papers. They've got to turn out learned papers at least every three months. [laughter] And – and you never turn one out, Higgenbottom. And haven't any publicity. The football team's losing everything this year. Why don't you turn out something on psychology?"

And so he goes over and picks up some book on Dianetics or Scientology, sighs, and puts this thing out in the public press, you see, and turns out a monocatharsis or something that he thinks will get him... And they give him his gold star, you know, and Higgenbottom has still got a job. That's how they do these things in universities. You think I'm kidding. Those poor illegitimate sons are always in trouble. They haven't turned out enough papers.

They've gotten so buggy on the subject that you're a scientist if you've turned out papers, you know? I'm never quite sure what kind of paper it's supposed to be. [laughter] Some of you got that. And look, look at this poor sod. He's got a whole bunch of bright-eyed students sitting down there in Florida or the North Pole or wherever this silly university is, and he's running Creative Processing on them. And he hasn't found out anything about creative processing. He doesn't know what he's going to run into. He didn't bother to read the next book, you know. [laughter] Step Six phenomena here we come! [laughter] Marvelous.

But, you see, these birds are monkeying. These birds are monkeying around. He doesn't know anywhere near as much about it as we did at the time we were... He didn't know anything about engrams or facsimiles. He knows nothing about what the person's liable to get into. If the person got stuck in a picture he'd never even be able to tell him to go to the end of it or come up to present time or anything because he's not ... You know. *Whooh*. You know, turn a kid loose with a .45 and say, "Cut your teeth on it, sonny. Here, I'll get it at full cock for you." It's about that sensible.

These birds are going off and riding off in all directions, trying desperately to achieve something. And it's been achieved and you mustn't overlook the fact that it has been achieved.

Prepchecking. Prepchecking is a rounded off activity. I'm never going to look at it again, just do it, see. It's a nice, rounded off activity; a very smooth activity. It's not something that's going to shift and nobody is going to change it, because I know exactly what its ceiling is. The ceiling is a total psychotherapy of this lifetime. It's a total psychotherapy of this life-

time. You can make it go back into former lives and you can make it do other things, but you actually have exceeded the purpose and limit of Prepchecking because the pc has got so many hundreds of thousands of other lives that it will take you a little too long by this process to do something about them, you see.

So its practical limits are the limits of this lifetime, and it winds up the work of Freud, Jung, Adler, any clinical psychology hopes, or anything like that. You should be able to do this. Because if you ever set up – let's say that you've got – all of a sudden a Saudi Arabian oil company came along and wanted you to be a part of their team for lower Kingville or something, and they were going to have all of their people set up and you were supposed to go through some motions of some kind or another that were – that was something like the practice of psychology, what they would recognize, you know, as psychotherapy and so forth. This is all you'd have to do. I mean, just prepcheck people. They'd all be very happy with you, providing you did a good professional job of it.

You could sit down there and do a good professional job of Prepchecking, and you'd pull everything this guy was really – really thought he was worried about. It'd all straighten out. Fellow would feel nice and everything would be smooth. But the funny part of it is that it does, it accomplishes more than man ever hoped of psychotherapy. See, there's more here than has ever been hoped for in the field of psychotherapy. It is a junior process, as far as we're concerned. But it is very comprehensible to the world at large. And they're scientific, you know, they've read the papers of Freud and this and that and they know which direction psychotherapy's supposed to go and this oddly enough covers the direction psychotherapy's supposed to go.

You know, you sit there and you're supposed to pull up the traumatic experiences of the person. And of course the traumatic experiences of these people are just locks. See, you're not running engrams or anything serious like that. They don't know anything about engrams.

And you say, "Well, you've been having trouble with your wife, you see. Well, all right. Let's see, we'll take that up, take that up. Very good. Very good."

Look it over and get some kind of a Zero that fits in here someplace and – like, "Have you ever done anything to your wife?" Or "Have you ever had any trouble with your wife?" He'd buy that very well, you see. And you start fishing around to find out what he's *done* to his wife, don't you see. You'll eventually get your incident and you work it with your Withhold System, and you know, got your What question that gives you a chain. Work it with your Withhold System. Go over this thing, finally recover the lowest dregs of it all, and get it on up to PT and all cleaned up slick as a whistle. He won't have anywhere near the trouble with his wife that he used to have.

You could also do job orientation with this sort of thing, you know. People having a hard time working for the company. They're considered valuable in some respects but they're a liability in others. Well, you could pick up what this is and straighten it up with Prepchecking. Rather rapidly – a few hours. And it looks very professional. You sit there and drag over what they laughingly call a psyche. If they only knew what lay below what they think the unconscious mind is, you know. If they had any idea, you know, they wouldn't go puttering

around that swamp. They'd run like a bunch of startled cottontails, you know, that had just seen a snake.

But, you can take all the froth off the top of the swamp and the bubbles and so forth. And as long as you don't show the guy that it's just black from there on down, you see, [laughter] why, everybody's very happy with this thing. And it's a process activity that you really don't expect to pull the pc's toenails with – right up through his gullet. You don't expect it to do this, you see. Maybe polish up his teeth or get the fur off his tongue, you see, but that's about it, see. That's what you expect of the process.

Now, if you expect too much of Prepchecking, why of course you're going to be rather upset here and there. This fellow is a total arthritic, he's in horrible condition, he can't walk, he can't sleep, he's on his death bed, and you walk in and you start to prepcheck him. And he dies. And he's still so curled up they can't even get him in a standard coffin. They have to build another kind – a corkscrew type coffin [laughter] in order to get him into one, you know. You'd be very happy with Prepchecking, you'd be very happy with Prepchecking if you didn't expect too much of Prepchecking.

Well, what the public expects of psychotherapy, Prepchecking more than delivers. And what you expect of it is very simple – you just want it to get this pc into some kind of shape so he'll sit in session without getting his rudiments wildly out – so that you can handle his rudiments and you can do a process that does pull his toenails.

And you get him – you get a person prepchecked up to the point where the rudiments will stay in. Well, of course, he's had to tell you most of his basic withholds that he'd sit there dodging with, and you'll have pulled quite a few somatics – they won't get in the road of your listing, and he'll come into session, you'll get a few missed withholds. If you're on an off-line, you'll have a little trouble. I mean, if you're pushing around on some line that is a rugged line to the pc because some other line, earlier than that, is out. If there's something basically in error with the Routine 3 activity, you'll have – always have a little trouble keeping the things in, but it'd be minor. It'll be picking up last night's withhold, you know and – at the beginning of the session, you know – these little things, the missed withhold, the thing he didn't find out about. And all of a sudden the thing settles out.

You can handle the pc because you can keep it all picked up, because you're not trying to pick up everything in this lifetime while you're doing 3D Criss Cross. Now, the basic thing that has been wrong with Routine 3 processes is because the auditor, in doing a Routine 3 session, was also always trying to do a Sec Check or a rudiments session. He was trying to cross two breeds of cat. And it was something on the order of trying to mate an eagle, you know, with a shark. And you just couldn't get them to recognize each other's sex appeal. [laughter]

Here on the one hand, you see, you're supposed to be listing, and the pc is sitting there, and really, he says at least, that he really is – he's all ready to go man go, you know. He's all ready to make that list, you know. He's getting interested in all this and he's ready to – you know, and so forth. And you read this thing and he's got a present time problem and missed withholds and so forth. And anytime you say anything, the E-Meter almost jumps off the pin by the impact of your voice, don't you see. And, you start to list and you say, "Well, maybe

it'll all get all right." Then all of a sudden he goes out like a light, and you say, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" which is what you should say, to pick him out of his boil-off, and so forth.

"Well, yeah, you missed a withhold on me. Well, let's see, while I was waiting to pick up this body I thought that my father was an ugly man."

You say, "All right, that was good." [laughter] "And have I missed a withhold on you?"

"Well, I never told you actually ... But that's too embarrassing."

What the hell kind of a session are we doing now, see? Well, we're doing a cross between an eagle and a shark, and he can't live in the sea and he can't live in the sky. And if an ornithologist ever saw him, why he'd have a hell of a time. [laughs]

And you'd be surprised, that's the commonest error in doing the Routine 3 processes is that you start in to do a Routine 3 process and you wind up doing a rudiments session. Well, that accounts for most of the breakdown. This also accounts for the fact that people couldn't find goals. And that's going to get very important to you very shortly so you better know all about this. You couldn't find goals because rudiments were out. Well, you can't do a *goals finding* session while you're doing a *Sec Checking* session and a *Prepchecking* session and so forth. You see, it's all crossed up.

Now, you can always tell a green auditor here that hasn't – nowadays – you can always tell one, because you send them up to do a Routine 3 session and they come down and they hand you a rudiments session and he spent the whole session trying to get the rudiments in. And you send him up again to do a Routine 3 session. And they always come back and give you a rudiments session. And damn little Routine 3 ever gets done because, of course, the whole ruddy lot is wound up in a – out-rudiments.

See, they start to do one kind of session and they get another kind of session. And it gives the auditor at once the idea that he has no control of the pc. And his sessioning sort of collapses at this point, you see. He's all set to charge in there and get the list, the pc's all set to charge in there and get the list, except the rudiments have busted the needle. The pc shouldn't be doing a Routine 3 type of a session, that's all. Should be doing a Prepchecking session.

So you don't cross the eagle and the shark. You reach into the Stygian depths and you get yourself a Prepcheck session going and you pull the withholds and things like that necessary, so that the pc can be comfortable being audited and always isn't sitting there with a pair of boxing gloves on to defend his favorite misdemeanors, you know. You get that straightened out, if you're giving him CCHs at the same time, why, you're getting the pc good – under good control, getting his havingness so it's straightened out and so forth. You're getting his withholds pulled. You're just grooving him in.

And with Prepchecking of course, you're already grooving him in to being model-sessioned. He's getting used to being audited without being thrown for a loop, see. And he eventually gets his prediction up on this thing and he can stay more alert in the session and so on.

So Prepchecking is vital. I don't care whether it produces a result beyond simply getting the pc to stay in-session. I just couldn't care less. Anything that you get beyond that is a terrific bonus. And it's remarkable that you get these bonuses quite routinely if you're a good Prepchecker. You just keep getting bonuses, bonuses, bonuses. But all you want is just to get the pc so he'll stay in-session. That's all.

So every time a stray thought hits him from someplace or another you don't have sixteen rudiments go out. And in view of the fact that there aren't sixteen rudiments it makes it very difficult, you see. It's hard to get in sixteen when you've only got a few, you know.

The difficulties which you encounter in Routine 3 are adequate and sufficient unto themselves without adding the difficulties of Prepchecking so if you get *all* of these it's somewhat like trying to play a barrel organ, some bagpipes and so forth while on roller skates on some slippery ice. It's embarrassing. You just haven't got that many hands and E-Meters. You begin to consider that auditing is terribly difficult, very difficult to do. Well, yeah, well, of course, you're doing an impossible job when you're trying to prepcheck while doing a Routine 3.

Now, the whole reason why Routine 3 got varied and moved around is because the rudiments kept going out on people and they weren't able to find items. They couldn't keep rudiments in. Here you'll find Prepchecking. And that is the remedy to those difficulties that were encountered heretofore in clearing.

These Prepchecking activities will set your pc up so that when you get a list you are getting a *list*, not getting a bunch of worries about whether or not you'll encounter his withhold, see. You're going to get a list. You're going to get a chance to do some Routine 3. Then you can find goals, find terminals, find items, find oppters. All this becomes easy because you've already set the case up so the case can be audited. So don't skimp this. Terribly important.

You're very lucky in that this is designed also to be very interesting to the pc. Hm, pc, yes. He's like the hypnotized bird when he gets himself ... He sits there in great insouciance you know. He's going to sit there with his rudiments all out, defending himself appropriately in auditing, and so forth. And you sit down and you open up on him with Prepchecking.

And you say, "All right, are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" That's your Zero Question. "Have you been willing to talk to auditors," or "Have you been willing to talk to people about your difficulties?" Any kind of a way that you want to vary this particular Zero to get, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" We don't care how you state the Zero, it's got to be something that's real to the pc.

"But of course. Absolutely." *Clang*, you see.

You say, "What's that? What aren't you willing to talk to me about?" and so forth. A little buzz-wuzz and a discussion here of one kind or another. And he turns kind of a beet red and ... Believe me, at that point he starts getting interested. You eventually get a withhold off of him of some kind or another. And you – out of that withhold, why, you're in business. You've got a withhold and you bang it into a What question that will give you a chain. And he thought he could get away with just telling you about Mary Belle. And imagine his surprise

when he has to tell you about ... [laughs, laughter] And eventually he gets over these pieces of nonsense and after that he isn't in this dodgy state. He can actually sit there and be a pc.

Without Prepchecking we had a hell of a time. I don't mind telling you. It was rough, rough all the way. So Prepchecking is very well worth learning.

Now let's take up Prepchecking from the viewpoint of auditor training. Routine 3 processes are too hard on a case to be done wrong. You cannot do a training activity safely with a Routine 3 process. Can't be done. You cannot set somebody to learn how to run an E-Meter while he is trying to find somebody's oppterm. That would be pretty grim. And some of you have seen this. We've set somebody out to find somebody's goal when they couldn't yet run an E-Meter, sit in session, nothing. And man, that doesn't get to be a picnic. That gets to be – that makes the Roman arena, you know, look like a Sunday school picnic. It's gruesome. Absolutely gruesome. And they wind up with a mess.

So you mustn't use Routine 3 or Class III processes as training processes. Even though in the final analysis they are easier to do than Prepchecking, you must continue to use Prepchecking as a training process even though Prepchecking has a tremendous liability. You can blow somebody right out of Scientology with bad Prepchecking. Oh, it's dynamite. But you won't kill him. It's dynamite. All you've got to do is miss a withhold and you've had it.

On some cases when they're still in their early edgy states just miss a withhold or, God help you, get a case where they're walking around with an, "Everybody knows all the time." you know, this is the theetie-weetie case. That's what distinguishes the theetie-weetie case – everybody knows all the time. They run around – it's on a standard, total, "Everybody should know." And the missed withholds you pick up off of them is when you ask them a question. Any time you, the auditor, ask them a question then you should know, so of course you have missed a withhold. So we have, let us say, three auditing questions in a minute, we have then missed three withholds in a minute. I think this is very well worth looking at.

You see somebody's graph crushed right straight across the top and the case is a perpetual missed withhold case. Somebody walks up to him and says, "What time is it, Joe?" See? Everybody should know, you see. And he has now found out that you don't know what time it is, but he knows what time it is, so you should know what he should know, so therefore you've missed a withhold on him and he gets quite cross with you. Doesn't tell you the time, either. [laughter] Do you understand that phenomena?

The person has the idea that everybody else should know anything they're thinking. When you get that combination, man, you've had it. The only thing that will crack a case like that is something like Prepchecking. You'll run into this sooner or later. You can break this down. You'll notice everything is reacting. Of course, what you really do is clip it out with a Routine 3 process. Eventually, why it's "swami" or something, you know, it will come up as an item and after that the circuit ceases. But not until then. But you can take the edge of it off with Prepchecking.

But they are hell to prepcheck. You practically have to sit on their chest and box their ears to get an answer to anything because they're sitting there, "What are you asking them questions for?" because you know it, you see, you must know because they know. That's good enough. They know. So they don't have any withholds. So they have never done anything.

You get desperate with a case like that unless you know there can be cases like that and what the common denominator of that case is which is, "Everybody else should know what they know." And they've got it to a psychotic extent.

So you sit there and the – eventually break it down and you suddenly realize, well, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" You've always missed them by the ton. You find out what withhold has been missed: you asked them a question. All right. So you just start cleaning up a chain called, "Questions they have been asked," see, or "Questions they have had to ask," since this put it all to shame, you see. You eventually will plow in on this thing one way or the other and you'll find the case will start straightening up. They are the hardest cases in the world to prepcheck.

Now, that's the rough case to prepcheck, not the sinner, not the fellow who has done a great many antisocial things. Just change your sights. It's the *good* people who are hard to prepcheck. They're tough.

And nobody says that Prepchecking is an easy thing to do. I wouldn't try to sell you this for a minute. You've got to be able to develop your sensitivity for recognizing a case for what it is, getting a proper Zero Question in there, getting a Zero A Question that hits the case right where it lives. And then you've got to develop the facility of yibble-yabbling around finally until the case actually owns up to a withhold of some kind or another, an overt of some kind, around which you can build a What question. And use that What question, use your withhold system, clean up the chain. And there's a lot of disappointments in the line. You get this, and you say, "Oh God, he burned down a church. My, my we really got something here," you know. And it just sits there, it just sits there at 2.4. And you go through the whole chain, not only one church but just dozens of churches. [laughter] And it sits there at 2.4. You get a needle knock on it, but the tone arm never moves and you're not doing a thing for the case.

And then you eventually, accidentally find out that he gets a bad fall on buying all-day suckers. And he finally, after much embarrassment and twisting in his chair, owns up to having purchased one that very morning. And it's, "What all-day sucker have you purchased?" that is your Zero Question and you get tone arm motion from 2.0 to 4.5. Those are overts. You finally get down to the fact that every time a kid in the neighborhood would buy an all-day sucker, he would sit down on him and beat the living daylights out of them until they gave it up. And maybe killed somebody doing it. And it got associated in this way and he'll finally – he all of a sudden triggers this, you get the basis of it, you pull at the big unknown strip of it that he never has known, comes to light, your tone arm motion quiets down, up to present time. Man, have you really done something for him. Now he *knows* you're a wizard – because that's one of his terminals, too, that he will learn later on. [laughter, laughs]

But there is what you expect, if you prepcheck. Nobody's trying to tell you Prepchecking is easy. But Prepchecking is precise and Prepchecking, more than anything else, has to be done in a very professional way. Because your differences of expression, your "*m-hm*," your expression of "yes," your personal reaction on the thing and your personal interest on the thing interjected into the session, your shockedness, your forbiddenness, all of these things coming up, just wreck Prepchecking. Just bzzz. That's gone. You won't get any others. Pc will sit there. And this is so prevalent that it causes a pc only to get off little tiny featherweight

overts. And then lie like mad. He tells you he feels so much better having gotten over the fact that he dropped a pin that morning.

Now, that's totally traceable to the auditor's nonprofessional attitude while auditing. If you expect to get overts off a case, you're going to have to be very professional in your handling of it. If you're very professional in the handling of it, you're not trying to make the pc guilty, you haven't got lots of greed to hear more of this salacity – hu-hu – then you've got it made. And your pc will just sit there and he'll just get more and more stuff off. More and more stuff off. More and more stuff off. Sometimes he even will get into a contest to see if he can shock you. By the time he finds out that he can't, he will have gotten rid of all of his withholds and doesn't care. [laughter]

But the training crucible of the auditor would be Prepchecking. It's a more difficult skill than Routine 3 to really get results with Prepchecking. Its topmost limits is to be able to get the pc in-session and keep him in-session. It gives you far more bonus than that. It will do remarkable and wonderful things for cases, far in excess of any psychotherapy that's ever been known here on Earth, and that makes it fine. But you're doing a terrific thing from the pc's point of view.

Actually, what are you doing? You're clearing up one grain of sand off the Rock of Gibraltar of grains of sands. One lifetime is about all you're cleaning up. Nothing wrong with him this lifetime. He's alive and sane. That's better than he's been for billennia.

But he gets a grip on being a pc. He gets so he can talk to an auditor, his rudiments stay in, and then eventually he is now – gets courageous enough that he can embark upon more *heh-heh-heh-heh-heh* difficult journeys across far rougher seas. And that's the value of this. So this is the make-break point of the auditor. And the training emphasis should be on whether or not an auditor can do good Prepchecking.

There's the liability of the auditor missing withholds. That's the main liability – missed withholds, not withholds. You can miss a withhold on the pc by not asking for it and the pc doesn't know about it. Well, that isn't what we mean by missed withholds. It's what he feels you should have found out, that is a missed withhold. *Heh-heh*. He sits there and all of a sudden he realizes that you should have found out about something. You haven't found out about it and out of session he goes. And he's mad at you and he's all upset. And if you're an expert Prepchecker all you have to do is say, "What withhold have I missed on you?" find it and get it out of the road in a hurry.

Very few auditors learn rapidly this interesting datum: That if the pc has an ARC break or is upset or is misemotional or in any way, shape or form is having trouble in the session, it stems from missed withholds. I mean auditors have the awfulest time learning this. Honest. It's so evident that it's in neon signs all over the billboards, you know. All you have to do is do it once or twice. Like magic. It's the most magical magic you ever cared to see. You know, here's this pc, and this pc is just about to tear strips off the ceiling. He's mad. He's solid. And he's going to blow session, everything else, and you say, "Have I missed a withhold on you?"

And he says, "Oh, oh, well, yes, I guess you have."

And you say, "What is ...?"

"Well, I don't know what it is. It's probably something or other."

You say – you notice all of a sudden you've got to guide his attention in and give him a spotlight of attention. And he thinks about one thing or another. And you say, "That – that – that one there. Yeah."

And he says, "Oh, that. A-huh."

And all of a sudden, why, he's back in-session. And he's being calm and nice and everything's fine. Damnedest exhibition you ever saw.

All you have to do is a time or two get a subjective and objective reality on it, and after that you'll never have any trouble with pcs. But do you know auditors have a hell of a time learning this at first? They'll think it's everything under God's green earth. They'll say, "Have you got an ARC break with me?" You know. And, "Oh well, all right. Now, what have I done to you?" and "What have you done to me?" And so forth, and trying to smooth it all out, "What responsibility haven't you taken for this session?" You know, anything they could think of. And they get all nerved up and the pc's getting nerved up and everybody's going unhappy and chairs are breaking finally. [laughter]

Two days before you told this auditor, "Now look, if a pc gets upset it's because you've missed a withhold on the pc. Just ask him, 'What withhold have I missed?'"

The day before this session occurred you've said to the auditor, "Now look, if the pc gets upset on you, all you have to do is ask the pc, 'What withhold have I missed on you?'" And yet at that time when the pc gets upset he'll say, "Do you have an ARC break? Let's see, what responsibility haven't your grandmother taken for this session?" [laughter] Honest, he looks like a fighter plane crashing into everything in sight. Down in flames, man. Quite remarkable.

So there's evidently at some times, tough to learn Prepchecking. It's tough to get in there, to probe deeply, to really scrape up the muck on the pc and get him to talk to you and so on. It's a terrific test of an auditor, whether or not he can prepcheck. Terrific test. An auditor who can prepcheck well, marvelous. He can do anything. He can do anything from there on. And of course, a pc who's been well prepchecked runs Routine 3 processes just like that, nothing to it. They have no trouble with them at all.

A pc is not prepchecked, auditor can't prepcheck, auditor runs Routine 3 type process, auditor sees pc going into spin, auditor goes into spin, pc goes into spin, floor falls in, the ceiling falls in. You see these lumps of charcoal years afterwards and you wonder what happened? [laughs] They've become their own Goals Problem Masses. It's murderous.

So although Routine 3 looks very easy and the motions of it are very easy and it's very easy to do, remember it's only very easy to do if you're an expert in handling a meter, an expert in handling a pc, and you can take it all like a breeze. And you know how to set a session back together again, bang, you keep the rudiments in, bang, there's nothing to this, you just handle the whole thing of course you can do Routine 3. And therefore after that Routine 3 will look very simple to you.

And you'll look at student auditors and you'll say, "Why can't I teach them Routine 3?" You see. "It's just so simple. There's nothing to it. I can do it." And all of a sudden, why, one day you're passing the classroom where they're sitting in there co-auditing, and you see this little trickle of blood coming out from under the door. [laughter, laughs] And you go in, and the place is full of smoke and all there is is some few charred chairs. [laughs] And you say, "Well, what possibly could have gone wrong? I prepcheck easily. I run 3D Criss Cross easily. Pcs are very easy to audit. What could have happened?" Well, what happened is you tried to get them to run 3D before they could do a perfect Prepcheck. And any time you do it you'll have trouble thereafter.

Prepchecking demands far more of the auditor than Routine 3 ever will. But oddly enough you can never do Routine 3 unless you can Prepcheck. You see how that is? And it's perfectly safe, by the way, to teach people to prepcheck. Teach them to use a meter while prepchecking. Perfectly safe, because what they stir up anybody can handle. You see some student bolting through the door madly. He's on his way to Arcturus or something. You grab hold of him and say, "What was – what was just happening?" And he says, "Oh, it's terrible. That auditor is butchering me," and so on.

"What withhold did he miss on you?"

"Well, I ... *Heh-heh-heh.*"

"Why don't you go in and tell him."

He'll go back and sit down. Now that we have answers of that type in the handling of beings, we can afford to be a little heroic in this level of training

So actually I expect you to know Prepchecking and CCHs very well, because they establish sessions while getting terrific gains from the pc's point of view. And when you're teaching auditing please teach CCHs and Prepchecking. And don't turn anybody loose on Routine 3 type activities until you're absolutely certain that they're just a fine Prepchecker. And then you'll never have any trouble.

Okay?

All right. Take a break.

RUNDOWN ON ROUTINE 3: ROUTINE 3A CRISS CROSS

A lecture given on 26 April 1962

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course – a lecture, on the subject of Routine 3 and company.

History! The discovery that goals could locate terminals and that terminals could be audited out of existence was followed by a discovery of the identity of the Goals Problem Mass. It was followed also by several pathetic efforts of numerous auditors to find a goal, and more pathetic efforts to find terminals.

Meantime, research continued forward. We got Routine 3A. Routine 3 consists solely of finding a goal. Then finding a terminal that matches the goal, and running the terminal. And then finding another terminal for that goal and another terminal for that goal, till that goal disappeared. And then finding that the goal probably had disappeared, and finding another goal then, and finding a terminal for that goal and so on, and finding and auditing that, and then finding another terminal and auditing that, and finally it disappeared. And eventually you got into a situation where you'd find a goal and it'd blow up and you find a terminal and it'd blow up, and then you just couldn't find anything and you got a free needle.

What you've done in essence was to pick off a number of pieces of the Goals Problem Mass so the pc was floating free of the Goals Problem Mass. Condition of Clear which is attained by this particular process was a very desirable condition.

Now, on many people when it was well attained has been quite stable, but contained the liability of a key-in from the remainder of the Goals Problem Mass which had not been touched by this auditing. And this was the reason Clears caved in. That's because there was still a Goals Problem Mass less just a few of its terminals, kicking around ready to kick the pc in his teeth.

All right. So there was an effort made, then, to find the goal and a new piece was discovered: the modifier. And you took the goal and the modifier, and you found the terminal with the goal and modifier. That was Routine 3A.

Now, the goal plus modifier ended up in a terminal which was much more intimate to the Goals Problem Mass, and because we reached time finding the modifier, we did not lose the Goals Problem Mass. The Goals Problem Mass can be keyed-in at any time, merely by repeating the modifier to the pc.

Why? The modifier ordinarily lies in the oppterm – new data for you. You find the goal then you find the modifier, and of course, you're going to find the oppterm. And that is a

mass which is more intimately connected with the Goals Problem Mass, so although you find a terminal, all you have to do is chant the modifier at the pc a few times and you pull the Goals Problem Mass right in on the pc. Why?

Well, you've got your two big balls. Freud by the way would have – I'm sorry, girls! [long, loud laughter] But the truth of the matter is that that is how Freud thought it was all sex! [laughter] That's right. That's right. He probably spotted some of these things someday and he says, "Aha! I know what that is!" Invented the libido theory.

Anyway. All right. Here you find the goal and then you find the terminal for that goal. But if you found the goal and the modifier, the modifier will have something to do with the oppterm. See? So, although you try to audit out this terminal, every time – you could audit it out, see. And then you just say the oppterm and you get that again – and you say the oppterm and you get that again, you see? So the Goals Problem Mass is over here quite fixed and you could always swing it in.

You can take any Routine 3 Clear and you can find their first goal, and you can find the oppterm for that goal, and bang – they're about as Clear as mud. In other words you can yank them straight into the Goals Problem Mass by merely finding the modifier.

Routine 3. Well, Routine 3 was designed to be processed. You found the terminal and then you found the goal and then you found the modifier and then you found the terminal, and then you processed the thing and of course it wasn't too terribly successful – it's an experimental process to that degree – because you were always kicking away at an unidentified modifier. You were kicking away at an unidentified oppterm.

So then we got 3D, and 3D – we skipped B and C and – they went by in a half an hour of research and – actually didn't go by at all, just skipped them – and we got to where you found the goal and the modifier and a terminal and then the opposition terminal. You did this in a sequence of finding the goal, finding the opposition goal, then finding the modifier to the goal – that isn't quite right ...

Female voice: The oppterm.

No, you found the oppterm to the goal, and then you found the modifier, and then you found the terminal – and of course that gave you a package and that package was designed to be audited.

All this material is available in bulletins as I'm just giving you a fast historical review of Routine 3. It has never ceased to be Routine 3, by the way – if you notice that carefully – it never became Routine 4, 5 or 6. All right.

Now, then came Routine 3D Criss Cross. Routine 3D Criss Cross came about because auditors had so much difficulty in finding a goal and in finding a modifier, in finding a terminal, in finding an opposition terminal – had so much trouble finding these parts, that I looked very carefully for numerous new entrances to the Goals Problem Mass.

Various entrances were found; the first of them were merely arbitrary entrances. You said, "Make a list of the things you like." "Who or what do you like?" "Who or what do you dislike?" You had lists, in other words and these lists came on down the line and were nulled

and you got items then on these lists, and then you opposed these – got the opposition item to these lists – and you've got a package – right there, bang. In other words you're dealing totally with terminals. So you'd get any – first it was an arbitrary assignment. You just told the pc "like," and then you got a line for "dislike" and then you got a line for something else. All right.

And this was succeeded by Prehav levels. You take a Prehav level and – which is assessed on the pc – and then you would list a large number of terminals for this Prehav level.

Prehav level, let us say is Badly Control. "Who or what would badly control?" And you'd make a long list, and you would assess that list out and you'd wind up with a terminal. And then you would say, "Who or what would oppose –," whatever terminal you found or whatever item you found. "Who or what would oppose that?" And you've got a pair of these things.

And you kept doing this on several lines, and then you got the flows, and you would assess all possible flows. And you would say, "Who or what would enforce inflow on you?" or something like that. And you would make that list and then you would make – after you had found that item – then you would make a list for the opposition terminal.

And the object of Routine 3D Criss Cross was to continue to do this until the Goals Problem Mass was totally shaken down to a point where you were only getting a few specific terminals which were constantly repeating. And this, of course, would be a package. And then that package could be audited. That was the basic intention on which this was developed. Very good.

A new concept of Routine 3 Processes has just arisen and that is an understanding of what we are doing. Several solutions have been found. I found several solutions to problems which opposed the original Routine 3, and what was the matter with original Routine 3? You see? What was the matter with it, basically, is that we were *trying* to do Routine 3 when we should have been Prepchecking. See?

We were trying to do both things at once. We couldn't keep the pc in-session, and God help us, it was all over and splattered on the ceiling, you see? Couldn't keep the rudiments in. We found out that it takes *forever* to find an item or a goal if the rudiments are out. I can prove that to you over and over and over again. If the rudiments are out, you will find nothing. If the rudiments are out, you will find nothing. If the rudiments are out, you will find nothing. I mean, it's been proven and proven and proven. I mean there is no fact that is harder driven home than that fact.

Of course we have Prepchecking. You give CCH and Prepchecking to a pc, he'll get into a condition where the rudiments will stay in and then it becomes very easy for the auditor to do a proper job of auditing.

Furthermore, auditing skill and the skill of an auditor has been tremendously upgraded. And that skill is tremendously higher this year. You realize that this week finishes a year of the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course? Actually it was Tuesday night, and if I hadn't been so busy getting audited and research and trying to tie this sort of thing up for you, why I

would have given you a cake. But we will wait until we have a proper place to give a party and I will give you a party and we will just give you all a rain check on that, okay?

Audience: Okay.

Now, Routine 3's difficulties were basically that a pc was not in any condition to have anything found on him. And auditors were not in any condition, as far as auditing skill was concerned, to find anything on a pc. Let's just face it, we stunk. Pick up an auditor from lower South Amboy and say, "All right, show me how to operate this E-Meter."

And he'd say, "Well E-Meter operation is very easy, very easy. You set it up like this ... You make sure this switch is at 'off.'" It's almost that bad.

One Saint Hill graduate went back to California and actually had tremendous numbers of auditors and was giving special lectures on just one thing: What is a null needle. Nobody knew what a null needle was. We had people coming in here, as original students last year – they would arrive here; they had never been on any courses or anything of the sort, and – from various parts of the world – and they'd strike the *E-Meter Essentials* and we would say to them in *E-Meter Essentials*, question on "Show me a null needle." And they'd say a null needle goes this way. [demonstrates something] And you say, "How does a null needle go?" and they say... [demonstrates something] Fantastic! The auditors didn't know anything about this box. I don't know what they thought I was trying to do. Maybe they thought I was kidding them – that it worked at all!

Actually we were... This is not too mysterious. Of course they didn't think an E-Meter worked. The E-Meters of Australia, South Africa and America, as well as New Zealand, would not demonstrate a mental charge. They demonstrated electronic charges. They were perfectly good electronically and they had nothing to do with the pc's thinkingness.

The last meters before that, that were of any value whatsoever, was the 1957 US. And I thought it was a very competent meter, until I was looking at one just a few months ago when I was over in the States at a congress and I found out, I found out that a Mark IV just runs rings around them. There's no sense in repairing those old meters; they've got delayed actions. They've got everything else in them they shouldn't have. It's marvelous.

You know, sometimes you turn your meter over to a repairman – he will build a delay into the circuit to keep the meter action from being injured. I think it's so sweet, the knuckle-head! In other words, you ask the question and one second later the meter responds. *Kaw!* How gruesome can it get? It's grim.

Well, with no meters – and actually at that time no textbook on meters – and a few other things lacking, and with about half of the rudiments that are vital to keep a session straight up lacking, of course it was impossible to do Routine 3. How could anybody do it?

So, it was very important to realize that a tremendous number of things have happened in the last year. One of them was the Saint Hill Briefing Course. You take somebody; you set them up, and show them how it works and that sort of thing. They get an understanding of it. They go back and they don't waste any time telling people how to do it right, believe me. Returned students can always be heard in here, clear to here, you know, they scream so loud. Auditing looks terrible to them when they get back home; it just looks grim. It looks too

ghastly. I mean they always thought it was all right, you know, and they go back home and oh, it looks terrible. Inevitable, we get in those responses.

Developed the technology of an E-Meter; put it down in a very precision stated book. The book is very precisely stated. Frankly, made sure that the E-Meter stayed very stable. Wiped out all corny E-Meters that we couldn't count on. And somebody said well that was a smart commercial move. Hell, no! That wasn't any commercial move – that was a move toward the survival of Scientology. These meters, people going on using these meters – wow. And particularly when we started to get other data; how dangerous it was to audit with these meters. Wonder we ever kept anybody anyways.

And then we developed Model Session out with many more rudiments to keep things smooth, and we developed various technologies of how to straighten this out. And then more importantly, proved conclusively that it was out-rudiments that made it impossible to find items. That was – that was a very important thing. And then developed the technology of keeping rudiments in by Sec Checking, and then eventually developed Prepchecking. And, brought it on up to where we sit now. And it's an awful long jump – just twelve months; it's an awful long jump. But it's a jump that had to be taken.

Now, there are many important discoveries in this past year. One of them is the instant read. Don't pay any attention to anything that isn't an instant read, unless you're trying to spot something for the pc. He doesn't know what he's withholding and every time he goes zzzz, he thinks something, we say, "that." That helps him spot it because he looks at what he's looking at at the moment he – we said "that" and he said, "Oh, that," and then he spills it and it cleans the needle. It's just helping a pc out. Little tricks of this character are only assistive tricks. Remember there's tremendous vital data as run before this.

We have now a session that looks like a session. We have auditors that look like auditors. The thing runs well. This – it's a tremendous jump for an auditor to take, particularly when you've been auditing for years to all of a sudden be crushed into this much precision. It's a horrible thing, perhaps, to do to them, until they start getting some wins through having been pushed there. And they wonder how the hell they audited before.

Now, you've got this – you've got all of these developments and out of this comes new data now on how to clear a person all the way through the Goals Problem Mass. The matter is being given to you and on the research line, as a research activity, should be accepted as such. But nevertheless it's sufficiently good that you should do it.

The latest finding – I haven't enumerated all the findings which have made these things possible – but the latest finding on the thing is easily stated: Listing is auditing. Listing is not finding; listing is auditing. And that changes the whole orientation of Routine 3 – just like that. I mean, all great discoveries along these lines are in the directions of simplicities, you see? Listing is auditing.

Now, early on, on Routine 3 – there are some here that have seen this happen – you started getting an assessment and you would assess a goal, and then you'd assess a terminal and you didn't get a chance to run it, because it blew. And then you'd get another terminal and it'd blow. And then you'd get a goal and it'd blow. And what the hell do we have our hands on, here? Person was just assessing out through the blue.

All right, and my effort at this time is to move assessing all the way forward and dis-pense entirely with the Class IV activity of auditing anything found. That is the direction we are going right at the present moment. That is what we are trying to do. I don't know that we'll be tremendously successful in this, but we certainly will be more successful in finding a final package that will run. So therefore, whether we accomplish this in its final state or not, is un-important. We will have a more valid package, and we will have a more comfortable pc.

Now, not the least of the reason for these discoveries along this line, and the reason for my address to this is the pcs get – have gotten terribly uncomfortable running 3D Criss Cross. Man, it can really rack you up. Now, you'd run out into the clear, you would run straight through this thing, but it's pretty gruesome. It's pretty hard, and it gets very difficult to hold the rudiments in if the pc is being run too far after a line is not discharged.

If we fail to discharge line B and we start to do line C, we're in trouble. The pc will have a hard time staying in-session; we'll have more and more difficulty with the pc. And if we then continue the error and finally get line D going, and then we oppterm the wrong terminal on line D; you get the wrong terminal on line D and we – oh, now it's just a dog's breakfast. Of course sooner or later all this will discharge. Sooner or later we get all this down. We get enough terminals. We discharge enough, and so on. We're not going to audit any of these things till we get a final package; the possibility it'll all come down to the end, but why have the pc caved in all this time?

I'm not kind, I'm nowhere near as kind as you are. It's a dirty word in Scientology, "He was a kind auditor." But it isn't just kindness; it's very hard to keep a pc in-session. So I've been studying how you patched up a case that had started going out of session because he'd had some wrong items found and what you do about this and I ran into this other fact: Listing is auditing.

We sort of went through a period where we understood this. But we didn't state this, see. So listing is auditing.

All right, now, there's another point about this, is the item – a wrong item found is only remedied by finding the earliest item that was wrong on a case. That's worth knowing.

You got D wrong. You opptermed it and the case is lying in splinters. You actually are not going to remedy it very well by getting D right. If D could go wrong, A is probably wrong or B. This is the discovery of what is a dirty needle.

A dirty needle has two sources. Both sources are missing withholds. Well, you haven't gotten the item from the pc, so of course you've missed a withhold. But, you've actual – and you will start to get the pc dramatizing missing withholds. And you get a dirty needle, you pick up a missed withhold, you'll straighten out that dirty needle. And you get a dirty needle and you pick up a missed withhold and you'll straighten up that needle. That's just current session withholds. You can always straighten up a dirty needle by picking up enough missed withholds. But let me tell you, if you've got a wrong line sitting on that line plot earlier than the line you were doing, you're going to – liable to get a dirty needle, and you're just going to spend half your time picking up missed withholds, missed withholds, missed withholds.

What do we mean by a dirty needle? We mean a needle that's shivering and shaking and whizzing and it's got a pattern, and you can't read through the pattern, and so on. It's just hell trying to do a Routine 3 on a pc with a dirty needle. Well, you create a dirty needle with Routine 3 by getting a wrong goal or a wrong terminal; oppterming something that wasn't factual. In other words we've got line B and we – what we've got down there is "an acrobat." And what should be down there is "a dog" so we oppterm "acrobat," and by the time we're three-quarters of the way through or less, maybe a quarter of the way through oppterming "acrobat," we've got a dirty needle on our hands.

The way to solve this dirty needle is to go back and find the first error in Routine 3 – any Routine 3, you see? Find the first error in Routine 3 and correct it and you'll find out your dirty needle will disappear and all of these later blunders will tend to blow off.

In other words it's like pulling basic-basic on a chain of engrams. You find the earliest improper Routine 3 action and you will get a relief of the later improper actions. Now, that's very well worth knowing, see? So that tells you sweepingly how to patch up a case. To patch up a case that has been misrun on Routine 3 of any kind, it is only necessary to find the earliest incorrect item and correct and complete it. That's the formula.

How do you set up a Routine 3 case that is running around the bend? Well you just find the earliest incorrect item that you can possibly lay your hands on – not the item that you said – not the item where his headache turned on; don't pay any attention to that item – not the item that was – he's having any difficulty with currently; don't pay any attention to that. Don't go getting all scrambled up. The best way to do it is go back and find the *earliest* incorrect item – the earliest incorrect action. Any type of Routine 3 action that is incorrect – find the earliest one and correct it, right then, and you'll find the rest of the liabilities will blow away. Then you progress forward from that point.

In other words you audit the case all over again. Interesting. You're liable to find things that were in, not in anymore. And you're liable to find things, so on. But you'll nevertheless find a lot of charge blowing off the case because it's been stirred up.

Now, do you get that as a solution to the situation? Now, you saw me doing it last night on your television demonstration. I was just taking cases, and I was just – that's all the formula I was applying to the thing. It – do you recognize it now as a formula? I'd find the earliest charged lists, where I was doing it, and squaring this around.

And listing is auditing. That's very important, because it at once tells us when we have a complete list. All the questions of a flat process can be asked of a list, and if that list is flat then all these questions will go together.

So a flat process no longer produces tone arm action. Okay? So that's your first conditional. You understand, this has not been broadly proven. That's a conditional test. We don't know if that will hold true forever. But flat process – flat list. When is all the charge off of this list? When we get no TA action on the list, of course.

So theoretically you would list to no TA action – that's theoretical. Next is you'd ask the meter if the list was complete. Next is by differentiation. You differentiate the first twelve items of the list and see if you have tone arm action. If you have tone arm action, the list is

incomplete. This could be fascinating, couldn't it? I mean, so you just read the first thing; you read the goal and you say, "Would a (whatever item you've written down) do (whatever the goal or line you got it from)." You see? See?

Should it – let's say the item you'd written down is "cat" and the... "disregarded when you're trying to do something," you see, so you'd say, "Well, should a cat be disregarded when you're trying to do something?" And the pc says yes or no, we don't care what he says, but we watch that tone arm and we see that it has motion, and our list is not complete and that's all there is to it. So we don't do anything about nulling, we just go back and start listing again – carefully keeping off the ARC break for asking for more and more and more. You understand? The pc gets to understand that listing is auditing and therefore he doesn't get so anxious to find.

All right, your next test is – consists of a *nulling* test. We null the first twelve – the first new twelve, because we can do this several times on the same list and if we find any items in, we complete the list.

What was that? What did you say? What did you say? If you find any items in, you complete the list. I mean if they don't null out instantly – they can tick, and that's all – you complete the list. If you have one item in, you complete the list. Simple, huh? I just dropped a grenade amongst you, didn't I? [laughter]

All right. Here's another test. If you find more than one item alive on the list, you complete the list. You understand, we allow you – we allow you up to five chants of the item. Interesting, isn't it?

Supposing you found three alive that we're going to check out? When there's three, they'll – they stay alive. *Bing, bing, bing*, you know. *Bing, bing, bing*. They just go *bop, bop, bop*. *Bop, bop, bop*. Nah – complete the list. Complete the list. It'll complete down to one. See, that's what charge means on a list.

We're regarding now listing as auditing, you see. You – regarding it in a different viewpoint than you've been regarding it before. You've been going forward to find something and get on so that you could find something, and eventually having found a bunch of some-things you wind up with a package that you can audit. You see, that's another intention. Well this is *not* our intention, as will become very plain to you in about 2 minutes.

Remember, I told you Routine 3 would assess out. All right, that's what we're *trying* to do here. And you understand that I've got that "trying" underscored. You're trying to do this. So, when we complete the list, we'll find there's one item on it. It ought to be very rapid. Although listing may seem to take a long time, you're not going to spend any time nulling because they're all null. You're going to null the thing, you see, but if they're all null, well, they click and they tick and they click and then they're gone or they're not there at all.

Now, this makes you have to be pretty sharp on, "Are your rudiments in or out?" So you have to run your rudiments fairly often because a lot of these items are just going to be flatter than flounders. They were hot while you were listing them but they're not hot now. You see, that's the theoretical approach that we're working on.

So, we've got "Cat, cat, cat, cat," all null, "Dog, dog, dog," all null. "Catfish, catfish, catfish," all null. "Aviator, aviator, aviator," all null. There isn't a tick. *Heh-heh*. This becomes spooky ground. But remember, you're expert Prepcheckers. See, you know your business by this time. Is your pc in-session or out of session? You had one last test, is did it tick once in a while? See, well that might not be present on a complete list. See, you might not even get a single tick, theoretically. We'll see how it works.

All right. Now, when you've got your complete list, you're going to null it. And it should all null down like hot butter leaving you one item which will go tick-tick-tick. It won't go tick-tick-tick sporadically, that I guarantee you. It'll probably go microscopically tick-tick-tick.

Did you see "master craftsman," on that last night?

Audience: Yeah.

Could you see the microscopic tick on that? And that was the sweetest tick I ever saw. It was meticulous, you understand? It wasn't doing anything unless I said "master craftsman," and at that moment it went tick. Did you see that? Instant tick. Tick-tick-tick-tick-tick-tick-tick, it didn't miss, see? It's the way an item ought to look. Not necessarily that tiny, but somewhat in that order of magnitude.

Of course the thing had been audited. But that's the way your items are liable to look on a complete list. Just one item, and it just goes tick-tick-tick. Very interesting. All right, that means you have to be pretty sharp-eyed, because if they're going to tick that microscopically you're really going to have to be looking. There's only one item in these five hundred and eighty-five that's going to tick at all, maybe. You see what a steep chance we're taking on this?

All right, so we find this thing. Finally we've got this item. We've got this item on this completed list. And we take this item, which, let us say, is "barrel." "A barrel." And now we're going to oppterm "a barrel." And all the rules of our oppterming "a barrel" apply, as I just gave them to you. When we get the list complete, why all of the tests I gave you, they will still apply, theoretically. See?

All right, we get down to the end of this thing – you understand this is theoretical approach I'm giving you. This actually is probably 3A Criss Cross – because you're going to use goals. I haven't gone into that. You've got this one item and theoretically what should happen, if you've done your job perfectly, you find out that "bungstarter" is the oppterm. You null it down – you got your list complete – and you null it down. It nulls down just as – probably even more gruesomely flat, do you see, like handling a dead fish, you know? And you find that it is "bungstarter."

Now, theoretically this could happen. This has already happened in auditing "Barrel, bungstarter," *Psssswww*. "Barrel" won't go, "bungstarter" won't go. That's your theoretical approach. There would be no purpose in auditing them, would there?

Now, there's several ways we could get our foot in the door on the Goals Problem Mass, but the way we're going to try to get our foot in the door, having confidence in you all, is we're not going to try to discharge the Goals Problem Mass by door – by, pardon me –

we're not going to discharge goals lists to that degree that we discharge items lists. That's very conditional. I have to learn more about this before I give you too much more about this, you see?

It might have to happen that we have to take all the charge out of it. But listen, taking all the charge out of the goals list is pulling all of the little holes out of the balloons in the Goals Problem Mass and I don't think you're going to be able to do it. See, it's not an item list. It's a bunch of think. It's giving you the intention of masses. The intentions of valences is what that goals list is. And it's good enough to identify things with, but believe me, I don't think it's good enough to discharge a bank with; I don't think so.

So theoretically, we do not at this stage of the game – subject to amendment – care whether the goals list shows charge or doesn't show charge, as long as we could find a goal that goes tick-tick-tick, tick-tick-tick, tick-tick-tick and doesn't do anything else. We're going to grind it down to a point to where we've got a goal, and that goal really sticks with us. And it goes tick-tick-tick just as nice as you please.

Now, that may take a much longer goals list than we ordinarily have been writing because the goals list may discharge to a better degree. But it's certainly going to take a goals list long enough that we can identify the goal.

Now, the goal was appearing in about the first hundred and fifty that the person listed. That was quite interesting. The goal seems to appear early; your items always appear late. So it obviously isn't the same breed of cat. Listing goals and listing items is apparently different.

Anyway, the way we're going to tackle this, from a Routine 3 action, is going to tackle it from the goal. And we're going to isolate goal. And then we're going to find, if we possibly can, a modifier. If it is too difficult to find the modifier we will skip it. I don't say this will be routine procedure but we is certainly going to find a goal, and we is certainly going to find a terminal. And we're going to find a terminal on a totally discharged list. We're not going to find a totally discharged goals list, see. We're going to find a totally discharged item list, see.

We've got this goal, "To smoke cigars." And that list is not well discharged. That goals list is still punchy. Things are still happening in that goals list, you see. So we make a list, "Who or what would smoke cigars?" see? And we finally make an item list out of that. Now, that item list has got to be complete and that's got to be discharged. That's flatter than a flounder when we finally finish it up by this theoretical approach, here. When we finish that thing up we really have got that thing finished up. And we get it, "Cigar smoker," whatever the item was, and it's going tick-tick-tick-tick-tick and it doesn't do anything else but go tick-tick-tick. Do you see? And that's all.

And then we're going to oppterm it. "Who or what would oppose a cigar smoker? And we're going to run that list down and we're going to exhaust that list. We're going to run it down flat as a tire. And we should find – we should find a condition at the end where either the terminals are very weak, or whether they blow at once. That's theoretical on its approach.

All right. Then what are we going to do? How are we going to get our next line? *Ha-ha* – we're going to list goals. Going to list goals. Obviously the pc has changed like the North Star to the Southern Hemisphere, see? You can get new goals off this pc now. So you ask him

to list a few more goals and be happy about this sort of thing, and you'll find out that some of the goals that are – weren't kicking might be now kicking. You're going to add some more goals and then theoretically again, we're going to approach this thing by nulling the whole goals list all over again to find out what we've got now. Because goals lists pump up and slow down and do peculiar things that items lists don't do.

Now, we're going to find a new goal that goes tick-tick-tick. And we're going to find a *complete* terminals list for that goal, and then we're going to find a *complete* opposition terminals list for that.

Now, this doesn't destroy any of your ability to do 3D Criss Cross. I could look upon 3D Criss Cross as a marvelous training exercise. That's worth much more than that but I could look on it now as a marvelous training exercise.

We let this person do a Prehav Assessment and we let him find an item. You know, when he's getting new on this and we don't pay any attention to what he's found. See, we find an item and we oppterm it. And he – we cuss him out, we say the list is not complete, and he tries to complete the list. And he learns – he learns on something he can't hurt much with, see? See? Pc might feel uncomfortable but nothing compared to how he would do if you mucked up a Goals Assessment, you see? See the training approach on that?

All right, but the actions are always the same. It doesn't matter what Routine 3 you've got, I call to your attention, you've got the same actions. You've got these certain steps and we haven't changed any of those.

Now, because we've put so much artillery behind it now, and because we've found out so many holes in the line, and if we know exactly where Routine 3 was falling down – remember Routine 3 was your most positive clearing process but that it didn't extend to the many. But Routine 3D Criss Cross can be done on anybody. Therefore if you use a Routine 3D Criss Cross but do Routine 3, you of course, got something which is extending to the many. See?

Now, if we do this right, and keep this remedied along the line, and if all this works very smoothly, and you don't develop a whole bunch of bugs that I haven't foreseen, which is always possible, because you see Routine 3 itself was thrown overboard only by auditor bugs. I can do Routine 3 to this day with the greatest of ease. If you don't develop a bunch of bugs and if there aren't a bunch of bugs in the thing, we may have our hands on, here, ample evidence, demonstrating it today, we may have our hands on a fairly rapid clearing thing. So the guy gets clearer and clearer. See, we don't have to push him straight through the knothole. Get the idea? He just gets clearer and clearer as we go, and therefore, ought to get easier and easier to audit.

See, its basic advantage would merely be as every other development has been here, in terms of speed of final result. That's our basic advantage. Speed of final result is quite important. Auditor's tied up over one pc – even an hour saved by someone becomes important.

All right, well that's your theoretical approach, of what we will call, just for the interim, Routine 3A Criss Cross. The reason I've back-graded it is after we've got the thing totally ironed out, why, we will assign it its final designation and probably there will be a little

bit of jostling around; there always is. I have learned to expect that as part of the randomness of it all. Doesn't matter how solidly you lay down these fundamentals, they can go astray.

Now, what I have just given you, by the way, aside from the fact of oppterming things, is contained in all the do's and don'ts of some of the earliest directions of Routine 3 – to show you how un-new this is. But we have the wherewithal now, so that those earliest directions can be followed. We needed things like a textbook on meters. And we needed a splendid meter like the Mark IV. We needed this data about instant reads and we needed to know without any doubt whatsoever that you cannot find anything on a pc with his rudiments out. And you see, we needed this and that and the other thing as we've gone along the line, and furthermore we needed this data about complete lists. I've given you several tests for complete lists. And, we just had one, just a few days ago, see.

We needed these things, you see, in order to carry the thing through. But the way you're going, the only mistake which you are making and which you will have to remedy – and this mistake has been *uniformly* made. Even I, last week would not have called any list I have recently inspected on your 3D Criss Cross, as a complete list. This – these lists are – man, I've gone over the number of times you've been going across a list and it is many. Why, you have to cover one item four times in order to get the thing – the whole list null – I'd say right then the list was charged.

Now, earlier, there was something else we were doing to take charge off of a list. We were differentiating a list to take charge off of the list. Well, there has been a technical discovery, and that is that a list does not discharge except by being complete. Do you see?

So you add up all the mistakes that you could make, actually come under the heading – except a goals list – is an incomplete list. Incomplete list, incomplete list, incomplete list. So you just get used to it.

What are the phenomena of an incomplete list? Well, the meter will respond to "Are there any more items on this list?" Sometimes, however, the meter doesn't respond to that question. Probably your tone arm action will be out of the listing, see, and those other tests which I've given you.

Now, you can relegate differentiation to a test step because it'll be your most reliable test step. Just differentiate the first twelve and see if there's tone arm action. I would say off-hand this possibly won't prove out to be the case broadly. But it – apparently tone arm action would be caused by charge. So the list is still charged heavily if you have heavy tone arm action by differentiation. And tone arm action by differentiation would betoken the fact that nothing is going to null. So you wouldn't have to start nulling at this stage of the game because you say this list is too heavily charged up.

Now, I'm totally prepared to have to do something else with a list in order to discharge it properly. You're – I told you at the beginning of this lecture you're way up on the assembly line – I mean you're way up on the research line. You're not on the assembly line at all. See, that's about where you're sitting right now.

But because we have to patch up Routine 3D Criss Cross errors here and there – I've had to study those errors very carefully. And the errors which I have found in the session tests

which you saw me take last night all add up to the conclusion that you might as well straighten up all the Routine 3D Criss Cross which you are doing. But if you're going to have to do that, you might as well learn this Routine 3A Criss Cross. Because it's the same as straightening up what you're doing right now.

All right. You've got to do it anyway, so let's go ahead and tackle this thing called Routine 3A Criss Cross, which is really at this stage merely a patch-up of your 3D Criss Cross, plus the fact that nearly all of you have had some action on Routine 3, so we have to take that into account, see. We're in an optimum position where – just to straighten them out and take all the charge off – well let's do this other process and see what we get out of it, okay? That's where we sit, right at the present moment.

I want to see faster clearing than I have seen. I don't want pcs having to be pushed through the knothole. There's too many hours being stacked up on auditing. There are many errors being committed, but all of those errors sum up to rudiments out, which we won't make a criticism on your Routine 3D Criss Cross – that's a criticism of Prepchecking. See, if the rudiments are out that's a criticism of a person's ability to Prepcheck. So just omit that. And the other error is incomplete lists and improper items.

So, you've got to straighten up your incomplete lists and improper items anyhow, so let's do Routine 3A Criss Cross, find out where we land up and see if we haven't got a faster clearing process, okay?

Audience: Mm-mm.

Sounds to me that this might possibly give you an easier run of it with a pc.

I've been studying this hard, and I've – now I'll give you a few of the little items which have given us the gen on this.

Number one: I have discovered the dirty needle phenomena to stem from missed withholds. And at the same time an improperly procured item, that is to say an improper item, gotten and labeled and handled by the auditor gives the appearance of a huge missed withhold, which gives us a dirty needle. Now, this is one of our main difficulties, don't you see, with all Routine 3 Processes. That's a very fundamental discovery.

The next discovery is that listing is auditing.

Next discovery is that cases that have been started on Routine 3 are still continuing to dramatize their goal and modifier in spite of a great deal of Routine 3D Criss Cross run on the case. So that tells you, as I told you in a lecture – a couple of weeks ago I guess it was – it's the one found by Routine 3, the item found by Routine 3 was more fundamental – which I think is quite, quite remarkable – more fundamental than the later items. So these later items must be shallower than the Routine 3 items, because at no time has Routine 3D Criss Cross knocked out, to my knowledge, the goal and terminal activity and dramatization of the pc. In other words we have quite a long way to go before we come around to the initial results of Routine 3. So that looks to me to be a very fine area to shorten up processing. That looks to me to be very splendid.

And then, that the earliest items found are capable of spoiling the reaction and sequence and response of all following items. If you have one – items A, B, C, D, E, F, and an error, and it's found to be consistent in F and we can't keep the rudiments in on F, we look to G in order to correct F. And we only correct G – we'll find all of a sudden that there's going to be something a bit wrong on G. And we will find ourselves straightening out C – that we found something wrong on – and then spending quite a bit of time straightening out C. And then we find out the person didn't get the proper goal in the first place.

And we find ourselves right off the 3D Criss Cross graph, and find ourselves back assessing for a – an earlier error on a Routine 3 Process, which has apparently been able to terribly influence all the Routine 3D we were doing – 3D Criss Cross that we were doing, you see, was influenced by the earliest error.

This is quite remarkable. In other words, you're going to run into people who have been assessed on Routine 3.

Now, here's the other – here's the other item that makes this vital to you: You're going to find people all over the place who have been assessed on Routine 3 Processes. And then they heard there was something new, later, so somebody dropped their assessment at that point – and it's lucky they did because it probably was for the birds – and we run on down the line here and you're going to run into somebody and he's going to say, "Well, go ahead and clear me, everything's fine, and go ahead and clear me, go ahead," and you say, "Well, all right." And you're going to prepcheck them, and get them into line, and you do some CCHs and so forth, and you get all set. And if you were just going to do Routine 3D Criss Cross you're going to be sitting there looking – the second you start listing you're going to be looking at a dirty needle.

You're going to say, "It was all straight on Prepchecking, particularly when I got the mud pies out of his mother, so, and here's this dirty needle." And you say, "Well, I'll carry on; I'll get the missed withhold," and you pick up four hundred and sixty-five missed withholds. That's an exaggeration, there's probably only fifty or sixty. And you get the dirty needle all beautifully cleaned up and you start listing again, you see, and there's the dirty needle again. Why, you're going to be baffled, unless at that moment you've been trained to ask the magic question: "Who assessed you on what? When?" and follow it down with the meter. "When was your earliest Goals Assessment?" or something like that.

"Oh, well, that was a long time ago. I remember Charley Gilpen came in from an Academy course that he'd taken – I think he was expelled – and he came in from uh – uh – uh – uh – Central Org and so forth, and he did a complete assessment on me. And uh – actually it took him about half an hour, and he found that I was a moped." [laughter] "And this is very peculiar, because his had just broken down." [laughter]

And you say, "Well, what was he doing?"

"Well, he was – he was – he was just listing goals, just listing goals."

"Well, how many goals did you list?"

"Oh, I don't know."

"What happened to the Goals Assessment?"

"I don't know."

You've had it, you see, you'd think, otherwise. But if you just sat down there and listed his goals again, this goal will appear again. If you know this little additional question – and this we went into, *oh-ho*, my goodness, this must have been ten months ago – something on the basis of invalidated goals. So you have to add – if you're going to do a patch-up list – you have to ask for what goals have been invalidated and clear up every tick you find.

See, it's kind of a funny little process of Prepchecking. "Have you ever had any goal invalidated?" See? And we don't care whether his mother did it or his school teachers or it was done in a session or he's done it out of session or anything else. We've got to take every tick off of that. If we haven't got the man's list, we can get his list back, only if we take the invalidations off the goals because he's not going to give us the invalidated goal. And that's the only one he's not going to give us a second time. Isn't that interesting?

When you're redoing missing lists then, pick up invalidations of that type of list and clean that needle slicker than a whistle on invalidations of that type of list, and you'll be able to get the list back. If you don't do that you won't be able to get the list back. See how?

So, we also had earlier trouble in that everybody's goals lists were getting lost, and nobody could find their goals list, and we're having to ship them everyplace. And this did make a barrier, to Routine 3. It's just too much administration. I mean auditors couldn't keep track of all of this that – that well. And we lost too many of them. Well, without this little gimmick about invalidation and getting the list back again and working it over, you'll find enough goals doing it that way to carry on. You'll certainly find the important goals. But only if you've gotten the invalidations off of the goals. That's the only one he won't give you a second time. That's too invalidated.

Somebody halfway found on him that he wanted to murder his father and then they had looked at him and said, "*Tsk-tsk-tsk*. That's a terrible goal," you see?

And then he said, "Oh, my, that's a terrible goal," or before that he said, "Oh, I wouldn't want to have that goal." That's going to be missing on the redone list, don't you see? That will be suppressed, in other words.

Well, all right. Now, what you learn in doing this, you can apply to straightening out any case. Whether this works all the way through as a clearing process in your hands or not is totally unimportant. Recognize that. You certainly have got to know all of these things in order to straighten out a case that's gone off the rails on 3D Criss Cross, you see?

I'm giving you the added bonus that we may be pioneering a little new way through on an easy route through the GPM, see? But you've got to be able to do all these things. You've got to be able to take all these steps to patch up cases, because you're going to find them that need patching up. And you've got a lot of them right here that need patching up, at this present moment. They're not in particularly horrible writhing agony, and they'd all come out straight in the end, and all that sort of thing, but you might as well learn to patch up a case fast, early, and know how to do it.

Now, I've given you two – I gave you a demonstration two weeks ago, I gave you a demonstration – yeah, a week ago, and I gave you a demonstration last night on just reviewing cases.

Now, I wouldn't bother to try to pattern my advice to these cases and try to apply it to all cases – I mean what you saw on the screen. Because I was just talking to these people, I was interviewing, that was a research session, is what you saw. Nevertheless, that's what I would do to straighten up these cases, see? And if they don't straighten up, I'd do something else. Do you understand?

But certainly, straightening up the first item that went wrong is the inevitable step which you would take in any case. You try to find the first item that went wrong in this person's Routine 3-type processes, and make it right. And you'll find out, I'm pretty sure, uniformly, that a case will continue to hang up until you either got clear to the end of the Goals Problem Mass, and had about sixty or ninety 3D Criss Cross items, you see – pc in misery all this time, see, till he's getting down toward the end. And you find out your best shortcut – because all that time you're going to have a hard time keeping the rudiments in, see – your best shortcut is to find that first item in.

All right, if you're going to have to find that first item in, you might as well learn this process we call Routine 3A Criss Cross and it makes a patch-up in any event, whatever else it does. Okay?

Audience: Mm-mm.

All right?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Thank you very much.

ARC BREAKS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on 1 May 1962

Thank you.

Well, from a survey of this I would say *some* of you can audit. And the rest, why, we're pretty good at training. Fortunately.

All right. This is the 1st of May. This is May Day. Mayday. That's a radio signal for "SOS." And if you feel in an SOS frame of mind ... First of May, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

All right. I might as well start in giving you hell. So you think you can audit? Ha! You know the hard thing that we have doing? The very, very rough thing we have doing? Is getting an auditor to ask the simplest question. I don't know, maybe there's some vocal selector on "missed withholds." Maybe there's some vocal impasse. Maybe it is absolutely impossible for most people to say "Have I missed a withhold on you?" Maybe there's something in the onomatopoeia of that syllablization. Perhaps the phonetics of it are insurmountable. But that's the hardest thing we have to do. That is the toughest thing to do. It is utterly wild!

We have had more than one case of somebody letting a pc die before they would say it! That's pretty fantastic, isn't it? "Have I missed a withhold on you?" It's simple, isn't it? Now, if – the syllablization can't be the reason because there's another way you can phrase it. "Is there something I should have found out about you?" *Ho-ho-ho*, that fooled you. You can't keep telling me, "Well, because of my – because I was Japanese in my last life I can't say it." Because you can say it, because there are several ways with which to say it.

Now, you needn't be taken so aback. But it's only that you haven't heard me. See, on this one I am forced into an involuntary withhold. See, I feel like somebody screaming in a soundproof room. Pc comes down out of session – *duhuh* – caroms into one wall, caroms into the other wall. The auditor comes down beaten to pieces, you see – just absolutely – face utterly flat, you know? And says, "That certainly is an ARC breaky pc. He just has ARC breaks all the time." Obviously the auditor cannot utter these words: "Have I missed a withhold on you?" It is fabulous!

People will actually let a pc sit in front of them and yap and scream and go out of session and have his list all mucked up and his brains knocked out, while the auditor sits there and says, "Well the pc really ought to be controlling the session anyway. And what do I have to do with the session?" It must start with that kind of an attitude, you see. "I have no respon-

sibility for what this fellow is doing because he – look at him – *ha-ha-he is-hrrr*. Well, what could I do about it?"

Well, you couldn't have done anything about it without Scientology. And perhaps you would have had a rough go of it even a few months ago when you didn't know about missed withholds. But in the few months we have known about it ...

You ever see a boa constrictor in a zoo? You ever see these? They have glass fronted cages and you look through the glass fronted cage and see this boa constrictor. You ever see this? You know how they feed them? They have a machine and every six months they pry open the boa constrictor's mouth and start the machine going and it puts hamburger – six months' worth – into the boa constrictor. That's the way they feed them. That's actually true. Now, don't make me get one of those machines to teach you this – please! [laughs] Now, please learn it for the importance that it has.

Let me read you a list of some of the things which a missed withhold cause – and *only* a missed withhold causes these things. Now, don't get the idea that there's a – see, I think maybe you're not hearing me because you think there's a lot of other things. And there are not. There are *no* other things that cause these things. The fundamental cause of this long list I am about to read you is missed withholds and *nothing else*. There isn't *any other manifestation* from here to the other end of this universe, if you've ever been there – and I'll send you, if you don't learn this – that causes any of these things, except missed withholds. You have *a GPM because of missed withholds!* Now, that's how important the missed withhold is. You'd never have a single item if people hadn't kept missing withholds on it and you haven't kept missing withholds with it. Now, that's something to know. This is *very* important.

It is almost as if the basic principle of existence is: thou – when existence is good – "Thou hath not missed a withhold." And when existence is bad, "Thou hath mithed a withhold." [laughter] See? Now, that's how important that can be.

Now, let me read you the list of the things which *only* a missed withhold cause. And which are caused *only* by missed withholds and which missed withholds, asked for, heal – bang. Just like that – bang. There is no monkey business about it. A missed withhold properly asked for, the meter properly cleaned on missed withhold, remedies each one of these fifteen things and many more. The number is almost infinite but these are the best ones:

One: Pc failing to make progress. Now, we used to say that was a present time problem. Well, a present time problem comes into existence because somebody has missed a withhold on him. That he's missed a withhold on somebody else and after that they have problems. You understand? A pc in the presence of missed withholds will not get any graph change. All right.

Two: Pc critical of or angry at the auditor. Pc critical of or angry at the auditor. Now, do you know that you sometimes make a flub. And have you made a flub and the pc didn't protest? And have you made a flub and the pc did protest? Well, now, listen, don't get hung in this mess. You made a flub; the pc protested about it. So therefore you were wrong and he was right. So therefore, it's reasonable. And you know that's why you don't pick up missed withholds? Because it's so reasonable. I spit on reasonability. It's so *reasonable*.

One auditor said, "Well, the pc sat there and kept calling me a coward and saying I was a coward and I was afraid to audit him and that sort of thing and it was true. So what could I do about it?"

Now look, look, get this real straight. Yes, it's true. Absolutely. That was perfectly true, that the pc was uttering these words and that the auditor was guilty of the charges. But that wasn't what the pc was upset about.

Do you know, it's not what's known that's wrong with the pc, you see? No. The reason the pc protested and got upset about it, is because the pc has a missed withhold. See, it doesn't matter how reasonable the pc's squawk is. You know, you dropped his goals list into the spittoon. [laughter] You know, and when you got up to fetch it, dumped the E-Meter over his head, you see. And he says, "What the hell are you doing?" Now, if he says, "What the hell are you doing?" it's because a withhold has been missed earlier than that. Do you follow this?

See, don't get so doggone tied up in the reasonability of it. Very often the pc's complaints are correct; very often the pc's complaints are incorrect. It does not matter whether the pc's complaints are correct or incorrect. The pc is complaining because you have missed a withhold on the pc. And that's all there is to it. There isn't any more explanation to it than that. Do you see? This bypasses reasonability.

Now, of course, you can take an auditor who can't do a Model Session and doesn't know an E-Meter – one end of it than the other – can't follow on any TR, and he's stumbling and fumbling in all directions, and trying to end the session with no rudiments. And before the session has started he said, "Well let's see, I'll do my Model Session. Now, let's see, what part of it is ...? Let's see. Have I ...? Let's see, where is it here? Oh yes, 'End of session!' No, no, I mean – uh, I mean – uh ..." [laughter]

And do you know the only reason the pc gets upset is because a withhold has been missed on him. You search it out sometime. You go into this thing, you know, and you'll see that's a fact. See, the missed withhold might be such a thing: "Well, you schnook, why the hell did they ever let you out of the Academy?" Still a missed withhold. See, for a few minutes, for a few seconds, the pc was – tried to be nice about it. Tried to be patient about it. Tried to, you know. Get it audited anyway. You know, try to get the session going so they're stonily not saying anything. Oh, you've been there, have you? [laughter]

Look, I told you a long time ago that it took a half an hour to an hour and a half for the pc to blow a session. This is just empirical observation. This betokens the fact that something must have happened that much earlier. And the something that happened that much earlier was a missed withhold. But you can see it; you can see it on a pc. You can see it growing and growing and then the pc finally blows.

And a real dumb auditor with no observation of the pc, auditing the meter instead of the pc or something, see, auditing the – his memory or something, doesn't see this, and all of a sudden the pc explodes and tries to blow session and the auditor tries to put this back together again. And if the pc is halfway out the door, that is not the time to try to patch up a session, see? See, it had already happened a half an hour to an hour and a half earlier. So this is not the time to patch up the session. The time to patch up the session is routinely and regularly, earlier.

And the way you patch it up – now this is, it's very complicated and I know it's very hard to understand, and I know there – that it's almost impossible to utter these words – is to say to the pc, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" Not when he leaves the session. When he's going out of the door, I want to point out a physical fact to you: the E-Meter cans are no longer in his hands. They are lying dented on the floor, see. So you don't ask him that at that time.

No, the technical way to go about it, you see, the real professional attitude, is to ask him the question while he is still sitting in the chair. And now if you're a real pro you will notice that the pc is not in good comm with you when he ceases to be in good comm with you merely by the tiniest inflection of voice. And at that moment you will ask, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" And it goes *glang*. And he tells you what it is and then you clean it up properly. Do you know how to clean one up properly? Well now, now just a minute. You say, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" And he says, "Yes, I had a fight with my mother this morning."

Now, a huge crossroads yawns before us. And there's a tremendous boulevard which has magnetic attractors laid into it all down the left. And the little, tiny straight path on the right is not at all attractive, see. And most auditors drive down this tremendous wide highway by saying, "What was the fight about?" *Ohhh-ohh*. Oh, no. Oh no, we've had it now. We're on the M1 at a hundred and twenty-five miles an hour with no brakes and can't find the ignition switch. There isn't any way of stopping now because things just go from worse to worser.

No, that little, little path on the right is the one we want. And we say, "Good," or "Is that all of it?" or "Good, thank you. All right. Is there any other withhold I have missed on you?" See. And that steers us right back into the session again, see. That's all we do. Trouble with it is it's too cockeyed simple, you see? You see? It's too – much too simple. And as long as you keep getting knocks on missed withholds you keep asking for them. And when he gives them, you don't develop them. You just understand and acknowledge them. That's all you do with them. Don't do another thing. And the pc just sinks back into session beautifully. He just goes right back into session. It's gorgeous. It's marvelous. It's such magic, nobody ever heard of such a thing. It's unbelievable until you've done it.

Pc is screaming his head off. You can't even be heard above the high-pitched roar, see. But you manage – he finally takes a breath, and as he takes that breath you say, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" [laughter]

Now, oddly enough, "What are you trying to make me guilty of?" is not palatable to pcs. It isn't. It's a piece of technology but if – pcs don't like it. And the next one is, "What have you done to me in this session?" The pc doesn't like that either. But pcs for some reason or other always take this like little lambs. "Babies cry for Castoria," you know? And, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" You see, you've already accused yourself. See? And very often this strikes him that you're being terribly clever. "How did you know?" [laughter] See? He doesn't connect it with roaring at you. Very interesting technology.

I'll read you another one of these conditions:

Three: Pc refusing to talk to auditor. That happens ordinarily fifteen or twenty minutes before the blow. So that's just a little closer to the end of session and the final blow, you see?

But the conditions are the same. Up to fifteen, twenty minutes, half an hour before that refusal to talk to the auditor there has been a missed withhold with magnitude. Ordinarily the session started out with a missed withhold, continued with a missed withhold while twenty or thirty new missed withholds developed. And then the pc goes into a total withhold.

See, there's such a thing as an involuntary withhold, too. The mechanisms of the ARC break – if you really want to promote an ARC break with the pc, you can, by hanging him with withholds which are involuntary. The involuntary withhold is something else. The pc says, "cat," and you don't acknowledge it. And he says, "dog," and you don't – you don't write it down or acknowledge it. And he's giving you list items, you see, and you just sit there and gaze off into space or something like that. And the next thing you know, he gets the idea that he's withholding. Naturally he is because he's not communicating. The funny part of it is, the same question serves. "Have I missed a withhold on you?"

"Yes, goddamnit. I said 'cat' and I said 'dog' and so forth. And you missed these as withholds."

Now, the thing to do is acknowledge these things. And you just acknowledge the fact that you've missed the withhold. That's all you have to do about it. Straighten out the situation with the pc if it's the fact you actually didn't put a couple of items down on the list. But honestly, it cures it up right away.

There are many types of involuntary withholds. Do you realize that most of you have all – are out of ARC with the Marcab Confederacy at this time because you're not saying anything to them. Somebody who is very Christian, extremely Christian – you know, has to have permission to eat breakfast and has to have permission to eat lunch and then forgiven for the evening. You know, their life wholly turns on these little pivots – will sooner or later in one lifetime or another listen for a moment after the prayer, you see, or something, and the circuit they've been using hasn't – hasn't spoken for some time. They get no acknowledgment. And they realize they've been talking all this time to the Big Thetan, you see? And nobody's ever said a word. And they get madder than hell at the Catholic church, you know. And they start revolutions and burn popes and ... It's marvelous.

The most adventurous activity you could possibly engage upon would be to start something that couldn't ever have any acknowledgment. See. Because sooner or later that's going to bust everybody up into a screaming fury. Because it's going to add up to nothing but one long chain of missed withholds. You follow that?

Now, this refusal to talk is the realization that one can't because one isn't being heard. Well, there's two ways to go about this, is acknowledge the living daylights out of the pc and give him about twenty or thirty acknowledgments in a row, one way or another. Or just ask him if you've missed a withhold. And he'll come back into communication with you, because of course these all seem to him like withholds. See, although he isn't withholding anything he can't communicate anything, so therefore he is, you see, withholding, in his opinion. You got it?

Now, of course we covered number four: pc attempting to leave session. That's what happens after the pc refuses to talk to the auditor or the reverse of the flow is scream at the auditor. See, there's a reverse side of the same flow. He's not talking to the auditor then, ei-

ther. In fact he's practically unintelligible ordinarily. And by the way, auditing can get a pc – I will tell you something – auditing can get a pc into this state when the auditor himself is being technically very bad. When his TRs are very bad, and so forth, he can just stack up, stack up, stack up, stack up, these involuntary withholds. And just keep stacking them up, stacking them up, stacking them up. And eventually the pc gets into a screaming fit.

There are – is no such thing as "an ARC breaky pc," you understand? There's only auditors who can't acknowledge, you see, and won't audit the pc, that's all. Because you could take any – I could take any person in this room and in the course of fifteen minutes of a session that they would think was letter-perfect, have them absolutely screaming enough to break plaster off the ceiling in an ARC break. You could do it to any pc, so don't think this is a specialized pc condition; it is not. You can get any pc into this state. They go out of – you can just drive them out of their minds. It's a liability in auditing. So don't classify one pc as ARC breaky and another pc not ARC breaky, because they could all be made to ARC break. There isn't a person here I couldn't do this to.

Just by asking you a question forcefully and then never acknowledging anything you say. Just be doing just that, see. And I'll say, "Well come now, come now, have you ever been to school?"

And you say, "Well, yes, I've been to school."

"Have you ever been to school!"

"I have *been* to school!"

"You're not answering my question. Have you ever been to school?"

And if we just kept up this thing – man, *boom!* That's all you have to do, you understand? Because you're creating a missed withhold every question. And you just stack them up, *bing-bing-bing-bing*. Actually pc's can faint, have heart attacks – almost anything you can think of under this kind of treatment. You can do anything you want to to a pc in the way of making him thoroughly ill just with this kind of treatment. Never acknowledge anything he says. Every time he says something, say something else. Don't ever acknowledge it. Just follow that course. You say, "Well, we're going to list this list. What should be disregarded in order to make people sick?" You know, whatever it is, you see.

"All right. Is there anything that should be disregarded to make people sick?"

And the pc says, "Well, medicine."

"Yeah. Well, I know – but uh – is there any uh – get the question, now: Is there anything that should be disregarded to make people sick?" You see, you haven't written down anything.

And he says, "Well, uh, ... medicine."

And you say, "Now, listen to the question carefully this time."

Honest, you can just blow them right straight up. They'll scream, man! Take them maybe fifteen minutes to work up to it, but if you do it adroitly, he'll – even though the guy doesn't – even though the guy might start out knowing what you're doing, he'll still scream.

See how you can stack them up? Those are all just missed withholds. And if you turned around after that and said, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" he'd say, "Yeah, you refused to say anything about medicine." [laughter] You clean this all up, and he comes right back to battery just like that.

In other words you can create and dissipate an ARC break just as easily as that. Just refuse to receive anything from the pc and then afterwards find out if you've missed a withhold on the pc. By refusing to receive anything from the pc you'll get the ARC break and all manifestations. They'll scream at you or they eventually refuse to talk to you. They go into complete apathy. They go into such apathy by the way, that they can't talk. They're not being unwilling; it's unable! And then they eventually know it's for the best that they get out of that room. Well, they might walk out howling and they might walk out absolutely mum, but they feel like hell.

All right, you – so you can turn the manifestation on by missing withholds and you can turn it off by asking if you've missed any withholds. In other words, an old pal of mine who did most of the helicopter work other people have gotten credit for in subsequent years, sits there and argues with the whole University of Kansas at Lawrence. He takes them all on. It's just a small pastime with him. He told me one time, he says, "Well, if you really knew your business," he says, "you could make – if you really knew anything about the mind, Ron," he said, "you could make people laugh at will and cry at will." And he said, "Then that would be a good test whether you knew anything about the mind. You know?" Well, I won't say it went so far as I immediately made him laugh and cry, but here is something: If you really know the mechanism of something, you can turn it on or turn it off, you see? And you sure know the mechanism of an ARC break. You can turn one on; you can turn one off. You can create them and you can vanish them.

Now, in view of the fact that you can be sitting there acknowledging the pc perfectly every time he speaks and taking care of everything he says, and you're doing all this perfectly, and so forth, how does a pc still have an ARC break? Well, the withhold that you've missed just has been ticked but hasn't come up, see? It could be something like this – it could be as vague as this: he read in a magazine – he's read in one of the Scientology magazines that one won't make any progress, you know, if he's thought evil thoughts. You know, or something. You know, something weird like this. He's got some misinterpretation. You're busy auditing him and you're going down the line. And you say, "Well, are you withholding anything?" And at that moment why, you're auditing with a Tasmanian meter or something. Something, something's going on, you know. I mean, it hasn't got anything to do with auditing; you miss this entirely. Or at that particular moment he's totally ARC broke or he's so scared of you he's not in-session or something happens and you don't get any register on this meter, see. You go by and all of a sudden you find out you're getting no place fast. You should sense that something is wrong with the session.

When you sense something is wrong with ... One of the ways of doing it is the needle bobs and then you ask a question or while you're asking a question the needle does something or the needle does something during and after you ask the question. Regardless of what you're saying the needle is active, see? There is no timing between you and the meter, let me put it that way, see?

You say, "Do you eat catfish for breakfast?" see, and the thing falls on "do" and "breakfast" but not on any timing that has anything to do with you, you see. You say – apparently, you know, it looks like it fell on "do" and "catfish" or something like this. And then you look up at the pc – one of the things to do is just stop talking to the pc for a moment. And you'll see it's doing the same thing. *Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh*. What do you know? *Hoo-hoo*.

And you say, "Do you eat catfish for breakfast?" And the needle goes *dip-bob-dip*, you know. *Hmmmm*. "Do you eat catfish for breakfast?" and it goes *dip-bob-dip* – latent this time, you see. "Do you eat cat- ." It goes, *dip-bob-dip*. Just don't ask anything for a moment. It'll go, *dip-bob-dip*. It's haunted. [laughter] You watch that sometime because that's the commonest thing that happens on one of these things. It's called a needle pattern.

All needle patterns are caused by missed withholds – all needle patterns.

Number five: Pc not desirous of being audited or anybody not desirous of being audited. Grandma is sitting there and she's going natter-natter-natter-natter-natter-natter. "The idea of little Johnny getting audited," and so forth. Johnny, little Johnny, is forty and married, see. But, "Little Johnny shouldn't be getting audited. Why are you interested in that sort of thing? What's the idea of doing anything about that? *Nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah*," she chews some more snooze.

You go in there to audit John, you see, and she's sitting over there in the chair. And she's going vitriol, vitriol, vitriol, vitriol, you know. Make up your mind. You've missed a withhold on her.

How could you? You've never talked to her? Oh, but you're the one who's supposed to know. So you see, it's automatic. It'd startle her half to death if you walked over and put a – E-Meter cans in her hands and said, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" you know, "Is there something I failed to find out about you, Grandma?"

"Well, I should say there is, son."

She'd probably tell you, too. It's quite remarkable. It all depends on how good your presence is. You have to hold her in that first couple of seconds to get over the rage surge. Then she'll talk to you like a canary bird, you know. She'll just sing, sing, sing. Well, you prompt her a little bit, you know, and away they go at it. They'll argue for a little while and then there they go. It's – she says, "I would never be audited." Why would she never be audited? Because somebody, including you, somebody else and other somebodies and also you have missed withholds on her, that's all. That's simple, see.

There is no other reason people don't want to be audited. You see, these are all on the bracket of, "There is no other reason," don't you see? There isn't also the fact that the libido often comes into confluence with the lumbosis, you see, and makes a censorious subconscious. See, that has noth – that explanation isn't there either, see. It's just missed withholds, that's all. Nothing – nothing more.

People try to make so much out of this, you see. And then they all say, "Well, the ARC break is so terrible. This person is so vitriolic." They've gone down to the police department and they've told the police there that everybody in that Scientology office should be arrested and everything else, and – and so forth. You say, well, it's because they're a member

of the Communist Party. Well all right, they're a member of the Communist Party. That's reasonable. And you say it's because they have an uncle who's a psychiatrist. That's reasonable. It's because they've been in an institution. That's reasonable. These things are all true, don't you see. Everything's all true. Nobody argues with any of these things. But the reason they did it was because somebody's missed a withhold, see.

And this reporter comes in to get a story from you for the newspaper. He sits there the whole damn time with a missed withhold. See, what you should know is he's going to clobber you, man. The way to start in on some guy, he's – guy's sitting down there with a hell of a sneer on his face, and say, "Well, all right. I'm quite aware of what you're going to do. You're going to go – you're going to treat me nice, and then you're going to go back to the paper and write a hell of a thing. You've already got orders of the kind of story you're supposed to write on the newspaper. You're already – city editor's been telling you. I wonder why you came down here to get any details because you've got the story all written in your typewriter already, huh! That's right, isn't it Jack? Ha-ha!"

The guy goes, "*I-huh-hoo-oooh ...*"

"Well, let's find out something about your personal life now that we got that established and you don't know anything about the thing. Let's see, what withhold has your wife missed on you?" Put him on the meter. "Well, take a hold of the cans!!" [laughter] "Take them! All right, now, what withhold has your wife missed on you?" *Heh-heh huh!*

"Oh, well, I ..."

Hold him back to the – against the wall until you get them cleared. And he'll walk out of there saying, "God damn them people, why don't they mind their own business!" He won't dare write a word, man! Marvelous.

All right. Now, this is a new one to you:

Number six: Pc boiling off. Oh, you thought it was from some other things, didn't you? Oddly enough a stuck flow is the basic cause of the actual mechanics of boil-off, but apparently a stuck flow is only caused by a missed withhold either way, too. And all boil-off is a missed withhold. So you say to the pc, you say to the pc – you're nulling, you know – and you say, "Cat, dog, catfish, waterbuck," and the pc goes *zzzzzzzz*, see. Well oddly enough, if you went on and read the list you'd still get the proper reactions on the thing – doesn't matter whether he's boiling off or not. But you should at that stage of the game say, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" Particularly when you hear him snore. [laughter]

Listen. If you let a pc even go fuzzy, you've missed a withhold on him. See, they go a little bit fuzzy and then they get a little bit dopey. And then they go into a *zzzuhhhh*. And they go all the way on out. Every one of those stages is caused by a missed withhold.

You understand, when I say "missed withhold" it isn't something about they have murdered the cook and stuffed her body in the dinner dishes. We're not looking for any blood here. It's just the fact that they came into session and wanted to go to the bathroom and didn't. Now, that makes a corking withhold. [laughter] And you didn't find out about it. And that's enough to make a pc completely boil right out in the session. Anything you try to do with the pc, the pc boils off. *Bing-bang*. And you finally better find out what it is and straighten it out.

That's all boil-off and all fogginess and all stupidity. It's all low IQ. That isn't mentioned in there, but it would be a section under six.

The next one is: The pc is exhausted. How many of you have wished that you didn't feel so exhausted? All right. Let your auditor wish right now that he'd picked up a few withholds off you – missed withholds, you understand. Pick up the missed withholds. Entirely different subject, you know, than picking up withholds.

Withholds you pick it up with Prepchecking, you can even pick up missed withholds with Prepchecking. But withholds are withholds. You have to develop withholds. What has he done that is contrary to mores and all this kind of thing. A big subject, withholds.

But missed withholds is a very tight, narrow subject. It's something you should have found out and didn't; something he should have found out and didn't; something it should have found out and didn't; some something they should have found out and didn't; something the pc should have found out and didn't. Don't you see? All of these things classify as missed withholds. "Should have – should have found out." Exhaustion – exhaustion and the sensation of tiredness and all the rest of that, pin right down on the subject of missed withholds. The pc finishes the session feeling very exhausted – some withholds have been missed. It's as simple as that.

And there's an awful lot of pcs come into HGCs and they come in because they're so exhausted and never have any pep or energy. And this is one of their prime examples. Well, it's just missed withholds. Simple. I mean, something that makes that much fuss in life, you see, to be that simple, is why everybody overlooked it. You see, because this little drop of water called a missed withhold couldn't possibly cause that avalanche and explosion called Vesuvius. But it did.

All right. Your next one, eight: Pc feeling foggy at session end. You actually, in going over your end rudiments should notice whether or not the pc can talk to you. I mean, that's interesting – it's all right for you to go in consultation with the meter and ignore the pc. You actually should only handle things in end rudiments which knock on the meter. But as you're sitting there – I'm not asking you to do this routinely and all the time, you know. You know, I'm not – not to put your attention on it or anything like that, but just the way you'd up your own havingness, you know, by noticing the settee or the ceiling or something; notice there's a pc sitting in the other chair, you know. And notice the pc is sometimes *mmmm-mmmm-mmmm ...*

And you say, "Is it all right if I end the session now?"

"Yaaaaahhhh."

Well, I know it isn't – I know it isn't absolutely necessary to – according to Model Session, in order to do this, but he might have been asleep. Something else might have happened when you passed "Have I missed a withhold on you?" in the end rudiments, you know? Pick up a few just for fun, you know? Not for any reason – yeah, just for fun, noticing that you have a pc, you might pick up some of the missed withholds at the end of the session and notice the pc brighten right up and cease to be foggy. It's quite an interesting thing to watch.

Pc starts into a boil-off – pick up the missed withholds right in the middle of the session, you see. End of session the pc says he feels real weird. You know, he doesn't know whether he's here or there or otherwise. Pick up a few missed withholds on him. He's always got some. They're little cotton-picking withholds. They haven't got anything to do with anything broad or expansive. Big missed withhold: You didn't find out that he wanted a cigarette and a break. But he knew he had better not have a cigarette and a break because he is also very interested in getting his goal found so he doesn't mention it. At session end he's going *blah*. "Have I missed a withhold on you?" "Is there something I should have found out?" Well, he thinks. And you say, "that, that," you know.

"Oh, oh that. Huh. Oh, it's nothing very much. I didn't tell you that I wanted a break and a cigarette about an hour ago. I didn't tell you I wanted a break and cigarette about an hour ago. *Heh-heh*. Nothing to that." He's all cheered up. He's all alert. Didn't take anything at all, don't you see? These things are little, tiny, damn, fool things, you know.

If you always put "in this session" ahead of your question, why, you find yourself keeping the pc quite alert and quite capable of being audited without ever plowing up any backtrack. When you're doing a Routine 3 Process you don't particularly want to be plowing any backtrack. And you'll find that it's a pretty good thing to do that.

One thing argues against that is once in a while you pick up not a missed withhold, but sometimes you will pick up something that wasn't known about the goal or something like this and it'll be backtrack. But that's not as valid as asking for an invalidation – when you're doing with items and goals you should ask for lots – you should ask for invalidations, you see, and things like that. That's not a missed withhold.

But "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" Actually, if you did no more than that, if you never picked it up any earlier than this session, you'll still keep the pc alert. And don't think by finding a great big avalanche of the thing stemming all from the basic-basic a hundred and eighty trillion years ago – you pick up one missed withhold a hundred and eighty trillion years ago – he's going to stay bright in the session. No, he's not. See, it's the session missed withholds that are important to your auditing and doing Routine 3, is all I'm trying to tell you.

All right. Number nine: Dropped havingness. Can squeeze at the beginning of the session, a quarter-of-a-dial drop. Can squeeze at end of a session, eighth-of-a-dial drop.

"Have I missed a withhold on you?"

"Yes. So, so, so and so-and-so. Yes, and ..."

"All right. Thank you. Now, let me clear that. Have I missed a withhold on you?"

"Yes. *Yap-yap-yap-yap-yap*." "All right, all right. Let me test that out. Have I missed a withhold on you? Yeah, well that's clean. Squeeze the cans." Bang A quarter-of-a-dial drop. No Havingness run.

You'll find the havingness will go right back up, and even improve. Particularly if you're picking up missed withholds on a little bit broader basis you'll find that havingness improves all over the place, not just "in this session." You just say well ... If you're prep-

checking, particularly, on some missed withhold Zero Question. Man, you'll find that havingness picks up and picks up and picks up and picks up. Because what it is – what is it? It's a not-reach, isn't it? And havingness is a reach.

All right. Number ten: Pc telling others the auditor is no good. "Joe is really a schnook. He really can't audit worth schnooks." You're passing at this moment on this list out into the outer perimeter of life. We've gone out of the auditing session. That's why that is marked there as number ten. It isn't these are all of them; it's just those that most concern the auditor.

And what is known at once about this pc? Well, that the auditor missed a withhold on the pc. That is actually all there is to be known about it. Of course, it is bad auditing now that you know about it.

Now, in earlier auditing, earlier than two or three months ago, it was possible for a pc to be pretty badly cut up by never being acknowledged to what he said. And a whole bunch of withholds stacked up and the guy got into a lot of ARC breaks, thrown into an apathetic state and all this kind of thing, because it was rocked-up auditing. Yeah, he'll argue about this auditor. But that doesn't – even though we didn't know the technology, that doesn't say it didn't exist. You see, people studying Scientology only – only people who study Scientology really don't know anything about it, you know. They haven't really done anything with it, you understand that. They make this mistake. They think that every time we come out with something new, old things cease to be true, you see. The ARC Scale went out because we've just said there's an Effect Scale. Yeah, oh, you'll find that rather consistently. Of course, they never had any reality and didn't understand the ARC Scale in the first place.

You'll find these people hanging around PE Courses and things like that. And they say, "Why is Ron always changing his mind?"

Ron isn't changing his mind! See? The thing's still true, you know? Well similarly, just because we have learned of a datum doesn't mean it didn't exist before we learned of it. See? It didn't materialize at the moment we learned about it. It had been there all the time. Well, this was the cause for all of these ARC breaky sessions and all of these prior upsets in auditing. See, whatever the score was.

Now, formerly it was simply an index of how well, really, how perceptive an auditor was, and how well he acknowledged the pc. And if he was not very perceptive and he didn't acknowledge the pc, and if he also ran a lousy session, of course, his pcs had a hell of a time. And the pcs would all go around saying, "God, that was a lousy auditor." Well, they might have been right.

But today, under this understanding, see, all right, you just – auditor's missed a withhold, that's all.

Now, what do you say about this pc. They said, "Well, this fellow, this fellow Schnooks up in the Northwest" – or something like that – "My God, was he a terrible auditor."

Your instant response is, "What withhold did he *miss* on you?" You understand?

Now, instantly you – you see, it just doesn't matter otherwise than you've got a snarl up of auditing track. So if you're auditing the person – I'm talking about in an auditing session and he says, "Well, Schnooks was terrible. And he just about cut my throat from ear to ear."

"What with..." If you're clearing up by Prepchecking and past auditing and that sort of thing. You don't do these things while you're running Routine 3, you understand. Prepchecking, you're trying to straighten out the pc so the rudiments stay in. You'd ask some question, "What withhold did Schnooks miss on you?"

Oh, you'll get the Seattle phone directory. [laughter] God, it'll be that thick. But they'll mostly be little things. Don't look for any big home runs. And they'll basically be fundamentally that he didn't acknowledge well, see. The auditor didn't acknowledge well and the auditor wasn't very perceptive. Pc stumbles into session, falls in the door, exudes alcohol fumes to the point where if it got as far as the gas stove in the kitchen the whole house would have blown up, you know. And the auditor takes him in session and audits him, you know, never noticing that he's three sheets to the wind with the demon rum, you see?

And the pc gets along fine and then all of a sudden says, "You know, I'm not supposed to be audited while I'm under the influence of alcohol." And then immediately concerned, and says, "You know, that auditor probably didn't notice I was under ..." so therefore what hasn't been acknowledged is his alcoholism, so therefore that has no chance of blowing and he feels stuck with the alcohol, see.

It's all on the basis of... Actually the whole thing is explainable on TR 4. You need no more technical explanation than TR 4. That which is not acknowledged continues to exist. Remember the old, very interesting old processes we had, something like the "Great Okay." You know, that kind of thing? Gee, I bet that about blew some peoples' heads off, man. It must have been fabulous. The "Great Okay."

If you were to look at some girl – if you were to look at some girl and give her a terrific acknowledgment of one kind or another, you know she might vanish. But knowing women, I don't think she would. She'd have other withholds that would hold her together. [laughter, laughs]

All right. Eleven: Pc demanding redress of wrongs. Now, that applies to a – pc is saying you ought to audit them 195 more hours free and demanding redress of wrongs – saying they're going to sue somebody over auditing or something like this. Well, you know, anything, it doesn't matter. And it doesn't matter if it happened and it doesn't matter if it's reasonable, and it doesn't matter if it's absolutely scurrilously antisocial – this occurrence – it doesn't matter! The fundamental of it is, and the cure of it is all contained not in court, but in missed withholds. "What withhold did the auditor miss on you?" "What should the organization have found out about you?" You understand? It blows; solves the situation. Simple, once you look at it.

Twelve: Pc critical of organizations or people of Scientology. Just the same that I just said. They say, "Natter-natter-natter. Oh, those people up in Johannesburg they're absolutely no good," and so forth. Well, what did Johannesburg fail to find out about them? That, that's the only thing. Bang! See? Johannesburg must have failed to find out something about them.

Get this kind of a situation: Now, George, George writes from Cape Town and he says – to Johannesburg, he says, "Please send me a book and here is – here are ten rand" or something, and, "apply the rest of it to any research funds that you have." And the book department credits them with this for new books. And you know that person will get very upset and critical of Central Organization? It won't have anything much to do with this payment they sent in. As a matter of fact trying to locate this will take a moment or two. He obviously has not been acknowledged. He actually was trying to give you some money. And you didn't take it. See, you applied it to his account or you did something else with it, you know? You've missed a withhold of some kind or another, you see.

He's tried to say something and it hasn't been acknowledged. He's tried to communicate something and it has not occurred. When people write you a letter and they say, "Is it true that Ron uses boats for roller skates?" or – and so on and it's that sort of thing. And "Is it true that – uh – do auditors have to wear gumboots while auditing pcs?"

And you look at this long list of questions, you know, and you say, "Oh, for Christ's sakes," you know. What a ... And you say, "Why don't you come in and see the Registrar?" Oh, no, man. No. Every question you didn't answer becomes a missed withhold. *Noooo!*

Now, these things can be very, very weird. Three years after a lady wrote in and asked for any data we had on processing children, I found the letter in Central Files. It had been answered several times. No second letter had ever come from this lady. But several Letter Registrars had written her letters. And none of them had answered her question do we have a book, you see, on child – on auditing children, you know? So I was – I used – very often every few years I'll be in some organization, I'll pick up a bunch of stuff out of CF and write some letters just to give some examples, you know? And every now and then why the HCO Communicator will up and mail them. This has been known to absolutely send a Letter Registrar into fits because he'll suddenly hear from people enthusiastically that they haven't written to. Because I will invariably sign their name, you see? You know?

The Letter Registrar is Dorothy Jay, you see, and something like this. I'll sign the letter Dorothy Jay, don't you see, and send it out. Just answer the question. "Yes, we – yes, we have a book called *Child Dianetics* that tells all about..." No preamble, see. "Yes, we have a book called *Child Dianetics* that tells about auditing children. We are sending you a copy in return mail and you can pay us for it if you wish." Terrific enthusiastic response from the lady, see. Three years we've been missing a withhold on her, see. So she's never communicated to us. Well, we go back and we say patiently – on some of these letters – we say, "No, auditors do not have to wear gumboots while giving sessions." And all of a sudden we get a vast burst of enthusiasm.

This is so much so that if you were to simply go through a Central Files or your own files and pick out every letter you'd ever received from anybody on the subject of that and checked it over very carefully to make sure that every question in those letters had ever been answered, you would all of a sudden be inundated with mail. It's quite fascinating.

This is – people all over the place pick up missed withholds very, very easily on organizations and on private auditors – very easily. Now, people critical of Scientology broadly go on the basis of, "They should know what I am thinking." They're usually kind of nutty.

They're not going outside the realm of Scientologists and "they should know what I'm thinking. And they don't know what I'm thinking because they haven't written to me, and they don't know what I think and we think something else and they haven't found out about it, and therefore they're no good and we ought to mow them all down!" Just as elementary as that. We failed to find out about them.

One of the best ways to knock out a complete entheta campaign against Scientology is just describe everything that you do know about the people who are attacking you. One of the most effective ways of doing this is to send this detective around to investigate them and then they know that you haven't missed a withhold. And you know, they shut up just like that. The most fantastic magic you ever heard of. Detective never finds out a thing.

They've been living an exemplary life, a totally exemplary life working for Russia in the American Foreign Office and there they are, you know. And – but they hear a detective has been around and now they know that you know, see.

If they're still unsure that you know, why, they will still be upset. So if you were to stand in front of one of these Joes and you could say, "Well, now that we know all about you, there's nothing much more we could say is there?" The guy will go away absolutely crushed. He actually would fall for that. Weird. But as long as you really don't know about them you're in trouble with them.

And of course, there isn't anything that substitutes for auditing. But you actually can put up a facade or you can find out the information so that it ceases to be a missed withhold. One of the effective ways is not only find out the information, but publish it. A-r-r-r-g-h. We're talking about somebody way outside; you say immediately that'd be libel suits.

Isn't that interesting that all these years I have never had a real libel suit ever filed against myself or a Scientology organization for publishing the absolute facts learned. Don't go into any fancy monkey business, just publish the facts. Say, "Well, most of the communists in the University of Australia are – amongst the professors – are shackled up with students and they're held under blackmail. And so are the Roman Catholic fathers connected with that particular university and they are held under blackmail for perversion. And that is why communism and Catholicism seem to be hand in glove in Australia – because of the same blackmail racket."

"Well, God" you'd say, "breathing anything like that these people could execute you at dawn, you know! They'll just yank you up in front of court and take billions away from you."

Well, they were going to take all kinds of things away from us up to the time we really put the blocks to them with it. I don't think we've ever heard anything since. The only entheta we've got now is in Brisbane. And that's pretty easy to dispense with – Brisbane. Just go up river a little bit and let them float on out to sea.

But, there's the missed withhold in operation in the society.

Now, fourteen: Lack of auditing results. And we go back actually a cousin to number One. We would say broadly in any organization that is there because we say, "broadly in any organization." If that organization is getting into trouble it's lack of auditing results and that's

all, or of practice. That's just lack of auditing results. And those lack of auditing results rest on the cornerstone, not of other technology, but the missed withhold.

You want to clean that up, just clean up missed withholds wherever you can lay hands on a pc and all of a sudden your organization will soar. That is the most magic method of repairing an organization's results, income, public presence, lack of buildings or anything else. It would be right under that heading. Quite important.

Joburg have to learn that right now and they haven't learned it too well. Washington is living down some of its sins and crimes. This is what you have to do to set it all back up again. You have to pick up all the missed withholds.

And, number fifteen: Dissemination failures. You're talking to somebody, you're trying to tell him about Scientology and he can't seem to understand about it and he argues about it, and he says, well it – "The I-Will-Arise Holy Rollers to which I belong are far superior and we've had that answer for many years." The answer is, "What have I failed to find out about you?" So he tells you and then he says, "Yeah, I'd like some auditing."

The trouble is it's too pervasive and it's too magic. It's too simple. And for that reason auditors miss it. So this bulletin on which this lecture has been based and which is not at all in – there's a lot more in this bulletin than there is in this lecture – May the 3rd, 1962, HCOB, "ARC Breaks and Missed Withholds" and that sort of thing has a certain design. And that's a how-to-use-this-bulletin. And it's a very funny thing that it is headed with, "How to use this bulletin."

Every time you hear any of these things taking place in any branch of a Central Organization or an auditing session or anything else, you hand the person who is at the receiving end of the upset a copy of this. That doesn't matter if he's a student, he's a preclear, he's an organizational executive, anything else.

Pc comes down, he looks all busted up. The auditor comes in and says, "My God that's an ARC breaky pc." Just reach in the drawer, get one of these, and hand it to him. Tell him to read it and tell him to report to the HCO Sec to take an examination on it.

Honest – it's the only answer. There isn't any point in doing anything else. Now, naturally, the person has to know his Model Session, his E-Meter and so forth. And has to be able to handle the tools and weapons of his business in order to even fetch up and get off the missed withholds, don't you see? So it goes without saying that people have some skill in handling meters and Model Sessions and that sort of thing. Beyond that point there is nothing but missed withholds that cause upset.

This is a fantastic principle. And it comes right back to the fourth TR. And it goes right into the communication formula. And it goes right in to not-knowingness, and it goes in at – it finds a birth or a cousin, in almost every factor we have ever handled in Scientology one way or the other. The person with missed withholds has the idea that he can't reach so it goes into havingness, and on and on and on. You got the idea?

So it's very important technology. And listen, you don't need to have, ever, an ARC breaky pc. You never need to make a flub on a list. These things are archaic. They belong to

our Stone Age, see. We're into a much higher level of technology today. As well as requiring new auditing precision, we've got this particular tool.

Why should you ever have anything but a session that was smooth as glass?

And if you don't have, it's just you really don't believe this: That ARC breaks are only missed withholds. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you. Take a break.

Routine 3G (Experimental)

Preview Of A Clearing Process

A lecture given on 1 May 1962

Thank you.

Okay. Here we go. Second lecture of 1st of May.

I suppose after that first lecture some of you will be calling Mayday! Mayday! [laughter] But remember, if you do, the response will be, "What withhold has been missed on you?"

All right. I'm going to talk to you about HCO Info Letter April 29, AD 12, "Routine 3G (Experimental), Preview of a Clearing Process".

And the first thing you should know about this is it is complete. And that's your first miss on it. You're going to read this and you're going to be sure that it is incomplete – that there's much more to be known. Because all the comments I've had on this to date – there will be other issues on this material, of course – but all comments I have had is on the basis of additive, additive, what do we do about the additive? You know, somebody says, well, what do you do about all the – you know, we got this – we got this right away and everything's fine and we think this is beautiful and this straightens out everything, but now, what do you do with oppterm of the items which have already been found? Unfortunate, you see, but it happens to be covered here. You don't do anything with them, you see?

It really – if it doesn't say it here ... This, of course, doesn't cover precisely Model Session. It doesn't give you – it doesn't – it doesn't give you a lot of the procedural actions. But as far as the – as the technology itself is concerned, it is jolly complete. So you in studying this, you see, what you should do is read what's here, not add something and worry about it.

You can do that. You can add something and then worry about it. And if it isn't here, don't worry about it. That's the first message, you know, you got. You say, "Well, what – what – what about a pc, what about a pc who had a goal and – he had a goal all right and they found this terminal, you understand? And the terminal was audited on – 'what have you done to' – 'what couldn't have happened with' or – or something. And it was audited that way for 269 hours and so forth. Now what do we do?" You know, you do ...

That hasn't anything to do with it. It says the way you patch up and go back and back-track is you check out the goal. It doesn't say a thing about doing anything with a terminal. But we couldn't care less about the terminals. Forget the terminals.

Why? A broad survey of everything done on 3D Criss Cross is it's been done wrong. It's horrible to behold, but it's absolutely my observation. I haven't seen a complete list yet. So

I'll tell you if you want to finish off a 3D Criss Cross, your best stunt with this... This – this isn't – this doesn't concern – it gives you the steps of 3D Criss Cross, but it really doesn't concern itself totally with repatching up 3D Criss Cross.

I can tell you how to patch up 3D Criss Cross. It is just, take the source items, you know, what should we disregard, you're trying to get something done the fellow had and he had the Prehav level, "God Almighty" and something like this – it doesn't matter. You just take that line and take the original list and complete it.

You don't do anything with the terminal, see; you can take the list source and complete it. And it's very odd, you know, but you're going to be able to get – apply these tests. But none of these tests would apply to any lists you've done yet – they wouldn't apply. Well, just experimentally, take any list you have done on a pc. I don't care, even if the items checked on 3D Criss Cross. Take the list and just read the first twelve items to the pc and watch the tone arm move. *Uuuuhhhh*. It didn't go down as fundamental as it could have gone. Right? So therefore, even though the terminal checks out very nicely and is sitting there very nicely and everything like that, you can still bleed charge off the list and you can get deeper into the Goals Problem Mass with the same type of list.

See, you can go further every time and the funny part of it is, is all the 3D Criss Cross you have done, of course, has blown charge off the bank. None of it is in vain.

Now, the rationale of 3D Criss Cross that you went on and found items and opptermmed items and found items and opptermmed items and they eventually come down and you get more and more fundamental items. In other words, we are blowing off charge on a gross basis of taking many items and the charge would eventually bleed off the Goals Problem Mass. See, that was the rationale of 3D Criss Cross. Well, this makes a pc pretty uncomfortable, experience has shown.

Now, we can also get into the Goals Problem Mass more deeply and more fundamentally by getting a goal. In other words, a goal is a better thing to operate with on each one of the line plot lines to find a Goals Problem Mass. It's – it – you know, it's all in the interest of shortening up the auditing. You'll always get a more fundamental item by going off from a goal. Always. It goes deeper. Why does it go deeper? Well, the pc isn't being asked to confront any mass. He's only being confront – asked to confront ideas and so he can go into the Goals Problem Mass and he can confront more and more and more ideas. He can rack around – and of course, he's basically confronting the idea in the mass he is stuck in.

So a goals list is only asking him to confront ideas, not asking him to confront any masses. And then you turn around having found that he is trapped on the fourth basement floor – you found this by ideas, you see. Now, you get him to list the items and he'll eventually list the item which surrounds the idea you found. See, it's all on the basis that it's easier to find the idea than it is to find the mass.

Pcs will confront ideas endlessly, but will not very often confront masses, which are painful to them. All the technique of war is based upon this fact. Somebody can confront and snarl and quarrel with the ideas of the enemy. And then he walks out and bares his bosom to some mass – shells, flame throwers, something of that sort – and he loses himself a body.

He could argue about their counter-philosophy, you see, all day and all night, you see and he'd still have a body, you know. So he's accustomed to being able to confront ideas. He can argue with ideas. He can confront ideas. He can do this with ideas and that with ideas and so forth. Do almost anything but change his ideas. And therefore, in the Goals Problem Mass, in racking around, the person is, of course, confronting more intimately the idea which is encysted in the terminal which he is actually in. He can confront that and he can tell you what that is without being able to tell you what the mass – terminal – see, what the mass of a terminal is or identify the terminal. He can tell you about the ideas of a terminal before he can tell you about the terminal. You see that?

So therefore, a goals entrance, taking the goal as your departure point each time, reaches more fundamentally and more deeply into the GPM. This is the theory of it. And now, having reached the goal of this mass, why, of course, you go ahead and identify the item. And the item you identify will have that goal. And that's – that's all there is to it. Now, that he's identified it, however, he's got to differentiate it and separate it. He thought many things had this goal, but only one thing had the goal per the list that you did.

And you got down to the bottom of the pot and, of course, there he was and he's mixed up with this particular – this item. It's a mass, you know. He's in the middle of that bowling ball, not in the other five hundred. And the reason the bowling ball is hung up is, of course, it is opposed against another bowling ball and which has exactly opposite ideas. Now, by oppterming the item which you have finally found, of course, it is hoped – and this is theoretical and experimental, of course – it is hoped that these two bowling balls will just go *whumphh* and that will be the end of that.

Because it's fantastic that they could be suspended in space and time and be so timeless because they happened so long ago. How are they still there? It's a freak. It's a freak. The GPM is composed of these accidentals and there are not very many of them that are poised. It's something like how do you – how do you take a boulder as big as a two-story house and balance it upon the exact pinnacle of a windblown mountain peak, you know. It – you could stand there for a long time and study this and say, "How the hell is that thing balanced there?" you know? It couldn't happen! See?

Well, down basically in the Goals Problem Mass, how could – how could you get such an exact balance between a terminal and an oppterm that they hang up in equal force and perpetuate themselves for trillennia. Man! That takes some doing.

You mean you found a waterbuck who is just as strong as a tiger and a tiger who is just as strong as a waterbuck. And a waterbuck who has just exactly these antagonistic ideas to a tiger that make the tiger's antagonistic ideas to a waterbuck hang up. And now that hangs up in time and the pc is still creating it. It's still persevering. It is still hung. If he was – just had an identity and he was still creating this identity, he long since would have ceased to create it. See, there just isn't anything – for a reason, for him to go on creating it. He's just saying, "It must survive." Well, that's kind of odd. Well, of course, it survived and now it isn't surviving.

Well, why must it survive? Well it must survive because it is opposed. It is *always* opposed, so it *always* must survive. How the devil did he arrange that in his reactive bank?

That's marvelous, you know. How – you get down to figure out how in the name of God could you have these two cannonballs fired from peak one and peak two directly at each other with the exact balance velocity that they hit each other exactly in midair. You see, that would be an artillery freak to end all artillery freaks.

I think in World War I, in the whole of World War I, they eventually found an unexploded shell that had been hit by another shell. It had a shell in the side of it. And everybody thinks this is marvelous. As a matter of fact, it's in a museum someplace over in France.

I don't know how many billions of bullets and shells were fired in World War I, at what close range and almost never did one shell hit another shell, see.

Well, it's just that kind of thing. And all these – all these billions of lives and identities a person's had, how does he have one that hangs up against another one that exactly, so that afterwards it will accumulate other identities and then accumulate other balances and accumulate and accumulate and he's still, weirdly enough, creating all of these things simultaneously and so forth. You just couldn't do it.

Just get the idea right now of creating simultaneously 585 different identities all at the same minute, each with all of its own particular... Well, you're doing it. Well, how do you do it? Well, that's because there's just a couple down at the bottom of it and that's what you're creating. And the rest of these things, of course, just accumulate and accumulate and accumulate and, of course, they don't uncreate. You got the theory back of this?

Well, therefore, it is of interest in terms of (1) shortness of auditing time and (2) pc comfort, to achieve the most fundamental grip that you can get on the Goals Problem Mass as soon as you can get it.

In other words, the earliest grip, the deepest – the deepest grip, the earliest. This is what you're trying to do. You're trying to get there mostest with the firstest and when you got that, why of course, you're that much closer to doing something about it.

Now, there's a couple of phenomena which have been observed and one of them is that later on, after proper terminals have been found and goals and terminals have been found in Routine 3, that later on you get nothing but constant blow of terminals. In other words, you try to find the terminals for that goal and you no more than find them and they blow. And then eventually you'll take a goal and you'll no more than find the goal than it will blow. Some of you have seen this happen. Some of you have experienced it.

Now, I'm trying here with this approach to move that phenomenon right up to the beginning of clearing, see. So we're doing nothing but blowing and we're never auditing, see. We're never auditing a *process* on these things, see. Just knock out auditing a process and just do it all by assessment. Well, that's the definite theoretical approach to this thing and that's what's hoped for.

All right. We know definitely that these things do blow. Well, all right. Let's move that up to the beginning of the case instead of experiencing it at the end. That's the effort here. And the other one is this: That a pc never feels better than when he has his goal and his first terminal. He just feels marvelous and many of you will agree with that. That's a marvelous

sensation to have those two things beautifully and accurately spotted and everything is fine. You feel great.

Well, now the second that you find a modifier and the second that you find an opposition terminal, you really never feel worse. You've had it right there at that point.

Well now, why is this? It's because you were coming away from the Goals Problem Mass in old Routine 3 clearing. You see, we're trying to push Routine 3 clearing straight on through the Goals Problem Mass, then there's no relapse of clearing. We're trying to push it through the lot, you see, so that you don't get a Keyed-Out Clear state but you get a Clear state that is absolutely straight through. All right.

Now, the modifier apparently has a lot to do with the oppterm, so why find it? You're going to find the oppterm in due sequence anyhow and it'll have to do with the modifier anyway, so why bother with it, see? It is associated with – I'm not saying that it is – but it's associated with the oppterm.

In other words, you find this terminal. You find this goal, you find this terminal. All right. It's the opposition terminal to the terminal you find that is going to turn up with the modifier. So the second we find the goal, if we then find the modifier, we key in the Goals Problem Mass and key it in hard.

Well, there's theoretically an easier way to key in the Goals Problem Mass and that is simply by finding the oppterm itself without finding any modifier. Because we don't need the modifier in order to find the oppterm. We're going to find the oppterm by complete listing.

Now, therefore, we've blown a piece off the GPM of magnitude. Now, if we find a new goal and we find a terminal for this new goal and then we oppterm it, we again snap the pc back in against the GPM, but we do it gently. And what we're doing is consistently chipping chunks off the GPM while clearing the person and theoretically, he shouldn't hit these heavy, steep dives.

Now, these items, when they start disintegrating and so forth, are hot and cold and electrical. And they are quite – quite an experience. And you can get somebody on a hot summer day shivering so his teeth rattle. These things are *cold*, man. Well, why are they cold? Well, why are they painful, why are they this, why are they that? Well, there's a lot of reasons, but to get an electrical standing wave into that condition takes some doing. It's hard to do. And it's got to be intolerably cold and intolerably hot and intolerably electrical and actually has to be all those three things to hang up. That's why they all don't hang up.

A person who's living his present life in southern California at this time is never really too hot and really never too cold, you see? And if they stay away from the mains plugs, why, they're seldom too electrical.

So if you were to go back in the future and find this life in southern California at all, it would simply be because it was hung up and associated with or keyed in, was keyed into a GPM that was too – an item that was too hot and too cold and too electrical, you see? In this lifetime, none of you have frozen to death. You haven't. You've been pretty cold, but none of you have frozen to death. I guarantee that. The best proof is you're here. See?

None of you have ever burned up. Well, you've been singed around the edges here and there, now and then, but the fact that you're sitting here right now shows that in this lifetime you haven't burned up, see?

And you haven't been killed by heavy voltage because in this lifetime you are still alive. But you have lived many lives, I assure you, in which you did freeze to death and in which you did burn up and got shocked in the bargain. It must have been fun.

You take a doll body, for instance, you consider rather precious. It goes 200 centigrade and a minus 175 centigrade. And you thought it was your old pal, Bill, as you walked around the corner and it wasn't. It was a Fourth Invader and at that moment, you got, oh, a few megawatts in the brisket. That kind of thing, don't you see?

You were minding your own business in this civilization and everything was fine and somebody dumped an atom bomb on you. See?

That's the kind of thing this sort of thing takes. It takes duresses. Duresses of magnitude. Now, you sit here and you know the limitations of the body you've got. And you know that if the temperature drops to 56, you shiver and if it goes to 82, why, you start getting too warm. Not much of a margin there, don't you see?

And somebody slips you 240 British volts, you say, "Yipe!" And you say that's a lot of jolt – 240 volts a jolt! Nonsense. I was holding onto 240 volts the other day and mostly had muscular kick to the thing. But with this body, I don't think I would take it up as a pastime. But it – you get hit sometime with a – oh, about two or three million volts and you'll see the difference.

Gormley Castle used to be down here. I was riding over to a tourney one day and was half-armed in a rainstorm – I had half steel armor on in a rain storm. The rest of it slung on the back of the horse. Brother with me and a groom and they had the rest of the armor. And so 'elp me, lightning 'it. And you know armor on wet ground makes the most marvelous conductor. Knocked me plumb silly, it did. Plumb silly. It's happened to me several times. But it – it's always you go sit down after a while and you say, "Oh, no," you know. You think about it. It preys on your mind. Some – that's something – it upsets you. It makes you absent-minded. It makes you flinch, and so forth.

I remember at that particular instance I rode right on to the castle and the grooms went out and got the bodies and my brother was still alive, but the groom was awful dead and laid the body on the bed. I stood there, you know and thought that was okay and went back over to Europe and walked in and – just shows you a guy goes *hnhh!* You know, I walked in and I fell over the old mither who was busy scrubbing the floor and of course, wet, you know, wet floor, you know and God! volts were coming up me like that, you know – and I step in her scrub bucket and walked through her and she gets a 'ell of a shock, you know. She says, "Coo, what's that?" you know or words to that effect. And go over to the table and sit down at the table and pick up my fist and look around and there's no mead, you know. Not a bit. It was about 1495, something like that. And so I pick up my fist and I start to say, "*Godderdammerung*, bring me in some mead," you know. And I go bang, you know and my fist goes straight through the table. And I say, "Wait a minute, boy... Oh, *no*, I'm dead." [laughter] Bright, moonlight night and there's a dog howling outside, so I walk out in the moonlight and decide

for the next 55 years I'll have to be a ghost. Well, it was a very shocking experience. [laughter] But you could get discombobulated and upset and not know what you were doing. I didn't. I went and picked up a baby or two, but ...

Anyhow, the point is, is it takes a lot more than you're even aware of confronting in order to pick up electronic masses and then keep mocking them up because, you see, they're so dangerous because you have to keep them mocked up, you see, because they're so dangerous, you see?

It's very logical. If you didn't keep them there, they're liable to get away, you see and blow your 'ead off, you know. So therefore you have to keep them created. You figure it out. You're the one that's been doing it mostly. But you see, if you didn't have that mass then some other mass would get you. Well, now, when you figure out that this particular incident I've been telling you about, which I consider rather amusing – I'm going to have to go down and – Gormley Castle one of these days and look and see if the old tilt field is still down there and so forth. I'd better not tell any of the Englishmen about it because they just used to raise hell around there, you know.

I committed enough overts that one day I was riding through there in about 1600, fell off the back of my horse, stone dead. Overt-motivator sequence caught up just like that.

There's no mass connected with that lightning. That's free track. You got an idea what I'm talking about? See. Well, look. If *that's* free track, what the hell is one of these masses? Well, they're that way.

Of course, earlier on the track, you had more horsepower. And you could keep more mocked up. You could stand up to more, so the violence is pretty terrific. And a pc hits these things and he turns ice cold, on the masses and hell keep telling you how cold he is and turn on the fire and you – God, you look at your watch and find out it's 90. And you – pc all of a sudden, he gets roaring red-hot. He is awful hot, terribly warm. But, the odd part of it is he less often gets warm than he gets cold because he's used the warmth of the mass time and time again. He's bled the warmth off of it, don't you see? But the coldness is less motional, so what's left as residue is the most motional mass so he is more likely to be cold. Now, he also gets electric whiz-whizzes going around one way or the other. You call these things somatics. And they'll come in odd patches of some kind or another. Well, that's all the GPM and its manifestations.

Now, the more gently you can pick this thing apart, the more comfortable the pc is. You can also drive the pc through it as though you were a Sherman tank leaving El Alamein, but you – it can be done, don't you see? But you get dented fenders. It's – it's one of those things, you know? And it can be sufficiently duressful. It wouldn't do anything drastic to your pc, but he gets very uncomfortable.

Now, 3D Criss Cross short-listed, improperly itemed, opptermmed the wrong way to and so forth, turns on such phenomena as ice-cold, red-hot and all you – you can't really bring yourself to go over and touch the light switch because it's liable to leap at you. You're sure of that.

So all of these data add up to the fact that we want a faster gain more comfortably for the pc. Now, you – the more sectionally you pick off the term and opterm of the GPM, the more comfortable the pc's going to be in the process. Okay?

Elementary – so far. Right?

But there's some more gains that come with it. And that is that you're going straight through to Clear because you'll be picking up the hearts of the masses in which the pc is stuck, most reliably. And you're going straight through and your improved gain will come out at the other end. Whereas that's not true of 3D Criss Cross. 3D Criss Cross is a roly coaster. Sometimes your lines are right and sometimes your lines are a bit off. And nevertheless you're making it, but at what cost – sometimes, you see. You – and an auditor can be dead wrong in this. He – the auditor can get awful knuckleheaded about this kind of thing.

The funny part of it is and – that apparently – and this has to be born out – that errors in 3D Criss Cross are probably most remediable by rerunning Routine 3 as 3G. Let's say you picked up "Who or what have you liked?" and you got no tone arm action, you list it as a short list and nulled it out with twenty-five repetitions of each item, ARC broke the pc into having only one item left and put that down and then optermed it. Well, you'll find out that this is less fundamental than the GPM and when you get a goal, theoretically, when you get a goal and you find its terminals, all of a sudden these others will blow off as locks. You'll run into these errors sooner or later and plow them out with a Routine 3G.

Now, what we have needed in doing Routine 3s – let's go into whys. What we have needed is for the auditor to know how to do it before he'd done it. And that has been very nearly impossible – because the weak end, the difficult end, the end he's going to have trouble with, is the end he starts on, i.e., a goals list. Goals lists are hard to do. Because this person's goals have always been invalidated and because the GPM is only hung up because the goal has been invalidated, the invalidations of goals is almost the common denominator. It is one of the common denominators of every item in the Goals Problem Mass. And the common denominator of it, of course, attracts the overt-motivator of it.

And you're sitting there and you dare look cross-eyed while you're reading off "I want to wear hats," you see. You say, "I want to wear hats" and you all of a sudden look a little odd for a second and that invalidates that, you see. And the pc – you've got a missed withhold right there – and there we go, see. Now, you can list hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of goals with the rudiments out and you can null and scrunch and batter and with the rudiments out and rough auditing and so forth – go around just trying to find a goal.

Now, we've had a number of units over in the States and in Australia and so forth which were trying to find goals on one another. And they were making it within about six weeks on some of them. This was an heroic performance. It was rough! But it was only rough because the auditors were rough. We were having to train the auditor to do it on something that can only be done if the auditor's perfect. Well, it gets idiotic, isn't it, you see? It's one of these things – you only get one chance. See, you can bust a pc up eight ways from the middle and it takes a real expert to put the pc back together again.

You string this wire from the Empire State Building to the Chrysler Building. And you hand the person – the auditor – a wobbly-wheeled bicycle. And you see, he's never had any

other wire. There's never been any wire on the ground. As a matter of fact, he's never even had a bicycle on the ground, you see. And you say, "Okay, son. Now, just – just ride along that wire over to the Chrysler Building. You'll find it's very easy." And, you know, he shakes. He – he does. He – and very often picks himself off of Madison Avenue or somewhere as a spot. I'd say 95 percent of the time he picked himself off the lower avenue as a grease spot.

They just don't do it. You say, "Find the goal." *Nyuuuh*. See, it takes terrifically smooth, letter-perfect auditing. Where has he had a chance to accumulate a Routine 3 perfectly smooth, letter-perfect activity? Well, he hasn't – in the past, but he can now because we can do a Routine 3D Criss Cross and he can make mistakes and makes pcs uncomfortable and find out what complete lists are and how the meter operates and get practice running Model Sessions, getting off missed withholds and invalidations and making everything run at once and he feels less like a one-man band who's had its arms and legs cut off. He can get used to it.

So the pc blows his stack a few times. All right. Let him find out how to patch things up with missed withholds. He's doing a lousy job, the auditor is, but still the pc finds out eventually. "Hey, what do you know, I found the wrong item and opptermed it and so on and picked up the missed withholds and the pc said it was all right. What do you know about this?", you know? And he gets on top of auditing.

Now, Prepchecking is a good school to learn how to do the meter and so forth, but it still doesn't prepare you all the way to go through all of the one-man band actions, of finding a list and nulling it and finding the item and checking it out and all that. It just doesn't. That's a specialized activity. Well, you've got 3D Criss Cross which in itself is quite valid as an activity, if done right. Yeah, just let the – let the person go on.

Now, the best way to get somewhere near the GPM is with the Prehav Scale. The Prehav Scale will get you shallowly near the GPM. A goal will get you much closer in to the GPM, you see, but a goal is not something you're going to let the fellow tamper with till he learns how, see? So we're going to eliminate our little Abe – can't go swimming until he learns how – out of this thing, you see and turn the auditor loose on 3D Criss Cross.

We have a perfectly valid process then which can be used as a training procedure, which I think is wonderful. Because there's really no difference to nulling a goals list than nulling any other list. There is no real difference, except that the goals list is fantastically vulnerable to invalidation and bad auditing. It requires tremendously adroit listing and handling.

Well, the toughness of a – of a 3D Criss Cross list will stand up to it. You've only got one chance at the pc's goals list. Of course, you've got lots of chances at 3D Criss Cross masses. You can get item after item, you see?

You understand now, that if you get the right Prehav Scale – that's all these Auxiliary Prehav Scales – you get a right level, if you list that properly. If you get the practice of completing the list and then oppterming it and completing that list and so forth, you're liable to get a blow occasionally. I mean a blow of the two items. It's liable to be all smooth as grease. But if you missed, you're just going to make the pc uncomfortable – total liability. You haven't done any irremediable harm because you could probably either straighten out that, that you did wrong or eventually you take the pc over into Routine 3G type of assessment and it blows

the whole thing out. In other words, all those items and everything are all going to be appended to this and that and the other thing and that's all going to blow out anyway. So you got a remedy which is below the level of intermediate remedies.

So you can teach somebody to do 3D Criss Cross and the case will make progress and everything is fine and so forth. And you get a chance to look at them sadly and say, "Well, Betty, do you think five items is going to make a complete list?" you know? "See if you can get six." And the auditor is saying, "Four or five hundred items on the list. How could you ever get through that many items? I mean look at the paper, you know, and – gosh!"

You know, well, goals list of six or seven hundred goals. Well, so what? The – you get to that point finally where you're used to doing lists and so on. It doesn't matter how long the lists are. You can take a six hundred goal list. So what? See? That's nothing. Null it down – not ARC break it out and null it down. And it goes astray, put it back together again, hook it up right and so forth. In other words, he's able to do it, now. He's able to swim after he's learned how. He's able to ride this bicycle from the Empire State Building to the Chrysler Building quite easily since he's been riding it only a couple of feet above the ground for some time, see? That's just the difference of approach.

And we're very rich in having a training process which gets benefits for the pc and which will only make the pc too cold or too hot or too damned electrical. Or it'll sometimes turn on a chronic somatic and the pc will go around with an awful cold – easily explained – because, of course, everybody is having a cold these days. And you get a mass half in-out of his ear or something of the sort and he has a horrendous earache. Well, try to keep him from going and seeing the osteopath or something. He's not suffering from oral lumbosis. He's simply suffering from – he – all – all he's suffering from is the wrong item oppterm, complicated with missed withholds. That's exactly all he's suffering from.

Well, the end product of this is a trained auditor and a working procedure.

Now, you'd be surprised how adroit you have to be to get a goal. Only when you can do listing easily and do a complete list, a nice complete list and get all the items properly off of it and find the final item and oppterm that nicely. Oh, when you can go through all those operations, because it is very easy to take a complete list of goals and go down the line and knock that off. But you will find even then that it requires a little more adroitness. Goals go out like that.

Before you – well, Prepchecking gets you heavy reads. You're very often a quarter-of-a-dial on a fall, you see and sometimes even a dial and I've seen stuff struck on an E-Meter which was 16 consecutive dial drops, see. So there's heavy drops.

All right. Now, on 3D Criss Cross you get used to reading something that's – that may be as little as a quarter of a division. Oh yeah, a tiny little division like that and a goal could very well come out reading a 32nd of a division. We're reading with a microscope. It can read very little and go in and out just *bing-bang, bing-bang, bing-bang*. Just in and out like that. It's reading very nicely. You're saying, "To sell apples. To sell apples. Is there an invalidation on this?" *Ping!*

"All right. What was that? All right. Thank you very much. Have I missed a withhold on you? Oh, yes. Well, thank you. All right. Thank you. Have I missed a withhold on you? That's clean. Yeah, all right. Fine. To sell apples. To sell apples. To sell – Is there an invalidation?" [laughter] Man, it's like sorting yourself through – through the labyrinth, you know. You've got to be pretty good.

And before, with any Routine 3 process, you took an auditor totally green and you threw him into the soup and the pc went into the soup right after him – 1350 and they still haven't found the pc's goal. How he ever found any is miraculous.

Now, therefore, Routine 3G is 3G because of goals. It's a Routine 3, employing goals. But it also employs several different principles. And the principle is that listing is auditing and that we're going to do our auditing by listing. So we cut out the impatience of it all. "Well, let's find something so we can audit it." This we're not interested in. The listing is the auditing.

When we find the item, we're going to oppterm it. And when we oppterm it, we hope if all is well, that we will get a small ping and perhaps we will. This is still susceptible to a bit of speculation. Perhaps we'll get a bit, perhaps this will become invariable. And, we get *ping* and the oppterm – we found it and then all of a sudden we can't find it. And there's no charge on the oppterm list and we can't find the terminal and we can't find the goal. And, of course, we turn right back and find a new goal, a new terminal and a new oppterm. Just that repetitive cycle. That's the cycle we hope for. We'll try everything we can to make that come true.

But here's this "listing is auditing" as a principle. Now that's a brand-new principle so you shouldn't really care how long your list is. But that your lists are so long – remember, don't lose your speed and adroitness. You've got to be able to list rapidly and handle the pc rapidly and keep the rudiments in rapidly and all these things have to be done. Otherwise this becomes an activity of months and months and months because you're handling tremendous numbers of items. So its – you have to pick up the adroitness and facility by which you can sit down and list 300 items, keep the pc talking, keep the missed withholds off, so the – three quarters of the session isn't blown because of the pc's boiling off. You can even knock out a comm lag probably with missed withholds. And you're not stopping the pc all the time, you know and you'll get down to where you developed a knack of making a pc give you a list – staying broad awake and giving you a list and plowing right on down the line. Well, that would make good auditing, see? And then you get the knack of a – of testing. How do you test this thing – how do you find out if it is complete and so forth. How do you get used to that? And now nulling it ought to be as easy as pie. A list ought to go out *bzzzt*.

When you're able to do all that and oppterm it and do all that sort of thing, when you're able to do that with 3D Criss Cross, when you get over to 3G, you'll find out that it isn't all that easy to get that goals list. That's all right. The pc can write it out of session and all that sort of thing and you can complete it in session and you can go through those ramifications, but you'll find it's far more susceptible to shift an invalidation – than to – and it's greasier. It's greasier. Now, it's here and now it isn't here. It's more susceptible to sporadic reads and all of that kind of thing. And, you spend more time, "Is there an invalidation on this item and..."

thank you. Now, Ill check that again. Is there invalidation on this item? That's clear. Thank you very much."

All right. And now you go ahead with the item and so forth and all of a sudden why, this has gotten a needle pattern. "Have I missed a withhold on you?" You see? You pick up the missed withhold. "Thank you very much." Needle pattern disappears. "Ill ask that again. Have I missed a withhold on you? That's clear. Thank you." And you go on from there. Don't you see? And you work at it and it takes pretty – it's pretty slippery. It requires a pretty slippery auditor in order to get a goal easily and hold it there. This is what I've learned about Routine 3 activities.

Routine 3 was never defeated by its own successfulness or its own potential – its own technology. The technical facts of Routine 3 are still technically accurate. They are – they are there. What defeated Routine 3 was lousy metering, incomplete Model Sessions. We didn't have all of the rudiments necessary. We didn't have missed withholds to hold the thing in-session. We didn't have the Mark IV meter, tremendous item there – all in one piece. We had meters that were reading electronically but were not reading the mind. Marvelous, you know. And we didn't have a lot of things that we have now in order to punch this thing along. And basically we hadn't grooved in and insisted on the auditor doing a perfect procedure.

And now today we can say what a perfect procedure is and an auditor can do a perfect procedure, so therefore Routine 3 would be as workable today as it ever had. The Routine 3 did have one technical liability. It is that you could tip into the Goals Problem Mass and then separate one item off the Goals Problem Mass and then blow it out sideways and you'd get a key-out without having approached the remainder of the Goals Problem Mass.

Well, by oppterming, we continually prevent this from happening without caving the pc in. So this thing has become feasible. Auditing this is very simple and all I actually expect an auditor to know how to do perfectly is his TRs, Model Session, his E-Metering and to know exactly what he's supposed to do as he comes down the line with listing and testing and so forth. That – that's all, you see?

That is not very much in actual fact. If he can do these things perfectly, then the – he can read a meter perfectly, he'd soon get used to finding out what an invalidation looks like and what it doesn't look like and what a needle pattern that suddenly turns on looks like and how to turn it off. He'll learn all of these things rather easily. Then learning through Routine 3D Criss Cross, how to handle lists, why, he should then be able to turn over to the Tartar of all Tartars – goals lists. Be able to find a pc's goal and really sail.

That's the approach. We're rich in a tremendous amount of technology. Basically, if we had just used the technology or been able to use the technology we had when we were doing Routine 3, that would have been quite successful, too. But not realizing the amount of flub there was on the existing technology, of course, I went for broke and straightened out all the rudiments and got a little complete Model Session and figured out all the elements and added up anything that could go wrong and what caused ARC breaks and you know, just solved a tremendous number of technical problems in order to make it come out straight. This ought to be like falling off a log, if you – if you learn how to do it.

And it doesn't require any freak solutions. You don't have to get very imaginative about this. But you have to be very precise and you have to audit the pc that's there – right there in front of you. That's the pc you audit. And if you do all of that, why, you'll make a good show of it.

There's no sense in trying to do any of these things if you're still having trouble with a meter – obviously. If you're still gagging on Model Session, if your TRs are wildly out, if you don't know how to conduct a two-way comm, if you – inevitably he says, "Well, I don't know. Yes, I do have a present time problem. I had a fight with my mother this morning."

And you say, "What was the fight about?" And you wonder why you never get anyplace with a case, you see? It's these little things. And it's being able to audit the pc who is sitting right there in front of you. You be very careful and double check everything, you know. You're not quite sure that the – "Yes, is there invalidation on that item?" you know? And "Let me check that again. Is there an invalidation on that item? All right. That's clean." See?

In other words, an auditor first gets terribly obsessed with making an awfully good show of it. You know? With something like the drum majorettes from the University of San Antonio, you know – or something – he's going to make a terribly good show of it. Hasn't anything to do with a pc, you know. But he's going to make an awfully good show of it and he knows he's only supposed to ask once, he thinks, you know and his "Now-I'm-supposed-to's" catch up with him, you see. And he'll actually fake through. You know, he says, "Well, have I missed a withhold on you? Thank you. That's – that's clear." [demonstrates something – laughter]

And he thinks it'd look awfully clumsy on his part or revelatory or something if he – if he said, "Have I missed a withhold on you? I'll repeat that. Have I missed a withhold on you?"

"Oh, well, yeah."

"All right. What's that now?"

See, he didn't catch it the first time. He thinks he'll look – he's so anxious to look good that he stinks. You get somebody coming into session there, man, you can just hear the high tension going through his power lines, you know. Hasn't anything to do with the pc. And all of a sudden then, he starts – he finds out he can ride the bicycle. And after that, why, he audits the pc in front of him. He does it rapidly. He does it well and he knows what he's doing and so on. But we've got the processes necessary by which he can integrate his knowledge without killing the pc. And who knows, he might even someday do the pc some good. So that's quite valuable, quite valuable to have a training routine for a senior routine. And it's what we've needed for some time. And I'm very happy about it.

I don't say that Routine 3G will remain exactly as it is under the gun and under inspection as you've done it because you haven't yet begun to make mistakes. That's always a necessary part of it, you know? You haven't yet begun to make mistakes. There are certain things – will get explained. The only thing I try to have happen is let's not – let's not have to explain so many things that nobody can recognize Routine 3G when we get through, see. That often happens.

I found out that auditors in doing lists, so very often – short lists – so very often pick up a sporadic reading item. That it is the commonplace, not the oddity. It is the commonplace for an item that is finally found to be reading three times out of eight – three times out of five, I'll be kinder. "Well, I've got the item. Yes, it reads, reads every – *hauh*. Well, it's because of course he has overts on you, Instructor. The reason it didn't check out is actually I didn't really clean his overts off on you. You – it's all clean with me, you see and so it worked out with *me* all right, you see, but when *you* checked him out, then, you see, the rudiments were out with you and that's why it was reading sporadically, you know?"

That's all part of the auditor trying to look good. After he ceases – tries so doggone hard to look good, which is symptomatic though of the process of learning, he starts all of a sudden to do a whale of a job. It – all that counts to him – it's not whether he looks good or not. It's whether or not the item is the item. See, that's what's important. It's whether or not the list was complete. It's whether or not the oppterm fitted. It's whether or not the pc wound up at the end of session bright and sassy.

You see, all these things are the important things to him. But he gets out the importances first and of course the first important part of training is to get the, just the standard action of being able to sit there and look at the E-Meter – down, you know? Sit there and look at the E-Meter without putting yourself on the cans instead of the pc or something like that, you know? "I had a wonderful session today. A wonderful session today. It was the pc held the cans, see. And we got – we got the session really started. Eleven o'clock at night and it's still going, but we got the session really started. I really got him in-session, you know." Big game. Big win.

"This pc was willing to talk to me after the session. This is the first time this ever happened to me as an auditor." You know wins, wins of various kinds. Now, I'm not really being sarcastic. Auditing can get that grim. Auditing is terribly simple. There is a response for every situation that you can get into in auditing today that will get you out of that situation. We are not grasping in the dark and we don't require freak solutions. It isn't now that we're trying to wind everybody up like dolls, but we've actually got it there and when the auditor gets certain that he has the answers, he can sit there in a relaxed frame of mind and he really sees things and he really audits and everything whizzes.

Auditing, by the way, around the world is succeeding. It's much better, infinitely better after a year of training here at Saint Hill than it has *ever* been in the past without any slightest doubts whatsoever. And the Saint Hill graduates who have gone back home and raised hell and for the most part have brought tremendous gains in, in auditing. And the stuff coming through on the lines today – the reports coming back from HGCs and so on – are much superior to what they had been in the past. But there is still tremendous room for improvement and of course you're the crew who will bring the next big surge of improvement, so work well on it.

Thank you.

TV DEMO: PREPCHECKING, PART I

An auditing demonstration
given on 2 May 1962

LRH: Okay. Have a seat. Shut the door.

There we go.

PC: *They can see me?*

LRH: Yeah, sit forward. Way up. Attagirl. Attagirl. Now, here we are. Make sure I got a pencil. Now, a little bit over here – puts a strain on the situation. I hope that's all right with you.

PC: *Oh, sure.*

LRH: You probably wonder why you are here.

PC: *I am consumed with curiosity.*

LRH: Well, actually, you are here because you've had a continuing present time problem.

PC: *O-o-o-oooh.*

LRH: And a bunch of alleged – . What's the date? 2 May.

PC: *Alleged?*

LRH: Alleged prepchecking was done on you, and I've just given a lecture on missed withholds...

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: ... and I just want to show people how awful easy it is. You know, if people would just relax about the thing, you know, and just do it, it'd all be all right. But they don't. They manage to do everything else. Well, here we are at 8:24. Now, see what your tone arm is reading here. Oh, it isn't very bad. That's about 2.4, at sensitivity 16. All right. Now, what we're going to do is very, very simple. All I'm going to do is locate some of the missed withholds everybody has been playing tag with, you see, and that they've been having a marvelous time with.

PC: *That's fine.*

LRH: And we're going to straighten this out. But the truth of the matter is that – apparently, whoever was giving you a Prepcheck was missing on most cylinders. I mean, I don't care if whoever sits there and hears me, you know? I mean, there's a – this is, you know, I mean...

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: ... this is just an oh-my-God situation, see?

Now, there's more to all this than everybody is doing, you understand? And

it's also simpler. So we're going to straighten this out if we can. We'll see what luck we have.

PC: *That's fine.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I want to find out, too.*

LRH: Why, you – you'll find out. All right. Okay. So, here we go. Is it all right with you if I start this session now?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right, here it is. Start of session! Okay. Has the session started for you?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

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

PC: *Well, to find the missed withholds!*

LRH: All right. Good. Any other goal you'd like to set for this session?

PC: *Yeah, to get the PTP handled.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *To get the PTP handled.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That's enough.*

LRH: All right. Is that enough?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. Any goals you'd like to set for life or livingness?

PC: *Yeah. I want to get through the – make a concerted effort to study and get through this stupidity ridge I'm sitting in on the...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... material.*

LRH: Any other goal you'd like to set for life or livingness?

PC: *No. That's enough. Mm.*

LRH: All right. That's it. All right, good. Now, here we go. Now, look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. I got a little tick there. What do you...

PC: *I noticed the picture. Everywhere I go, I see that picture.*

LRH: Oh, yeah. Yeah. All right. Okay. Now, look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. There's just one little tick left there. Anything else about this room? That's it. That's it.

PC: *Mm. Just noticing the bed.*

LRH: Hmm. That's it.

PC: *Not anything special about it.*

LRH: All right. It's going kick on it.

PC: *Is it?*

LRH: Yeah. It did. What's about that bed?

PC: *Rather out of place in this room.*

LRH: It's out of place.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Good enough.

PC: *Belongs in a bedroom.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Very good. Okay. Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. That's fine. Thank you very much.

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: That's clear now. All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. There's just one little slightly latent tick on that, you might say.

PC: *Mm. Well, I – I – it's difficult for me to reach for you.*

LRH: Oh, there is...

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: ... oh, it is. All right. Okay. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: That's fine. That came out. That's clear now. All right. Are you withholding anything. I got a tick there.

PC: *Just more of the same. I've got so many overts on you that I tend to individuate, is...*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *My ineffectiveness on dissemination.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Well, right this minute, are you withholding anything?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Thank you very much. Are you – now, let me see if this is clear.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Are you withholding anything? Well, that's pretty good. There's just the tiniest tick there now.

PC: *Hmmmm.*

LRH: Just the tiniest tick. You might – what's that? Right – right now, just right this minute, are you withholding anything?

PC: *No, there isn't anything I'm not willing to talk to you about. There's a whole gob of stuff, of course, that I...*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *... got rattling around.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But not withholding anything from you.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Let me test this again.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Are you withholding anything? Well, we've got that clear enough. It's nothing but a latent read on it.

PC: *Mm. Good-o.*

LRH: Okay. Now, do you have a present time problem? That's –

PC [giggles]

LRH: I get nothing – an equivocal registry on this, very latent.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: But what are you laughing about there particularly?

PC: *Well, just, I've got a chronic PTP.*

LRH: All right. But right now, aside from that chronic PTP, do you have a present time problem?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. There's a little tick there. There's just a little tick there. What is your problem right this minute that...

PC: *Well, a little bit of a hope that this session comes out so it's real instructive for the students.*

LRH: Oh, well! I'm not – we're not running this session, you know, for the students. That's all right.

PC: *I – I know. But I – they feel very close right now.*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *They're almost in the room.*

LRH: That's fine. And that's what you...

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: ... what you thought of there.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Thank you. All right. Do you have a present time problem?

PC: *No.*

LRH: That's dandy. That – that – oh, I don't know. There was just – there's just one little other tick there. I said "dandy," but a little bit too soon.

PC: *Yeah, well, I do have a problem with the course. I could put my attention on the course at this time and uh...*

LRH: Mm-mm. Mm-mm.

PC: *I just – an awful difficulty in passing material.*

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

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Do you have a present time problem? Well, there's an infinitesimal flick. We're getting it cut right down now. There's just an infinitesimal flick before a latent flick.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: There's two flicks here.

PC: *Uh – well.*

LRH: All right. Now, what might that be?

PC: *Well, am I going to be terminated next week without a classification? That...*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *... that's the problem.*

LRH: No, you were already extended, I think. That's uh...

PC: *Oh, was I?*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Oh, good-o.*

LRH: We weren't worried about that.

PC: *Yeah. Well, that...*

LRH: All right. Instructions were that people that this caught with only two or three weeks to go, and so forth – they got extended.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: It was automatic. All right. Let me check this again.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Okay? All right. Do you have a present time problem?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Well, we've got this awfully, awfully cut down, but there is just a little hair there.

PC: *Well, this could go into the chronic PTP, actually, because this is what I've got keyed in.*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *It's how do I get effective enough to do something about my marriage and do something about dissem – dissemination. It's just the whole ball of wax.*

LRH: Hmm, hmm, hmm. All right. This is a constant worry to you?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right. Now, aside from that PTP, which we're going to take up here anyway...

PC: *Yeah, I know. That's...*

LRH: ... do you have a present time problem?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. I still get a tick.

PC: *Well, see, the course is part of this one because...*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *... this is where I hope to get effective enough to do something about my livingness.*

LRH: All right. All right. All right.

PC: *And that's the only thing that is worrying me.*

LRH: Mm-mm. All right. Okay. Let me check it again. Do you have a present time problem? I've got a tiny flick. Right this minute. Now, I'm not talking

about – . Now, we're going to take up your...

PC: *Yeah, I know.*

LRH: ... husband and the course and dissemination.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: We're going to take all that up. But, right here, right now – right now – do you have a present time problem?

PC: *No.*

LRH: That's it. Thank you. All right. I'm going to let that ride...

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: ... because we got it clean as a whistle. [PC sighs of relief] Okay?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Now, I would like to do a little Prepchecking on you, if that's all right with you. What would you say to that?

PC: *That's fine.*

LRH: All right. Here we go. First thing I've got to do is look at your folder.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: And we seem to have been racking up a lot of O/Ws on the course and O/Ws, O/Ws, O/Ws. Well, O/Ws aren't missed withholds and they aren't problems. Well, you got a lot of stuff here about snakes. No, nothing marked null on that. And destroying plants, and snakes and – Somebody is having a ball here one way or the other. Wonder how far afield you can get. That hasn't anything to do with it. Let's get into something here. Let's get into something here, shall we?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Now, you got a present – chronic present time problem about your –

not trying to upset your auditor or anything like that, if your auditor is hearing all of this. It's not he. This started with your auditor earlier.

PC: *Oh.*

LRH: And it's been going adrift, and all I'm going to get into is I understand you have a chronic present time problem now that has to do with your marriage and your husband and so forth. Is that right?

PC: *Mm. Actually, part of it is Bill and Donna, too, of the Scientology Center.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *It's all one big ball of wax, really.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *It's all big bunch – big – one big bunch of wax and glue, like.*

LRH: All right. Now, were you having trouble with your husband before you had trouble with this Center?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Oh, you only had it since.

PC: *Actually, it all started at the same time. You see, I met my husband through the – Bill and Donna.*

LRH: Oh, you met your husband through here.

PC: *It all started...*

LRH: I see. Well, we get a fall here on the Center.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: We don't get much of a fall on your husband.

PC: *Yeah. But that's the problem.*

LRH: How about your husband?
No.

PC: *Well...*

LRH: All right. And how about the Center? Well, you're thinking about something else, now.

PC: *I am?*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Well, I actually don't feel that the problem with my husband is acute anymore because oh...*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *... I can separate this one out.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *It's actually Scien – Scientology is my problem.*

LRH: Oh!

PC: *How do I disseminate effectively?*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *You're part of it.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Okay. And how long has this been a problem?

PC: *Mm, actually, it's been a problem since 55.*

LRH: Hmm? 55. Earlier? Earlier than 55? Yeah.

PC: 50.

LRH: 50? Was the problem in 50?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Yeah. We're getting a fall now.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. This predates this Center, huh?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. What about 50?

PC: *Well, that...*

LRH: Spring of 50?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Summer?

PC: *It was in late September, early October when I met – read the first book.*

LRH: All right. September, October. Okay. Did you have some auditing sessions at that time?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *That's when I went into Jack-ins', because he was my first Instructor.*

LRH: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Well, I well know this particular combination.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Now, what we're going to do here is we're going to operate on a Zero question. And let me just test two or three Zero questions here.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right?

PC: *That's fine.*

LRH: I'm going to say, has an auditor ever failed to find out something about you? All right. That's not it. What should have been found out about you? All right. What should have been found out about you? Have you ever failed to find out about something? What should have been found out about you? Well, that seems to have a little reaction there. All right. So we're going to put that down as

the Zero, in spite of the fact that it starts with *what*.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And what should have found – been found out about you? What should have been found out about you? That's it. [writes something down]

All right. Now, we're referring clear back to September? Something like that? October?

PC: *October.*

LRH: It's October.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: October 1950.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: And what should have been found out about you at that time?

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *Well, that I was – actually didn't have – well, I – I was – I was stupid. That's – that's my biggest problem, is my stupidity.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Very good. And did your stupidity get you into some trouble at that time? Nope.

PC: *Uh-uh.*

LRH: Well, who failed to find out about this?

That's it.

PC: *Well, Jackins.*

LRH: Jackins? Jackins? Oh, you'll have to come again.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Who was it? Who was it? You've got him. Who was it?

PC: *Well, I'm looking at Jimmy.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *My – my first husband, Jimmy.*

LRH: Jimmy? All right. Was it Jimmy? Jimmy? We got a little halt on that. Jimmy? Jimmy.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Anybody ever ask any Prepcheck question on Jimmy?

PC: *Overt-withhold on him.*

LRH: No.

PC: *Not Prepchecking, no.*

LRH: Anybody ever ask you any Prepcheck questions about Jimmy?

PC: *I – "a husband", actually. Not Jimmy. Yeah, I think they did. I think Ava did.*

LRH: Mm-hm. When was that?

PC: *When Prepchecking first started here.*

LRH: Mmm.

PC: *It generalized into "what have you – What did you do to a husband?" "What have you done to a husband?"*

LRH: Well, what did he fail to find out about you in October of 1950?

PC: *Well...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *Yeah. That I was uh – hmm – using, actually, Dianetics to uh – I – I – I...*

LRH: You got it.

PC: *... I get real confused what I did.*

LRH: All right. Come on.

PC: *Um...*

LRH: You got it. Using Dianetics...

PC: *Well actually, to establish – a beingness that couldn't be made less of.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *This.*

LRH: All right. All right. What did he fail to find out? What did Jimmy fail to find out there?

PC: *Well, that I didn't consider myself anything.*

LRH: Ah, I see.

PC: *That's what I'm hung up in. I...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... I totally make nothing of myself...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... really.*

LRH: All right. Is that October of 1950?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. There we go. Hotter than a pistol. Okay. Okay, now, well, who was this an overt against?

PC: *Well, Jimmy.*

LRH: All right. And just what did you do to Jimmy there?

PC: *Well, I learned Sci – Dianetics at that time. I got to understanding it better than he...*

LRH: Yeah...

PC: *... and using it as a – "I am smarter than you are."*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I do that to Charlie, too.*

LRH: Yeah, yeah, yeah. All right.

PC: *But I did that to Jimmy.*

LRH: Okay. And what did you do there specifically?

PC: *I took the first course under Jackins and learned about Dianetics. Learned to audit.*

LRH: All right. All right. All right. But what did you do to Jimmy there, specifically?

PC: *Well, I made him take the course with me.*

LRH: All right. That's it. Go on.

PC: *...oh. But just a feel that – was using, then, Dianetics to solve him.*

LRH: To do what?

PC: *To solve him.*

LRH: Oh, I see. Well, now we're back to what didn't he find out there?

PC: *Well, he didn't find out that I – that I thought – that I thought he was more able than I was. I would always put out that I was – was more able...*

LRH: Yeah...

PC: *... than he was.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And I never let him know that I considered myself inferior to him.*

LRH: All right. All right. Good enough. Good enough. Now, what did you do that he failed to find out?

PC: *Nm.*

LRH: That's it. That's it.

PC: *Well, I read the first book.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *But then he found about – out about that later.*

LRH: Yeah, but what did you do, specifically? Come on. What did you do specifically? You must have done something there.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: The needle isn't falling on...

PC: *Reading the first book, you mean?*

LRH: ... nothing. No. I mean, the needle isn't falling on nothing here.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: This needle is falling on something. And it's doing rather steep, repetitive falls every time you think over this situation. So what did you do? You must have done something. Now, what did you do?

PC: *That he didn't know about.*

LRH: Yeah!

PC: *That he didn't find out about it.*

LRH: That's right. He never found out about it that time.

PC: *Well, see, this is why it's difficult for me because I would do it and then it was a get-even-with?*

LRH: All right.

PC: *So he – he always knew what I did, but I – well, he didn't know it was a get – yeah, he knew it was a get-even-with, too.*

LRH: All right. Good. Good. That's fine. But what – what did you do? You see, you're mostly telling me attitudes...

PC: *Yes, I know.*

LRH: ... you've had, do you understand? I want to know something you did that he never found out about. That's it.

PC: *Any time? You mean later than...*

LRH: I don't care when it was.

PC: ... *when? Well...*

LRH: Tell me what it was.

PC: ... *well, okay. I – I did stuff that he didn't find out. Later, though. You see, I went into a promiscuity bit later, after I left him, that he didn't find – ever find out about.*

LRH: All right. All right. All right.

PC: *But this was later than...*

LRH: All right. And earlier, what did you do that he didn't find out about? I want a specific instance here.

PC: *Earlier.*

LRH: I don't care when. You just give me one.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: A specific thing that you did – that *you* did, you know...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: ... *did*, actually did...

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: ... with your paws and your head and your hands and you. You know?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: You know, that you did that he never found out about – that Jimmy never found out about. That's it.

PC: *I don't have anything. I'm just...*

LRH: Da-da-da-da.

PC: ... *looking.*

LRH: That's it right there. Right there.

PC: *Oh?*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *It is? I've got an area of time, but I don't have a doingness.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *I've got an area of time, but not a doingness.*

LRH: All right. It's right in that area of time.

PC: *This is in Oklahoma, in 1943, when I – before I married him.*

LRH: All right. Go on. Go on.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: You've got it taped. What did you – that's it, right there.

PC: *I did. Something I did. I had...*

LRH: Mm-hm! That's it. You – you're right on it. You're right on it.

PC: *Well, I had some intentions to – well, I did – trap him. I gonna – you know?*

LRH: Is that something you did?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Did he find – I don't think he ever found out about that.*

LRH: And he never found out about it?

PC: *I don't think so.*

LRH: All right. And now, go over this further. What did you specifically do?

PC: *Well, I slept with him, as a trap.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I actually, I used up my virginity at that point to trap him.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *This is – this is the – the biggest overt I have on Jimmy.*

LRH: And what's the overt there?

PC: *Just, I was a virgin and this flipped him. You see, he seduced me at that point, and I – and that hung him up.*

LRH: I see. I see. All...

PC: *I intended to use it, you see...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... as a trap.*

LRH: What did – how do you state this now? Exactly what did you do?

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Do, you know. Not thought or intended. What did you do? What did you do, specifically?

PC: *Well...*

LRH: That's – you're getting there.

PC: *Yeah, I...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *Well, I don't know how to state it so that it makes a good One question.*

LRH: Well, you let me make up the One question.

PC: [laughs] *Yeah. Let's see.*

LRH: You make – you let me audit this, huh?

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Just because you haven't been audited lately, why, this doesn't say you're not being audited now.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Let's go now. What did you do?

PC: *Well, the – the – the nearest I can come to it – and this sounds maudlin – but like I saved myself, you know?*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *Like, I stayed a virgin...*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *... to trap a man.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I had every intention all this life to do that.*

LRH: All right. Okay. All right. You're getting – you're getting there. It's ticking in.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: I acknowledge you did that.

PC: *Yes. Okay.*

LRH: All right. I acknowledge you did that. I'm just driving it down...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: ... in time, in a specific instance, at a specific moment.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: An act. An actual act, not an intention. I want an act. What did you do?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: That's right. Now you're rocking on it. That's it.

PC: *Well, that isn't very much of an act, though, you know? I mean it was...*

LRH: I don't care. What is the act?
There it is.

PC: *Well...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *... to use this. I've come out like a doingsness though. It's an intention.*

LRH: I don't care how it comes out like.

PC: *Well, just – I – I...*

LRH: You just tell me what you did and I'll take it from there.

PC: *Okay. I spotted Jimmy in the environment, and I decided he was the man I was going to trap by sleeping with him, and then I was going to marry him.*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *Was an intention to marry him.*

LRH: All right. Good. That's fine. And you got the tick there. And what did you do?

PC: *I slept with him.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And you slept with him with what intention?

PC: *To marry him.*

LRH: To marry him?

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: Or to trap him?

PC: *No. It just – that's the same.*
[laughs]

LRH: Oh, is that the same?

PC: *That's the same to me, yes.*

LRH: That's the same. All right.

PC: *Marriage is a trap, yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It's a trap.*

LRH: What about sleeping with a man to trap him, huh?

PC: *Well, this is fine except he's the only one I did this life.*

LRH: All right. That's all right.
[writes something down]

PC: *Well, the earliest one I did, I should say.*

LRH: That's my girl.

PC: *Yeah, that's the earliest one this life.*

LRH: That's a little more honest.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. And we've got our What. All right. And that isn't – nobody is doing anything accusative here. But you see, I operate very funny, Dorothy. I think it's what people do, not what they intend to do, that makes a Prepcheck.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And, of course, I know that's novel.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: I know – I know that's a novel theory. Look-a-here now. You've got an incident here. Is that right?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Now, when was that exactly?

PC: *Uh – that was in uh...*

LRH: That's a girl.

PC: *... well, May...*

LRH: That's a girl.

PC: *... of 1943.*

LRH: All right. That gives a nice little bing there.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Very good. May of 1943.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: We're back here in 43. Right?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. And where was that specifically?

PC: *Norman, Oklahoma.*

LRH: Norman, Oklahoma.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I was in the navy.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *I was in the navy.*

LRH: Is that a girl? All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, what should have appeared there and didn't?

PC: *... Hmm ... I know something that shouldn't have appeared.*

LRH: All right. What was that?

PC: *Well, my girlfriend.*

LRH: Aha. She did appear, huh?

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Hey, now. Very good. Very good. And who didn't find out about it?

PC: *That she – you mean about her appearance or the incident?*

LRH: Well, no, just who didn't find out about the incident?

PC: *Oh. My mother!*

LRH: Ah, your mother didn't.

PC: *My mother.*

LRH: All right. That's my girl.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Now, when was this?

PC: *It was in the evening, in May – I think May. The summer.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *Well, you can't tell about Oklahoma. It gets summer there fast.*

LRH: All right. And just exactly where was that located? That's it.

PC: *Well, that was a hotel...*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *... out in the outskirts of town.*

LRH: Good. Good. All right. Bing-bing.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: You got it. That's bing-bing.

PC: *Yeah, I, yeah, I can – I know what hotel it was.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I liked it, the hotel.*

LRH: All right. And what didn't appear there?

PC: *Hmm.*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Mmm. Well, I'm getting more what's – what is beginning to appear there is more the misemotion.*

LRH: Mm-mm. And what didn't appear?

PC: *Hm. The room! I can't find it.*

LRH: Mm-mm. All right. That's good enough.

PC: *Is there a – hazy picture.*

LRH: All right. Now, who failed to find out about this incident?

PC: *Jimmy's mother.*

LRH: All right. What didn't Jimmy suspect there? That's it.

PC: *Well, he didn't suspect that I was going to hold him to this one.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *Actually, what he didn't suspect was that he would get that totally entrapped on it. Oh, I know what he didn't expect!*

LRH: What?

PC: *Well, he didn't expect me to be a virgin, of course!*

LRH: Well, all right. Okay.

PC: *That's what he didn't expect me to...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That's what he didn't expect. Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Well, that's a very interesting...

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: ... thing for him to find out at that moment, huh?

PC: *Yeah!*

LRH: So how did he take on about that?

PC: *Well, he flipped.*

LRH: Oh?

PC: *He flipped*

LRH: He flipped?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And what did that mean for him?

PC: *That mean he – means – that meant he was trapped.*

LRH: Yes sir.

PC: *Mmm. That was a dirty trick!*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *That was.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And when was this again?

PC: *Hmm.*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *Oh, you know, it – it was just about this time of year? Mm – early May?*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *It was in the evening.*

LRH: Hm-hm. What time in the evening?

PC: *Oh, about – I should say about twelve o'clock at night.*

LRH: That's it. There it is. There it is.

PC: *Yeah. Because we went out first, and then came back.*

LRH: Hm-hm. Hm-hm. All right. Is there any more about that? Is there any more to that?

PC: *Well, just – it was messy.*

LRH: How do you mean, messy?

PC: *Well, I got blood all over my clothes.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *This is what Betty discovered.*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *And an unexpectedness on Betty.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *This – this was rather an uncomfortable situation for me.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And what failed to appear there?

PC: *Mmm. Well, there's something very interesting going on here. There's Bob in the background, but somehow he's there and not there.*

LRH: Who?

PC: *Betty's boyfriend.*

LRH: Yeah?

PC: *Bob? Was that his name?*

LRH: There was somebody else at the hotel with you?

PC: *Yeah. Bob.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Betty's boyfriend.*

LRH: There – there was somebody there?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Oh, I see. Had they put up at the hotel?

PC: *Yeah. They were in another room.*

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. Then they knew all about this?

PC: *Well, I don't think Bob did.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *Unless Betty told him, which I don't think she did.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I didn't tell him.*

LRH: All right. He didn't appear there.

PC: *No, he didn't.*

LRH: All right. Now, good enough. Now, who failed to find out about all this?

PC: *Bob.*

LRH: Bob did.

PC: *Oh, actually, the – what keeps popping up is the navy personnel out on the base didn't – failed to find out.*

LRH: All right. Did you go into a vast withhold from all those people?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Should they have found out about this?

PC: *Yeah. Actually, my – my senior officer should have found out about it.*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right.

PC: *This was a betrayal on her, actually.*

LRH: All right. How was it a betrayal on her?

PC: *Well, she had a solid postulate that her girls did not do these things.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *It sort of made this one stick with most of the girls.*

LRH: All right. That's fine. That's fine. All right. That's very good. When did you try any of this earlier with a man and it didn't work out?

PC: *Well, didn't...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *I get the earliest – no, this is – I think the earliest one is when I was eighteen and uh...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *... I chickened out.*

LRH: Aha. We got the tick-tick there.

PC: *Yeah. I chickened out on that one.*

LRH: And when was that?

PC: *That was in 38.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *1938.*

LRH: 1938.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. And what – is that all there is to that?

PC: *Well, no, because I did have this same intention there to trap him, but I couldn't – I wouldn't go through with it because I – he – I didn't know what the myst – there was a mystery on Cleveland. I would have had to have lived in Cleveland and I didn't know what it was about, so I chickened out.*

LRH: All right. Okay. And what appeared there?

PC: *Hm. Blackie. My friend.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *This was an older man.*

LRH: Very good. Very good. In what wise did he appear? How did he appear?

PC: *Well, he interfered.*

LRH: Oh, he did, huh?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Was this a knockdown-drag-out?

PC: *No. Just he raised hell.*

LRH: What did he do?

PC: *And he made me sufficiently guilty so that I blew off of him. Actually, I solved the whole thing by going to Seattle.*

LRH: I see, I see. This is your departure from where?

PC: *From Fromberg, Montana.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *My hometown.*

LRH: What town in Montana?

PC: *Fromberg, south of Billings.*

LRH: Yeah?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Attagirl. All right. Now, who failed to find out about that whole thing?

PC: *My mother.*

LRH: All right. That's tick-tick, bang. Now we're really getting there.

PC: *Yeah. Mother and Dad.*

LRH: Hm-hm. They didn't find out about this?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Do they know about it to this day?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. You've never had anything to say to them about this.

PC: *Oh, no. They – they wouldn't have dug this game at all.*

LRH: They wouldn't have, huh?

PC: *Oh, no.*

LRH: All right. And what did you do? Did you tell them something else? That's it.

PC: *Well, yeah. I told them that I wanted to get married. This was perfectly reasonable. But I didn't tell them that I had – well, see, the one I've got there is that this is the only thing I had of any value.*

LRH: What?

PC: *My virginity.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It's the only thing I ever considered was valuable.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good.

PC: *I already knew I was no good.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *You know?*

LRH: Okay. All right. Now, is there any earlier incident? That's it.

PC: *Well, that's when I was only thirteen.*

LRH: When you were thirteen.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Very good. And what did you do when you were thirteen?

PC: *Well, this one was sort of inadvertent. Some guy spotted me, and turned on a big admiration deal for me. I never could understand that one.*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right. What did you do there?

PC: *Well, I was just sitting in the park minding my own business...*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *... and he came along.*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *Yeah. I did do something there. I did uh...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *... try to force – like I must be something if I attracted him, and tried to force the relationship.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Very good. Okay. And when was that?

PC: *That was in 1933. That was in – on Labor Day, 1933. September.*

LRH: Labor Day, 1933.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Very good.

PC: *Labor Day celebration.*

LRH: All right. And is that all there is to that?

PC: *Uh – no. I kept that one going. Tried to foster some sort of a romance out of it. I couldn't make it, though.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. But right there at that instant. Right there at...

PC: *Oh, that...*

LRH: ... that moment. Is that all there is to that?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Yeah. All right. Very good. All right. What failed to appear there?

PC: *... Well, sure enough, uh – the – whatever I had mocked up as a desirable male failed to appear there, because he sure wasn't.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *You know?*

LRH: Very good. Very good. Now, who didn't find out about this incident?

PC: *His mother.*

LRH: His mother?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Oh, all right. How old was he?

PC: *Uh – fifteen. No, I guess he was only about fourteen – thirteen, fourteen, too.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And she didn't find out about it, huh?

PC: *Oh, no. You see – .*

LRH: Was he upset about this?

PC: *Well, later, I introduced him to my mother, you see? And then later he had a compulsion to introduce his mother to me. This is...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... a real funny one on it.*

LRH: That's bing-bing. We're getting somewhere now.

PC: *Yeah. She – she disapproved, you see?*

LRH: Did she tell you she disapproved?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Did you tell her?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, is there anything earlier than this?

PC: *Good heavens, no!*

LRH: Well, was there anything earlier than this?

PC: *No.*

LRH: I don't get much of a rack-around here on it. Is there anything earlier here about trying to sleep with a man to trap him?

PC: *Hm-mm.*

LRH: Well, now, we just had that go counter to what you just said.

PC: *Well, I'm looking at some...*

LRH: Come on. Come on. What could there have been earlier?

PC: *Well, there was some sex play with my brothers, but that wasn't wanting to sleep with them to marry them.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. But how about trapping them? Would this trap them in some way?

PC: *Oh, well, yeah. That – that – there was some wanting to be close to my brothers. Actually, this is interesting. That's – that's that "I want to be close to a man."*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *And I did want to be...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... close to my brothers.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And when did this sexual activity take place?

PC: *Well, it's my brother Eddie.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *That's the incident there with uh – it – it was just straight together, his masturbation – me letting him...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... do it.*

LRH: Good enough. And now, when was this?

PC: *Uh – oh, dear. I got to guess on this one. About 1928-9.*

LRH: All right. Good enough.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Good enough. Is that all there is to that?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. And what appeared there?

PC: *Well, this – the...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *Yeah, it was too much misemotion. I mean, I – I – I couldn't confront – easily confront his emotion on this one.*

LRH: There we go.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: We're right there. Right there now.

PC: *Yeah, this is...*

LRH: You couldn't confront his emotion.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Hm-hm. Emotion appeared there.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Mmm. Mmm.

PC: *It's actually sexual sensation on his part.*

LRH: Mmm. And you weren't able to confront that.

PC: *Uh-uh.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Interesting.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, who failed to find out about that?

PC: *My mother.*

LRH: Right. All right. There it is. Bing-bing. Very good.

PC: *My mother. Oh, wow!*

LRH: All right. Fine. How did this trap your brother? There it is.

PC: *Well, was – there was that emotional tie there. Something in – we had experienced something in common. Um – this actually is a – huh... Just the misemotion is what's the trap. Sort of a goopy misemotion that...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... couldn't – couldn't ever have just as a clean-cut type relationship. There was always that withhold there – on his part. It's actually still there.*

LRH: What? On his part?

PC: *Yeah. It's still there.*

LRH: To this day?

PC: *Uh-huh.*

LRH: To this day, he's still afraid people will find out about this?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Is that so?

PC: *Actually, he's afraid I'm going to mention it. One of these days I am. I'm going to pull that withhold off of him.*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *I think that would help.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Now, is there any earlier incident here? There's a little slowdown.

PC: *Well, this is the picture that I don't have any – any recall on. Just a stuck visio.*

LRH: Picture of what?

PC: *Of running to Mother and telling her about a sexual experience with my brother Jake. But this one was...*

LRH: Writing to your mother?

PC: *Running to my mother.*

LRH: Running to her? Oh, running to her?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And telling her about a sexual experience with your brother Jake.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: When was that?

PC: *Well, I'm sure I was only four years old, but I don't know why this comes out then in the place where I was – didn't live until I was six.*

LRH: Well, that's good.

PC: *I mean, I've got some confusion in it.*

LRH: All right. What is this? An overt act on Jake?

PC: *Yeah. It's actually an overt act on Mother, too.*

LRH: Uh-huh. Both of them?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Both of them.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Was it true?

PC: *Yeah, it was true.*

LRH: What was true?

PC: *Well, the experience, uh – well, no, I shouldn't say that because I*

don't remember the experience. I only remember running to my mother telling her that Jake had uh – uh – taught me all about uh – well, I – I said, "Mom – Mother, Mother, Jake told me all about fucking," you see?

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *And my mother almost dropped dead!*

LRH: Mm-mm. All right. Very good. Now, what didn't appear there?

PC: *Well, what the hell ever happened there?*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Well, who hasn't found out about this?

PC: *My dad never found out. My other brother – my other brothers and sisters didn't find out.*

LRH: They didn't find out.

PC: *No.*

LRH: Your father didn't find out.

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. How about Jake?

PC: *Yeah, well, he found out about something because Mother beat him up.*

LRH: Oh, I see. Was he punished?

PC: *Yeah, he was punished.*

LRH: All right. Now, when was this?

PC: *Hmm. Well, boy, sure seems like 1924.*

LRH: All right. Very good. 1924.

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: What time of the year?

PC: *Well, it co – . See, that's where I get confused, because it was in the cornfield. And I was six years old in that place, but the corn was – actually it was high, so it must have been in the middle of summer.*

LRH: Okay. Very good. And is that all there is to that?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Mm?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: What else is there to that? There must be something else to it.

PC: *Well, hmm. Bunch of confusion, like uh – it seems like it's the same incident where I was sitting in the hallway or in the side porch with this – Mother had told me that – well, she – it was more of an attitude of I was totally unacceptable to her. And just sitting in the hall there thinking, you know, things will never be the same again. But I'm not sure it's the same incident.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It just seems like it.*

LRH: Very good. Very good. And what appeared there? All right. What didn't appear there? That's it.

PC: *Well, Mother didn't. I have a just a real funny feeling there of being all alone.*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *That somebody else should have been there and wasn't.*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *I don't know.*

LRH: All right. Now, who hasn't found out about that four-year-old incident?

PC: *Hm. Well, I sure haven't found out parts of it.*

LRH: All right. All right. Anybody else hasn't found out about it?

PC: *Mm. Well, Mother didn't find out other parts of it.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *The one that Mother didn't find out, actually, was I don't think she realized what – how – I Q-and-Aed with this. I mean, I just straight decided I was no good...*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *... on her consideration that I wasn't.*

LRH: All right. Now, what are we talking about here that she considered you were no good? When did this enter into the situation?

PC: *Well, it was uh – later in that incident – I think. I don't – it looks like...*

LRH: Did she tell you you were no good, or what?

PC: *Well, she – yeah. Just...*

LRH: What did she say?

PC: *Well, she gasped like this was the most horrible thing that anybody could ever do.*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right.

PC: *I mean, it was the attitude...*

LRH: What did she say?

PC: *... and the misemo – . Well, I think she appealed to God at that point that this happened, this horrible act had happened. I don't remember what she said. She*

was talking in German anyhow. I wouldn't remember German.

LRH: All right. What had you just done there?

PC: *Well, I told her that I was – that Jake and I had – I don't even remember what we – what – what we did. I do remember telling her that...*

LRH: Yeah, but what did you tell her? That's what's important.

PC: *Yeah. Yeah. Well, I told her that Jake and I were fucking.*

LRH: All right. That's what you told her.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Very good. Very good. When was this?

PC: *I don't know, 24 or 26. 1924 or 26. I can't decide on this one.*

LRH: Well, all right.

PC: *It must have been in 1926, because we were living in Fromberg. But then everything that happened to me I put into my barnyard anyway, so this could be another thing I just put into my barnyard.*

LRH: Into your barnyard?

PC: *I drag all my pictures into my barnyard. It's the only safe place I had in my childhood.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *So every picture I – every time I get audited I drag all the pictures from all over the place and I'd go into the barnyard to look at them, while I was in the auditing chair.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *This...*

LRH: Now, where – where did this incident with Jake happen?

PC: *Well, it was in the cornfield...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *...so that – that had to be the farm.*

LRH: Well, what did you do?

PC: *I don't know.*

LRH: Nothing? Something? Anything?

PC: *Well, I'm sure it was something, yeah.*

LRH: Well, was it nothing? Something? Had you done anything? Or is this just an outright lie on Jake?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Did it get him in trouble?

PC: *Yeah. It did get him in trouble.*

LRH: All right. Who wouldn't want you to find out about it?

PC: *Who wouldn't want me to find...*

LRH: Yes.

PC: *... me to find out about it.*

LRH: Ah, that's an interesting thought, isn't it?

PC: *Well, Mother wouldn't want me to find out about it, I would think.*

LRH: That's it. All right. Mother wouldn't want you to find out about it.

PC: *No.*

LRH: Would Jake want you to find out about something?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Is there a big agreement there you shouldn't find out about this?

PC: *Well, an agreement there that something like that would be better forgotten, which would be something we would have had in – in our childhood.*

LRH: Everybody would agree that that...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... should better be forgotten.

PC: *It should – should be forgotten. Sure.*

LRH: When did you all decide to forget it and be friends?

PC: *Uh...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *Hm. Well, just sort of oozed into forgetfulness there.*

LRH: All right. Very good. But there was an agreement there.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Very good. When was that? That's it.

PC: *1926.*

LRH: Very good. And what exactly happened there? Exactly what happened?

PC: *Well, I get an impression only, now.*

LRH: Oh, you can tell me what happened. Don't sit there reading your pictures. Tell me what happened.

PC: *All right. Actually, he did try to put his penis in me.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Was this with your agreement?

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: Or your connivance?

PC: *Well, it was oh – actually, it was – this was all right to do. That's what I was...*

LRH: All right. That's – that's fine.

PC: *Yeah. That's what I was trying to communicate to Mother.*

LRH: It was your idea?

PC: *No. I had learned a new experience.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Very, very good. Excellent.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And what appeared there?

PC: *Well, my mother's shock, because, you see, I wanted to communicate to her that I had discovered something new.*

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. Very good. Excellent.

PC: *I didn't expect my mother to be shocked. I thought she would be pleased because I had found out something new.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And who should have found out about this in later years?

PC: *Dad.*

LRH: All right. Who else should have found out about it in later years?

PC: *Well, Jake should have found out about it, that I was this knuckleheaded.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I didn't know that this was something should be kept secret.*

LRH: Very good. And who else should have found out about it?

PC: *Uh – well, my whole family should have found out that I was knuckle-headed.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. Okay. Now, when was this incident, exactly?

PC: *Huh. Well, it was in the summer of 1926. Actually, this one does feel more in place now, in 26.*

LRH: Very good.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right, fine.

PC: *It was in the summer of 1926.*

LRH: Excellent. Excellent. And is that all there is to that incident now?

PC: *Mm. Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And what shouldn't have appeared in that whole incident?

PC: *My mother.*

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

PC: *Schoolteachers. Townspeople.*

LRH: Oh, very good. Excellent. Anybody else?

PC: *You know, the one that's the real shouldn't-have-found-out is my stupidity there. Mmm, my brothers and sisters, particularly, shouldn't – should have found out about this one. Well, I don't know. They still shouldn't know about this.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *This stupidity.*

LRH: Should they have found out about your stupidity?

PC: *Well, it still isn't all right with me for them to find it out.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, what we're going to do here – how do you feel about this now?

PC: *Mm, better.*

LRH: You feel a bit better?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: A lot better?

PC: *Yeah, it's...*

LRH: You got something a little more in place?

PC: *Yeah, and it doesn't seem as hung-up.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. We're not – we're not through worrying this one – that one, probably, but we're going to look some more on this line.

PC: *Oh, that's fine.*

LRH: All right. Now, would it be all right with you if we took a very brief break?

PC: *That would be wonderful.*

LRH: Ten-minute break?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Would that be all right with you?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: And is it all right with you if I just asked one more question here? Now, have I missed a withhold on you? Yeah, that's all right. Latent.

PC: *Mm, yeah. You didn't.*

LRH: Very good. Very good. There was a latent...

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: ... but that's all right. I'll check it again.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Have I missed a withhold on you? There's a slight slowdown.

PC: *Well, just I didn't realize it'd be this comfortable...*

LRH: Oh, you didn't?

PC: *... being audited by you.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Thank you very much. Let me check that once more. Have I missed a withhold on you? No, that's fine.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Very good. We got that. And is there anything you care to ask before I give you end of session for this break?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Here it is. End of session.

PC: *Okay. Thank you.*

LRH: You bet.

TV DEMO: PREPCHECKING, PART II

An auditing demonstration
given on 2 May 1962

LRH: Pick up the cans. Okay, honey. We been getting a TA action here of 2.0 to 1.3, well 1.6.

PC: *Wow.*

LRH: Oh, now I don't know this is enough TA action to amount to anything, but it's worthwhile.

PC: *Well, the one – I was – didn't realize it was going below 2.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *I didn't realize it was going below 2.0 is why I was going "wow" about it.*

LRH: Oh, yeah. That's been wandering up and down there very nicely. We're in a zone of where you haven't taken too much responsibility.

PC: *That's the one that had occurred to me.*

LRH: All right. And 10:33. All right, honey. Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Here it is. *Start of session.* Has the session started for you?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Very good. All right. Now how're you doing

PC: *Well, I'm fine now that I'm back in the chair. I was a bit dispensed down in the hall.*

LRH: Oh, yeah. All right. Now, very good. Have I missed a withhold on you?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Well, there's a little latent tick here. There might be something on it. There it is.

PC: *Well, yeah. Just I was pretty – pretty far out of present time when you ended the session.*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *That's...*

LRH: Okay. All right. Did I fail to find out about that?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. When was that?

PC: *Well, when I went clattering down the hall by myself I couldn't find Suzy's bathroom.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Okay. Now, have I missed a withhold on you?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Is there anything else there? Any other thing I might have missed a withhold on?

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: Okay. Now let me check this.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Have I missed a withhold on you? All right. That's going independently.

PC: *What does that mean?*

LRH: Now, you listen to me.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Now, you listen to *me* now.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: To me. To me. All right. Have I missed a withhold on you?

PC: *No.*

LRH: That's right. You're absolutely right. All right. Now, we were going great guns here on something that happened in a cornfield.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. Now, is it all right with you if I get on with this?

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: All right. Now, apparently you've been packing an awful lot of they-should-have-found-out-about-me's here, on this subject.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Mostly Mother, yeah.*

LRH: Well, has this been basic... Yes, it's Mother all right, because I've got a double tick here I'm following down.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: It's a – I'm getting wider. The closer we get in to the base on this, why, the more we're getting close to this little double tick. Okay?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: And that's what we're looking for. We're looking for something... Apparently every time you say something about your *mother* or his mother, or something, we get this double tick.

PC: *Yeah?*

LRH: See, I can turn this on here. All right. What should your mother have found out about you? See, and there it is – little one.

PC: *Yeah, I know. This is...*

LRH: See, I say something on that order. Now, you want to answer that question?

PC: *Well, sure, she should have found out that I wasn't as pure and perfect as she thought I was.*

LRH: As who was?

PC: *As she thought I was.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right.

PC: *Or that she insisted that I should be...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... is more in line.*

LRH: All right. Now, we're following down the track here about sleeping with a man to trap him.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: And we're mining gold all the way. But I think there is an incident before 1926.

PC: *I think there is, too, but I haven't a clue.*

LRH: And where is it? You said two years earlier.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And you didn't know whether it was or wasn't. Well, what happened two years before this time? Where were you living?

PC: *In uh...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *Park City.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *Montana.*

LRH: Park City what?

PC: *Montana.*

LRH: Montana. Park City. All right. And is there some sort of an incident there where you got all mixed up with somebody or something?

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: Is there any incident in Park City? I don't know here. I'm getting a little bit of a rough line. This...

PC: *Well, there could be, but...*

LRH: Is there some incident in Park City? No, it isn't Park City. Is there some...

PC: *Is it Glen Ullin – Glen Ullin, North Dakota, then?*

LRH: Is that earlier?

PC: *Well, that would be in – when I was four, we moved from...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... Glen Ullin to Park City.*

LRH: Well, haven't you any memory back of...

PC: *No.*

LRH: ... that at all, huh?

PC: *Just splotchy pictures.*

LRH: Hm-hm. Just got some pictures?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: What pictures?

PC: *Well, I've got a picture of a – a stone house that I assume is my birthplace.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Then later in Park City, I've got a couple or three pictures.*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right. Is there any other incident here with your brothers? I get a little slowdown there.

PC: *Well, there is the one incident with my brother, Bob. But this is not on sex-line stuff.*

LRH: What about that, just roughly?

PC: *Well, I was supposed to care for him, and...*

LRH: And you didn't.

PC: *Well, there's some mystery on this one. I don't understand my reactions in that.*

LRH: Well, what is your reaction?

PC: *Well, a little girl tried to take him away from me, and I got panicky...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: ... *and it's way out of proportion to the situation.*

LRH: Well, what happened?

PC: *I hit her in the stomach with a rock.*

LRH: And what happened with that?

PC: *That's all. Just she – I – it hurt.*

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: *And I got my brother back, but uh...*

LRH: Hm. How old were you then?

PC: *Four.*

LRH: About four. Is that the incident here on the 19 – ...

PC: *1924.*

LRH: That's the 1924 incident.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: That's it. Tick, tick.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. This have to do with a man?

PC: *Hm. Took my brother who was a...*

LRH: All right. Well, was he...

PC: ... *he was younger.*

LRH: What was he? A boy?

PC: *Mm-hm. Two.*

LRH: All right. It had to do with a boy.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. What about this boy?

PC: *Well, I was supposed to take care of him.*

LRH: Right?

PC: *Mother said I should look out for him.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *And I had agreed to care for him.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *But this little girl was just teasing, said I was – she was going to take him away from me. And just – I got panicky.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And I just – it was just a – almost a reflex action. I picked up the rock and threw it at her to stop her...*

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: ... *from taking him away. I don't know where the hell she would have taken him.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *She was only four, too.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *You see?*

LRH: And where did the rock cut her?

PC: *In the stomach.*

LRH: Uh-huh. She bleed much?

PC: *It didn't cut her. It just went pow! in her stomach.*

LRH: I see. It just went pow! in her stomach. Did she bleed much?

PC: *She didn't bleed at all.*

LRH: Are you sure?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: You're sure?

PC: *Well, no. Of course, I'm not sure. But I don't think so.*

LRH: Come on. How seriously was this little girl injured?

PC: *Well, she uh – she cried. And I just imagine because it hit her in the stomach, that it was awful painful. It is when I get hit in the stomach.*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *It's...*

LRH: What else did you do to her?

PC: *That's all – I think.*

LRH: All right. Did you hit her in the stomach?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: With a rock.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: That's it. With a rock.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. Who else did you hit with a rock?

PC: *Oh, well, heavens, I...*

LRH: Oh, well, now we're onto something else.

PC: *Now, yeah. But not earlier. I mean, I used to throw rocks at my brothers. I don't think I ever hit them though.*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *I was a lousy shot.*

LRH: All right. But which one of them did you blood?

PC: *How'd blood get into the act?*

LRH: I don't know how blood got into this.

PC: *Oh. Well, well, there's my brother, Bob. There's the incident when I hit him into a rock. I mean, it was concrete. It wasn't that I threw a rock at him, but I hit his head into a rock – into concrete.*

LRH: Hm-hm, you did.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And that bled?

PC: *Yeah, that bled.*

LRH: That bled.

PC: *That bled. Yes.*

LRH: All right. Fine. How old was he?

PC: *Uh – he was older then. He was – oh, I should say four and I was six. That's roughly.*

LRH: All right. And what did you do?

PC: *I made an airplane out of him. I was swinging him around...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... me.*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *I was going around and had him by the feet, you see...*

LRH: Mm. Mm.

PC: *... and I was swinging him round, and I hit his head into the concrete block.*

LRH: Because you were dispersed.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Yeah. Go on.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And what happened, there?

PC: *Well, I injured him very seriously.*

LRH: All right, how seriously?

PC: *Well, he's still got a knot on his head which he...*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *... assures me every time I see him that I did it. And I did.*

LRH: All right. What did this do to him mentally, at the time?

PC: *Hmm. Well, he – I think he was almost out cold.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I was going to say it cold-cocked him.*

LRH: Well, did it?

PC: *It stunned him. It did. Yes.*

LRH: Mm. Mm. What did you think you had done at that time?

PC: *Well, I thought I had injured him beyond repair, really.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Like his head was pretty wide open.*

LRH: And when was that?

PC: *Uh – 1926, I would say, roughly.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *I'm not sure.*

LRH: All right. When was it? Have you been told about this or do you remember it?

PC: *Oh, no. I remember it.*

LRH: You remember doing this.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I was having a ball.*

LRH: All right. And?

PC: *And I slipped, actually. I mean, I got his head too low, and it cracked up against the concrete.*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *And he uh – he was stunned. I don't remember whether Mother uh – patched him up or not.*

LRH: All right. Well, what might have appeared there?

PC: *Well, the wound.*

LRH: Hm-hm. Very good. And who didn't find out about it?

PC: *I don't think Dad did.*

LRH: Hm-hm. Who did you withhold that from?

PC: *Well, from Dad.*

LRH: Hm-hm. Anybody else fail to find out about it?

PC: *The doctor. I don't think he was taken to the doctor.*

LRH: Took him to the doctor?

PC: *They didn't take him.*

LRH: They didn't.

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: Doctor didn't find out about it.

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: Well, who else didn't find out about it?

PC: *I'm not so sure Mother did. I think it was my sister patched him up.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I don't remember, but I don't think she did.*

LRH: Was there a big secrecy involved in this?

PC: *Well, just uh – occlusions more than secrecy. I don't remember.*

LRH: Oh, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no. Now, now, now you weren't carrying any banner signs around there...

PC: *Oh, of course not!*

LRH: ... telling everybody "I busted my little brother's head open."

PC: *No, no, no. No.*

LRH: All right. Who did you keep this from?

PC: *Oh, well, I kept that from the kids at school, and teachers, and...*

LRH: Hm-hm. And your father and your mother.

PC: *Mother, and anybody that would have made me guilty.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Like the townspeople.*

LRH: Very good. Do you actually remember now suppressing that?

PC: *Yeah. Sure. You wouldn't uh – that's a now-I'm-supposed-to, actually. I mean, you wouldn't go around saying you'd bashed your brother's head in.*

LRH: Yeah, but did your mama know about it?

PC: *I don't think so.*

LRH: Now, how did she escape knowing about it?

PC: *Oh, well, my sister was very effective in patching up wounds.*

LRH: Mm-hm. Mm-mm. She helped you suppress this.

PC: *Yeah. Well, actually my brother did, too.*

LRH: He helped you, too.

PC: *Well, we protected each other from my parents.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And did you get your brother to agree not to tell?

PC: *No, it was a tacit agreement.*

LRH: I see. You didn't tell him not to tell.

PC: *No.*

LRH: You just knew he wouldn't.

PC: *Yeah. I just knew he wouldn't.*

LRH: And your father didn't find out?

PC: *No.*

LRH: And your mother didn't...

PC: *I know my father didn't.*

LRH: Your mother didn't find out?

PC: *I'm not sure...*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *... about my mother, whether it was Mother that patched him. Mother would have protected us...*

LRH: Well, did your sister even know?

PC: *Well... I don't know. I don't know. It was either Mother or my sister Agatha that patched him up. And if it was Mother, my sister didn't know.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *If it was Mother that patched him up, then my sister didn't know.*

LRH: Well, which is it that didn't know?

PC: *I don't know. Must have been my sister because I think my mother would have beaten me up, and I don't remember getting beaten up by my mother. I'm just assuming now though.*

LRH: You got this figured out that way.

PC: *Yeah!*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *It's just logical.*

LRH: But here's a head injury – here's a head injury that remained a secret to your family.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Is that right?

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That's not unusual.*

LRH: All right. It's not unusual, but I'm just pointing out that here is...

PC: *Mm-mh.*

LRH: ... an incident of that character. What else did you do to bloody your brothers up?

PC: *Well, I've got the later incident with my brother Jake when we got into a fight.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *I didn't bloody him up though. Oh, I guess I did. I scratched him.*

LRH: Oh, you guess you did it.

PC: *Yes, I did.*

LRH: Now come on. Did you or didn't you?

PC: *Yes, I did.*

LRH: All right. When was it?

PC: *Oh, that was way later. I was about fifteen.*

LRH: All right, honey. And what did that consist of?

PC: *You mean, you want all of it?*

LRH: Well...

PC: *Well, I was supposed to fix his lunch, and I didn't. So he tried to get me to fix his lunch, and I fought back.*

LRH: Yeah. And what did you do?

PC: *Well, I just uh... See, I was littler than he was. And I just fought like I wasn't.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *And I – he got so mad that he forgot I was littler, and we had a fight like we were evenly matched.*

LRH: Yeah. What did you do to him?

PC: *Oh, just uh – it was pretty dispersed, but I – I kicked and clawed and bit...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... in any part of the body that I could get ahold of*

LRH: All right. Good. And what did you do?

PC: *Uh – shhh... well, mostly w-w-w-w – scratched him and bit him.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I kicked... yeah, I kicked him, too.*

LRH: Did you bloody him up?

PC: *I don't have a picture, but I assume if I – if I scratched, I would have bloodied him up. Sure.*

LRH: Mmm.

PC: *I mean, I...*

LRH: Well, what do you know you've done there?

PC: *Just that I fought tooth and toenail...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... with all the strength I could conjure up at fifteen...*

LRH: That's good.

PC: *... with this body.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That I know.*

LRH: All right. And who did you both keep that from?

PC: *Mother.*

LRH: All right. Anybody else?

PC: *Dad.*

LRH: All right. Okay. That's all?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Seems like you didn't seem to enjoy the confidence of your parents anywhere along the line.

PC: *I didn't.*

LRH: You didn't, huh?

PC: *Oh, no.*

LRH: What did you do? Has this lifetime been a career of keeping things away from your mother?

PC: *Mm-mm. Mostly Dad.*

LRH: Mostly Dad.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Mother? Keeping things from Mother?

PC: *Well, yeah. There would be some type things I'd keep from Mother, and there'd be other type...*

LRH: Sex.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Sex you'd keep from Mother.

PC: *Yeah. I'd keep from Mother.*

LRH: That's good.

PC: *And anything that would provoke my Dad's temper, I would keep from Dad. And fighting would provoke his temper, you see?*

LRH: Mm-hm. All right. He'd get mad, in other words.

PC: *Oh, he'd get... Yeah.*

LRH: He'd get furious.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. So keeping things from Dad. That's bing, bing. Now, what type of thing would you keep from Dad?

PC: *Well, I keep breakage...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... getting into trouble with uh...*

LRH: Good.

PC: *... the school authorities.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And beating up the guy who tried to beat us up for stealing his watermelons.*

LRH: Right.

PC: *These things.*

LRH: Go on.

PC: *Just if I would get into trouble...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... I would keep it from Dad.*

LRH: Any trouble...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH:... would be kept from Dad.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: So he's the symbol of no communication if in trouble.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Is that right?

PC: *Well, he's more than that. He wouldn't let us talk to him, actually, either.*

LRH: He said, "No," huh?

PC: *He just said "Don't talk! Just talk when you're spoken to."*

LRH: Oh, I see. All right.

PC: *And we had that one and then the other one, we don't talk if we got into trouble, because why invite more trouble?*

LRH: All right. How did you trap your father?

PC: *Oh! Gee! I did that with ARC.*

LRH: All right. How did you do that?

PC: *Just uh – uh – mmm – uh...*

LRH: Go on.

PC: *Well, I just wouldn't let him keep this game going. I moved in, got close to him.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *Got him off of this German "I am the father and you are the child, so*

therefore you must never speak to me unless you're spoken to."

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *I just would speak to him.*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *I would demonstrate affection.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *And it worked.*

LRH: All right. What didn't he find out about this?

PC: *Hmm. Well, mostly what he didn't find out was that he didn't have a prayer with our family after he got off of that one that he used to control us.*

LRH: All right. And what didn't he have a prayer with, now, exactly?

PC: *Well, he didn't have a prayer with me or – or the rest of the family.*

LRH: Good. Now how did you trap him specifically and exactly?

PC: *Well, I don't remember exactly when it was, but I know there was the first time when I kissed him.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *You know?*

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

PC: *Uh...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *Well, that was, I would – should say 1938. But, actually, what I'd – happened is I stumbled onto this earlier incident of violence.*

LRH: Of what?

PC: *Of violence with him...*

LRH: Yeah?

PC: ... *which was not an answer to your question.*

LRH: With – what – I didn't get what this earlier incident was of...

PC: *Well, I've got an incident when I was sixteen when I stopped him from beating Mother.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *And it got into a violent – violent incident rather than...*

LRH: I see.

PC: ... *an incident of affection.*

LRH: Oh, all right. That's perfectly all right.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Nobody is worrying about this.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Now, you trapped him with a kiss. Is that right?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That was affection there that actually trapped him.*

LRH: An affection. Did you feel the affection?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Something wrong with affection here, honey?

PC: *Well...*

LRH: What is this all about?

PC: *Well, you don't demonstrate affection to a German father!*

LRH: I know, but what about affection in general?

PC: *Well, youuuuuuuu – well, actually, it's a trap.*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *It's – that traps men.*

LRH: Affection is a trap.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: That's the way it equates.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: That's the way it equates.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Who doesn't know about this?

PC: *Charlie doesn't know this.*

LRH: All right. How about Jimmy?

PC: *Well, yeah, Jimmy doesn't know about this. Actually, that's what's – goes on with me with the students here, too.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I want to get close to them, but I already know it's a trap...*

LRH: Yeah, go on. Go on.

PC: ... *to be affectionate. Go on what? Who else doesn't know?*

LRH: Tell me. Go on. Who doesn't know about this?

PC: *Oh!*

LRH: Let's get the roster out here.

PC: *Well, my dad didn't know it.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *My brothers.*

LRH: That-a-girl.

PC: *My...*

LRH: That-a-girl.

PC: *Any... I've got it: it's a trap if you have affection for a man.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: I see. All right. And who doesn't find out about this?

PC: *Uh... well, none of the men I've ever known.*

LRH: Just the lot.

PC: *Yeah!*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. That's all I was trying to check into.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: How about the little kids that you were around?

PC: *Well, it's all right to feel affection for kids.*

LRH: Well, come on. How early did this start?

PC: *Well, it started uh – real early with me with my father. But like it was all right for me to feel...*

LRH: There we are. There we are. The tick-tick. Started very early with you and your father.

PC: *With my father.*

LRH: Did you – what – how old were you? Four, two, three, what? Four? Two? One? One?

PC: *Probably.*

LRH: But did you know at that time that it was a...

PC: *No.*

LRH: ... action? Well, when did you overtly use this to betray him?

PC: *Well, that time when I was eighteen.*

LRH: All right. And what happened there exactly? Now, we got onto that a moment ago and got off of it.

PC: *Well, just I intended to get him off of this other one he had on. You know, where he's totally individuated. So I demonstrated the affection for him...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... and then – hmm – like he was trapped and I was trapped, both, on this one.*

LRH: Hm-hm. Is that so?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. And what didn't appear there?

PC: *Hmm. This one flipped... I have trouble with it because I don't ever know whether it's – oh – what's supposed to. You know, like the thing that didn't appear there was just actually a warning of things to come.*

LRH: All right. All right. Very good. What things to come?

PC: *Well, like he was vulnerable then. Mother used this one on him particularly.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *She would withdraw affection from him.*

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

PC: *Well, actually I didn't find out about it at that point. I didn't realize that's what I was doing.*

LRH: All right. When did you decide this is what you were doing?

PC: *Well, jus – I didn't really connect it up until now...*

LRH: Oh, all right. Very good. Very good.

PC: *... that this is part of the thing that goes on with me.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That used to bug me.*

LRH: All right. This seems real to you?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: I haven't forced any cognitions on you, have I?

PC: *No, no, of course not. See, this – I have got a late incident. It happened here on course – is the last incident.*

LRH: Yeah? Yeah. Well, there's a whole series of these incidents.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And they consist of "trapped with affection."

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Trapped with affection.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. All right. Very good. Okay. Now, how far back does this go?

PC: *Well, it doesn't go... Just to trap with affection doesn't go. I just wouldn't do it. I never would do that, I don't think. I don't remember any earlier incidents. I mean, I would try not to.*

LRH: Try not to trap with affection.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Then what does that do? What's the result of that?

PC: *You're lonely.*

LRH: Oh, I see. So if you use affection, you trap.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And if you don't use affection, you don't trap.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: I see. All right, honey. All right. And uh... That's very interesting. When is the first time you really trapped a man that way? Or a boy?

PC: *Oh, wait a minute. I do have some incidences on this. Actually, I've got an incident with a priest.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *With a priest...*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *... this life. Yeah. Father O'Sullivan. That's what happened there; it was just...*

LRH: All right. What life was that?

PC: *This life.*

LRH: This life?

PC: *Yeah. Huh.*

LRH: You were a...

PC: *I was a Catholic this life, you see.*

LRH: Oh, yeah. All right.

PC: *And I was, oh, fifteen, sixteen, when Father O'Sullivan was our parish priest.*

LRH: All right. Good. And what happened?

PC: *Well, it was just uh – I got – just got real close to him.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *Got to liking him.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *And he – it was a – a real close, affectionate situation. Nothing sexual.*

LRH: I know, but uh...

PC: *There was a lot of affection...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... there – me for him and him for me.*

LRH: Okay. Now exactly what occurred? Something must have occurred.

PC: *Well, yeah. I was actually... Thisssss is – this is interesting in view of the fact Dad said I'm stupid. I was the outstanding student in the catechism class.*

LRH: Ah! Very good.

PC: *And uh – got just uh... Well, just uh – by being outstanding and smart in catechism, I attracted his attention.*

LRH: All right. Good.

PC: *And I just got a real pull for the affection for him.*

LRH: Hm-hm. Go on.

PC: *Well, this one was pretty disastrous, because you don't really get that close to a priest.*

LRH: Yeah, all right.

PC: *It violates the...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... "all that's holy in the Catholic Church," you see?*

LRH: Right.

PC: *But that's all that happened. There wasn't any uh...*

LRH: Well now, what was disastrous about it? That's it.

PC: *Well, for one thing, I don't think he's any longer a priest.*

LRH: Uh, really?

PC: *I don't think so.*

LRH: What did you do?

PC: *Well, I don't think I did... I think I just contributed to this one.*

LRH: Yeah, but what happened? There's a...

PC: *Just that I – I got closer to a priest than a girl...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... is supposed to get to a priest.*

LRH: And then what happened?

PC: *Then he left town.*

LRH: Well, why did he leave town?

PC: *Uh – I don't know, but I do know that he was moved to an Indian mission, which is a reduction in status for a priest.*

LRH: All right. Well, what occurred? What happened there? You got a – you're leaving me with a blank.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. You're very bright in class, and you get next to this priest, and then he leaves town.

PC: *Well, there – actually, there wasn't anything else did happen.*

LRH: Well, what did you do that was an overt?

PC: *Just got that close to him.*

LRH: And that what?

PC: *Just to form uh – that much of a personal relationship with him.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *To get on that ah – ah – just on the same basis with him rather than as a priest – girl in the parish.*

LRH: Good. Bing, bing. Now what... There's something there, see?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: There's something there. There's something more there than just that.

PC: *There is?*

LRH: What is it?

PC: *Well, there's – there was an incident there when...*

LRH: Yeah, that's what we want. What is it?

PC: *I went into a game with him that you don't – you shouldn't play with a priest. Like I got mad at him and told him I was never going to speak to him again. And then he got me to speak to him again. I was walking down the street one day and I saw him, and I just had my head – I wasn't going to speak to him.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And as he passed me, he put his face into my face and said "Hello."*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And we got back into communication again.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *But there really... That's about all...*

LRH: Nothing else happened?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Was there anything happened there? Was there anything happened with that priest?

PC: *Mm-mm. That's an – that's...*

LRH: Was this kind of charged?

PC: *Well, that's enough!*

LRH: What's enough?

PC: *Well, to get that close to a priest! You're not supposed to get close to a priest. Now – uh?*

LRH: What did you do to the man?

PC: *I don't know.*

LRH: Would this ruin him in some way? What's the overt here? Showing affection?

PC: *Well, it's – it's knocking him off his priest uh – priestliness. I mean, he was a man instead of a priest.*

LRH: All right. All right. But what happened here, exactly? Did you set out to plan to do this?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Did you know this was bad?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: You did know this was bad?

PC: *Mm-mh.*

LRH: Well, you went ahead and did it though.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Uh, you knew it was bad...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: ... and you went ahead and did it.

PC: *Well, sure.*

LRH: All right. Who didn't find out about it?

PC: *Uh, well, hell, my mother didn't find out about that or any of the church people.*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *Besides that, if they'd have found out about it, they'd have said I was uh – trying to sleep with him, which I wasn't – I don't think.*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. And what appeared there then?

PC: *Well, a man instead of a priest!*

LRH: Uh, all right. All right. And who didn't find out about that?

PC: *Well, he didn't.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, when was this exactly?

PC: *In '36. I was sixteen, I think.*

LRH: Over what period of time was it? How many weeks? Months? Days?

PC: *Uh – it was that summer when I was being prepared for confirmation.*

LRH: Go on.

PC: *Was in the summertime – was in summer school. I was being prepared for confirmation, so it was over a period of weeks.*

LRH: Over a period of weeks.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Very good. And what didn't appear there?

PC: *Hm. I'm hung up on a occurrence there, too.*

LRH: What is the occurrence?

PC: *Well, he flipped me one time when he was testing us finally for our uh – whether we were fit to be confirmed. And he tested all the other students on the catechism...*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *... but he asked me questions out of the Bible. That was a betrayal, 'cause I didn't know anything about the Bible.*

LRH: Uh, I see. All right. Good enough. And who didn't find out about it?

PC: *What...*

LRH: Who didn't get any answers?

PC: *He didn't. He didn't. I hit a blank.*

LRH: All right. You hit a blank.

PC: *Uh.*

LRH: That's quite interesting. Before that, you were bright. Is that what you are saying

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And after that you were stupid.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. How do you account for this?

PC: *Why, that I was just – I was going to cogitate on this. I was wondering if this had any connection with...*

LRH: Well, is that correct?

PC: *Well, yeah. It's just after that I had...*

LRH: Am I rushing your cognition?

PC: *Yeah. You are.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Good enough.

PC: *'Cause it was just that feel there of stupidity.*

LRH: You ever spot this before?

PC: *No. Not really.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But I – there's something else there.*

LRH: Yeah, what is there?

PC: *Well, I feel there that I betrayed him.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *And...*

LRH: Did you?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: How?

PC: *I was supposed to be smart. I was supposed to know about the Bible.*

LRH: uh, I see. You were supposed to know...

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: ... about the Bible.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. And what happened?

PC: *I didn't.*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *I didn't ever...*

LRH: And who didn't find out about it?

PC: *Well, he didn't find out it soon enough to not ask me the questions.*

LRH: I see. Well, when did this examination – did this examination take place in front of witnesses?

PC: *Uh, yeah. Up in front of the other students.*

LRH: uh, I see. All right. And that was a source of what to you?

PC: *Well, a source of failure on him, like I've supposed to...*

LRH: All right, what were you trying to cover up in front of these students, Dorothy?

PC: *Huh?*

LRH: That area must be loaded with missed withholds.

PC: *Well, did try to cover up that I was his favorite.*

LRH: Yeah. All right. What else didn't they find out there?

PC: *Well, you know, what I have a feel of here is – that they failed to find out – was that I didn't consider myself smart because I knew catechism. Catechism is a cinch.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *I mean, there's non – a knucklehead could learn about catechism.*

LRH: All right. And they didn't find out about that.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, did you do anything to this priest?

PC: *Well, I sure let him down that day.*

LRH: All right. Very good. This make him feel foolish?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Hm-hm. Did he look confused?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. And what did you do there?

PC: *Mm. I was noticing something else there, too.*

LRH: What?

PC: *Well, he expected... This has happened a lot in my life. He expected me to be smarter than I was. I didn't come through, you know?*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *I did an incident like that on you.*

LRH: Yeah, yeah. All right.

PC: *In '55.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Okay. And your brightness failed to appear, is that right?

PC: *Yeah! It sure did, man!*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *That's right. It...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... let me down, boy. It didn't appear.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And who's been in the dark about this?

PC: *You.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It's failing to appear here, too, you know – my brightness. Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Okay. All right. Very good. All right. Then what's the missed withhold?

PC: *"I ain't as bright as people think I am" is actually the missed withhold.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I'm not.*

LRH: Well, what uh – is that the thing that everybody misses on you?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *Mother and all.*

LRH: Everybody misses this.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: One and all.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Let's go back to this incident in the cornfield.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Is that a piece of it?

PC: *uh – I...*

LRH: Is that part of the same picture?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Yeah? Well, how is it part of the same picture?

PC: *Well, my brightness didn't appear there, because if it had – have, I would have known that Mother – this was not one of Mother's acceptability's. She – that she – just... Sex was something she just couldn't confront.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, is there any earlier incident when they – somebody should have known this?

PC: *No. Not that I remember.*

LRH: All right. I don't get anything clicking on the meter.

PC: *Uh, good.*

LRH: All right. Now, there seems to be there are a whole chain of incidents here.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Something on this order.

PC: *Yeah. There is.*

LRH: Describe this circumstance to me here just what we've been finding out and plumbing into here, and so forth.

PC: *Well, what I've got straight is that any darn fool can learn anything that they have – you know, that's easy to learn.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *But if it's hard, I'm not bright. I can't learn anything hard.*

LRH: All right. Good. Click, click. There it is.

PC: *Yeah. Sure, I mean, Scientology auditing is hard.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Like, I can sit down and get a preclear to talk to me.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But I can't do a heck of a lot with Class III stuff*

LRH: All right.

PC: *You know?*

LRH: Click, click.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Hm-hm. Well, how does this all add up?

PC: *Well, it adds up to "I am not acceptable to people as soon as they find out I'm not bright." That's how it adds up.*

LRH: Now, what proved this to you when you were four or six or something like that? What...

PC: *Well, because Mother told me I was not acceptable to her.*

LRH: When did she say this?

PC: *When I was four.*

LRH: Hm-hm. What did you do?

PC: *I...*

LRH: What had you done?

PC: *You mean because she said that?*

LRH: Mmm.

PC: *uh, I had communicated to her about an experience.*

[Please note: At this point there is a gap in the original recording. We now re-join the session where the original recording resumes.]

LRH: Is there another sexual incident when you were – there. Bing, bang What's that?

PC: *Well, I've always had a – a horror that one day I was going to get something un – unoccluded and find that my father had sexually...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But I – I have no recall on this.*

LRH: All right. Very good. We got the same tick-tick on your father here a while ago.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Now, what is this? Did something happen with your father?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Was there some sexual incident with your father?

PC: *No, except that he was capable of it.*

LRH: Bing. Bang. Is there a sexual incident with your father?

PC: *Before? No.*

LRH: Well, at any time.

PC: *No. The only thing that I have on my father is that one time when I was taking a bath I didn't pull the curtains, and he watched me through the window when I was naked.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That's all he did.*

LRH: When was that?

PC: *Uh, I was eighteen – seventeen or eighteen by then.*

LRH: All right. All right. Good.

PC: *And then, of course, the other thing I have is I've always been afraid of – my father was going to sexually molest me, ever since I was a child. I was afraid...*

LRH: Thought what?

PC: *Huh?*

LRH: Ever since you were what?

PC: *A child.*

LRH: Yeah. You always were afraid of that.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Well, who told you this?

PC: *Mother told me.*

LRH: What did she tell you?

PC: *Well, she told me that he wasn't safe to be around. Girls weren't safe to be around him.*

LRH: Uh, I see. And who didn't find out about her telling you?

PC: *Dad.*

LRH: All right. Who else didn't find out about it? Anybody else?

PC: *I doubt it. She used to scream this one to the high housetops whenever she was...*

LRH: Well, what did she used to scream to the high housetops?

PC: *That he was a monster and beast and all this type thing I...*

LRH: Is that so?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *My mother never did uh...*

LRH: All right. Did anything of this character ever happen?

PC: *With Dad, you mean?*

LRH: Yeah, mm.

PC: *Well, not that I know of. I've heard of incidences where he did. My mother... Actually, I'm sure it was true, but I didn't know about it until later.*

LRH: What was true?

PC: *Well, that he had molested my aunt when she was nine.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But this was way before my time.*

LRH: Mmm.

PC: *And I didn't find out about that till I was sixteen.*

LRH: All right. Is any of this an overt against your father?

PC: *Well, now it is because I can – I have a – better understanding what was going on with him. Now, let's see, was it at the time. It seems like it was, some feel there but not any...*

LRH: All right. Well, what's this four-year-old incident we're looking for?

PC: *Hmm.*

LRH: Tick-tick. What is it? Tick-tick, what is it? Come on. There it is.

PC: *Yeah. Well, this one's been plaguing me ever since '50, and I don't know what it is.*

LRH: Uh, you've had something plaguing you since '50.

PC: *Yeah. This turns up quite often.*

LRH: What?

PC: *Just that there... I get four and six mixed up.*

LRH: Is that the only thing about it that plagues you?

PC: *No, just I feel like something did happen, but I don't know what it is.*

LRH: All right. All right. Very good. All right. Now, just think about this for a moment. What happened to you when you were four? That's it.

PC: *Well, what I thought of is I moved from North Dakota to Park City, but that happened to me, but...*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *... that doesn't seem very significant.*

LRH: All right. What did you do? What did you do when you were four? That's it. Tickety-tick.

PC: *Now I have a stuck picture of the granary – when I was sitting in the granary.*

LRH: Granary.

PC: *Mm. But I don't know what I did.*

LRH: What granary?

PC: *This, I think, is in Park City. I think.*

LRH: All right. Well, who hasn't found out about it?

PC: *Most auditors.*

LRH: All right. Who else hasn't found out about it?

PC: *Well, Mother didn't... I don't think Mother found out about it.*

LRH: All right. Who else hasn't found out about this four-year-old incident?

PC: *Well, I haven't found out about it.*

LRH: All right. Very good. How long haven't you found out about it?

PC: *Sheesh, ever since 1950, when it got dredged up somehow in engraving.*

LRH: 1950.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Very good. Now, who missed that withhold in 1950?

PC: *Mildred.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Mildred. One of my first auditors.*

LRH: All right. And what did she miss? Tick-tick.

PC: *Hm. Just missed that I feel there is something there and I don't know what it is.*

LRH: All right. Did you tell her there was something there?

PC: *Well, it was more like she was making – you know, having me go earlier and earlier, and I would – I bumped into it.*

LRH: And what did you bump into?

PC: *Just uh – uh – more of a – a impression that something happened.*

LRH: What's the impression? What do you mean, impression?

PC: *Uh, all I get is just a picture flashes that I'm on this granary – I was sitting in the granary – and I'm sure I had something that I had stolen, but I don't know what it is. And I'm sure it was something that belonged to the neighbor gal, and I don't – I'm sure I was hiding.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *But that's all I can get on it.*

LRH: All right. Is that what you bumped into when you were – in 1950?

PC: *The impression. It didn't really...*

LRH: Uh, you know more about it now...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... than you did in '50.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. Has this sort of haunted you, this little four-year-old period here?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Well, who's missed it as a withhold?

PC: *Well, Mildred missed it.*

LRH: Who else?

PC: *Paul.*

LRH: Good. Who else?

PC: *Actually, Donna is the one that dredged it up. I got more on it with her than in – any other auditor.*

LRH: Uh, people have been looking for this?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: I see. Good. And who's missed it?

PC: *Um – Juanita.*

LRH: Good. Who else has missed it?

PC: *Hm. I was looking at the '55 auditors – Hazel Hart.*

LRH: All right. Good. Who else has missed it?

PC: *Actually, Dick missed it here on course.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah. He was...*

LRH: Good. Good.

PC: *... poking around in that area.*

LRH: All right. Who else has missed it?

PC: *That's about all. The one I'm looking at here is just a long – all these auditors poking around trying to uncover this one and never being able to...*

LRH: Hm-hm. .

PC: *... get it.*

LRH: Did you think there was anything there originally?

PC: *Uh – not uh – no, not really.*

LRH: You didn't think there was anything...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... there originally.

PC: *Yeah. It's just that uh...*

LRH: Just a...

PC: *... there should be something when I – I should have a time track when I'm four years old, shouldn't I?*

LRH: I see. All right. All right. Why? Is it because the time track is missing there?

PC: *That's partially it. The other one is that I've got the confusion there. I've always had the six-year-old picture...*

LRH: Mmm.

PC: *... and I always got it confused: it's four, it's six; it's four, it's six.*

LRH: Mm-hm. And is this what they usually take off on?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: And so forth. And you usually bring this up.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Is that right?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Now, how do you always bring this up?

PC: *Because they ask me questions on it, and I never know what to do with it. I mean, how am I supposed to answer up to something I don't remember?*

LRH: All right. But how come this turns up in the first place?

PC: *Because my attention just goes that way. I go "bloomp" on this picture, and then I go four, six. There must some – have been something happened at four.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *I keep figuring on it.*

LRH: Mm-mm. Well, who basically is missing this withhold?

PC: *Well, I am, basically.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Fine. Is there anything there that's withheld?

PC: *Just...*

LRH: Did anything happen when you were four?

PC: *I don't know. You see, there must have been something happened, but I don't know.*

LRH: Well, good. Well, why do you want auditors to look there?

PC: *I don't, particularly.*

LRH: Look, look-a-here. We're going over this ground.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: How come we're sitting there?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: That's fascinating...

PC: *Yeah!*

LRH: ... isn't it? Now, is there something on either side of this that you want an auditor to avoid? I'm not asking you a dirty question.

PC: *Mm, I don't mind you asking.*

LRH: But is there something there that you want an avoidance on? Is there something there you're trying to avoid? Is there something there you're trying to get auditors to avoid?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Nope. That's right. This is clean.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: See, I've got to ask these questions to straighten it out.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. Did anything happen when you were four? I don't find anything on the meter.

PC: *Well, that's fine with me.*

LRH: Well, who insisted there was something at four? I just asked you if there was something at four. I haven't insisted there's anything there. But who, amongst your auditors, insisted there was something there?

PC: *Well, I don't know why they...*

LRH: There is something right there.

PC: *Yeah, well, I'm not sure that they insisted; just like it came up and they would poke.*

LRH: They'd what?

PC: *They'd poke on in that area to see if we could open up the track.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *You know? I don't think they insisted on it, however. Like I would do the same thing I did tonight: It's six, it's four; it's six, it's four.*

LRH: Well, what do you do? Cut your throat on the subject of sex when you were about six by telling on your brother? Is there some regret involved in this?

PC: *Well, sure.*

LRH: Yeah, what's the regret?

PC: *Well... Actually, the most regret I have on this is Mother. Because, I mean, I didn't cut my brother's throat on this one. I mean, Mother beat him up, but then that isn't particularly disastrous. You know?*

LRH: Well, what's disastrous there?

PC: *That my mother had uh... well, had her ideas of the way a little girl should behave shook.*

LRH: Mmm.

PC: *I hadn't intended that.*

LRH: Mmm. Do something to your mother?

PC: *Well, sure, I jus-ss... I did... I indulged in sex play that was totally something she didn't want me to do. Yeah, she's got something like "you're ruined if you do," you know?*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *'Course, I have, too.*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *You know? And like I... I didn't ever intend for her to get this one shook up.*

LRH: Get what? G...

PC: *Get this idea of hers shook up.*

LRH: Mm-mm. Well, did she talk to you about the commercial value of all this?

PC: *That was later.*

LRH: Uh, yeah. But at that time there was something about this, hm?

PC: *Yeah. I didn't actually know she was sitting that strongly on – on it.*

LRH: I see. All right. Now, let's skip what you don't know. Let's take a look at what you *know* in that period. Now, what do you *know* in that period?

PC: *What period?*

LRH: Anytime. Four, six – somewhere around in that lifetime area, in that life area.

PC: *Well, I know that incident.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I know the incident when I was four when I hit that little girl. I was four then.*

LRH: When you were four...

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: ...you were what?

PC: *I hit that little girl. I know about that.*

LRH: You know about that.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Is that an overt?

PC: *Well, sure.*

LRH: All right. How long have you known about that?

PC: *Well, I've always known that one.*

LRH: All right. Good. And what other incident do you know in four-six period?

PC: *Uh, wait a minute. I – I – I know why auditors would go off on this one, is because I still have that one there*

that is the divided thing where I was sitting in the hall. I can't account for that.

LRH: What hall?

PC: *It's a side porch.*

LRH: Yeah, what about the side porch? You mean you had it... What about this picture? You mean you've got a picture there...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: ... and auditors keep hitting it?

PC: *Yeah. It turns – it just automatically comes up when I think about that six incident.*

LRH: I see. At four you get a picture of the side porch.

PC: *Yeah. And it's all...*

LRH: Six and four.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Uh-huh. Did it...

PC: *Like...*

LRH: Is it this lifetime?

PC: *Hm?*

LRH: Has the picture anything to do with this lifetime?

PC: *I can't be sure about that.*

LRH: Mm-mm. So you got a picture.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Interesting. How many other pictures you got? Bang! What's that.

PC: *Well, I bumped into that one where I saw that man sitting in the rocking chair. He was a monster.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Uh, I saw this monster sitting in the rocking chair, and... But this actually is an actual... I don't know whether I slapped a picture over it or there was actually a man sitting there. But he was there and I called my sister and she came out, and he wasn't – he'd disappeared out of the chair.*

LRH: Yeah...

PC: *I got that picture.*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. All right. Now, what do we – what *don't* we know about this period?

PC: *Mmmmmmmmm.*

LRH: What is unknown about this period?

PC: *Well, everything – my whole chronological events of my life in that period is unknown to me.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And who's been missing all these?

PC: *Uh, well, all the auditors missed that.*

LRH: Well, good. What's the withholds in this area? What are the real withholds in this area?

PC: *Well, my whole – my life is a withhold there. What did I do? What was I like? You know?*

LRH: Hmm. All right. And who's been missing it?

PC: *Mostly me.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Very good. Very good. And any other data you'd like to tell me about concerning that right now? All right. We got a little halt – little click, little click.

What's that? What are you going over? Bing. Bing. What are you going over there?

PC: *Mostly, I've – mm – come into present time and noticing it was getting late, is all.*

LRH: All right. Good. Is that what you're noticing.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, what about sleeping with a man to trap him?

PC: *Jimmy is the only one I'd want to be and Charlie.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Yeah, Jimmy and Charlie. No, this isn't true. I had some promiscuity...*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *I had some promiscuity occurred in between Jimmy and Charlie. But I wasn't intending to entrap.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Just let me ask you that question now.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Let's find out what the reaction we get on this is.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. What about sleeping with a man to trap him? Seems peculiarly uncharged now.

PC: *Mmm. This feels uncharged.*

LRH: Well, do you suddenly feel better about it?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Did you feel worse about it than you do feel?

PC: *Well, I did during the break – felt worse...*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: ... *than I did. I feel all right about it now.*

LRH: Mm-mm. Do you think anything has occurred here, then?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: What?

PC: *Well, feel more uh – uh – well, actually, less frantic about the whole thing, and notice a lot of connections between my present behavior and past stuff*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *You know?*

LRH: Mmm.

PC: *Like it's what's going on with me with this chronic PTP is just the story of my life.*

LRH: All right, honey.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Nothing too new in this then.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right, honey. Now, we got a null on this What question.

PC: *Uh, good-o.*

LRH: And so if it's all right with you, why, I'd like to end that Prepchecking and bring us down the line.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *That's fine. Fine.*

LRH: All right? All right? Okay. Anything you care to say or ask before I end that Prepchecking?

PC: *No. Just...*

LRH: All right.

PC: ... *thank you.*

LRH: All right. All right. Here we go. Okay. Let's walk into these end rudiments, huh?

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Have you told me any half truth? Have you told me any half-truth? Untruth?

All right. Come up to present time.

PC: *Mm. Okay.*

LRH: All right. See if we get this thing a little bit better here.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Have you told me any half-truth? Thank you. Untruth?

PC: *Mm-mm...*

LRH: All right. Said something only to impress me? Uh, what have you said only to impress me?

PC: *Well, I always get the impression when I'm sitting here talking that I am impressing.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. You doing it on purpose?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Have you done it on purpose just for me?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. All right. Have you said something only to impress me?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Not anything particularly?

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: All right. Let me clear that again.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Have you said something only to impress me? That's all right. Have you tried to damage anyone in this session? Tried to damage anyone in this... Boy, you sure stop on *damage*, don't you?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: The damage kid, huh?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now listen to me: Have you tried to damage anyone in this session?

PC: *No.*

LRH: That's so right. All right. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. That's in this session?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. The subject of E-Meter seems a little rough with you here.

PC: *Yeah, that's a lot of uh...*

LRH: What's the matter?

PC: *... never can tell what the meter is reading on. You know?*

LRH: Don't auditors tell you?

PC: *Well, yeah, they tell me, but they say, "Well, have I missed a with-*

hold?" and I say no, and they say, "Well, it's clicking," and then it's unreal to me because I don't feel like I've failed to tell an auditor something. Then I dig, and it does clean up.

LRH: Mm-mm. Mm-mm. What do you answer them for?

PC: *What do you mean?*

LRH: Just what are you answering them for?

PC: *Well, they say, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" and I say no.*

LRH: They're actually just talking to the meter.

PC: *Is that what goes on?*

LRH: Well, sure. And you say – they say, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" you see, and you say no. And they say, "uh, yes, you have," and so forth. What are you talking for?

PC: *Ha!*

LRH: They're just rudiments.

PC: *Oh!*

LRH: You don't have to say anything.

PC: *Well, then I feel like if I don't do that, then I end up with – it will read when it says "have you failed to answer a question or a command?" See? [PC and auditor laugh]*

LRH: All right. You're going to be caught three ways from the middle.

PC: *Yeah. You're trapped any way you do it.*

LRH: All right, honey. Well, you go ahead and answer it or not, as you please.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you in this session? That's clean. Thank you. You see, you didn't get a chance to answer me, did you?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? There's a tiny, latent slowdown. Is there a little bit of something that...

PC: *Just uh...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *...I'm sure if I dredged, I probably could find a lot of things, but like you haven't missed anything.*

LRH: All right. But in this session...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... in this session...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... what we have done...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... have I missed a withhold on you?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. I got a tick. I got a little latent tick here.

PC: *Yeah. Well, I'm afraid if I take a look and I ever find something, then it's going to be missed.*

LRH: Go ahead and take a look.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: I'm running this session. You relax!

PC: *Yeah. Okay.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Let's see. No. Nothing.*

LRH: All right. All right, let me check that again. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? I got a click.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: That's it. That's it. That's it. Right there.

PC: *Well, just uh... see, this didn't turn up in this session.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *It didn't turn up in this session, but it's here now.*

LRH: What is it?

PC: *That's what I don't understand.*

LRH: All right. Well, all right.

PC: *Uh... well, like I've got some discreditable habits that I don't particularly like to talk about.*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *You know?*

LRH: All right. Have I failed to find out about those?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Good. Good. All right. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? Well, it's just a latent tick now. Now, what did you think of on that latent tick?

PC: *Just wondering, well, are you going to – if it's going to click again.*

LRH: Click, click, click. There it is.

PC: *Yeah. Just wondering, is it going to click again?*

LRH: Well, no, it's latent.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: It's latent. I'm just being mean. I'm just cleaning it up hard...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... see? All right. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? Yeah. Tick.

PC: *Hmm.*

LRH: Tick.

PC: *Well, what you're – what you've missed is I get – just my – my mmm – I'm thinking thoughts, and now it's a missed withhold, and damn it. You know?*

LRH: What is this?

PC: *Just, well...*

LRH: Are you sitting there trying to run the session?

PC: *Uh...*

LRH: Trying to keep yourself from thinking things and thinking things and...

PC: *Yeah. Actually, I'm trying to not to dump all my case in your lap.*

LRH: Well, thank you. Are you trying to keep me from missing a withhold?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Yeah. All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: You're working much too hard, you know?

PC: *Yeah. I am.*

LRH: You know? That's my job just now.

PC: *Yeah. Okay.*

LRH: All right. But what I've asked for and what I've looked into, you've told me, haven't you?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Right. All right. Now, let me ask this question again. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? There, that's very latent, and we're just going to leave it that way.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: All right. Because I think that one came up from anxiety of "is it going to be clean?"

PC: *Yeah. It did.*

LRH: You sure have a hell of a time with the meter.

PC: *Yeah, I do.*

LRH: Yeah. You're not used to an auditor like me. I just maul you around and say you're supposed to do this and that.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything. Click!

PC: *I can really have that picture. It reminds me of the Outrigger picture, the one that's in The Outrigger in Seattle.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. Let me check this again.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Look around here and tell me if you can have anything. Tiny slowdown. What else did you run into?

PC: *I was staring right into the face of the camera.*

LRH: Uh, all right. It isn't on, that one.

PC: *Uh, good-o.*

LRH: All right. Let me check it again.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything

PC: *That telephone.*

LRH: That's my girl.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: That was quite late.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: So we're just going to leave that one right *there*.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: You might give me a can – wait a second now. This...

PC: *I've got them clutched awfully hard.*

LRH: That's all right. Let me make sure that you've got some havingness here. Squeeze them. Man! Man, who runs you with havingness that far down? What's your ordinary havingness run?

PC: *Point out something*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *You mean the process?*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Point out something.*

LRH: Yeah? Well, here we go. We're going to run a few commands of that. All right?

PC: *Will it be... can I just do it like this?*

LRH: Just do it right like that.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Point out something.

PC: *You.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *That lamp.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *That picture.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *That thing on the mantel.*

LRH: Good. Point out something

PC: *The camera.*

LRH: Thank you. All right. Squeeze the cans, just like you did before.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Boy, that's certainly not much can squeeze. How are you holding those cans?

PC: *I'm clutching them.*

LRH: All right. Give 'em a squeeze. Uh right. Point out something

PC: *The telephone.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *Those curtains.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *The radiator.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *The televisions.*

LRH: Good. Point out something

PC: *That chair.*

LRH: Good. Point out something

PC: *That camera.*

LRH: Good. Point out something

PC: *Uh – that cabinet.*

LRH: Good. All right. Squeeze the cans. Well, that's – we're gaining tone arm on it anyhow.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. Point out something.

PC: *The couch.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *That fireplace.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *The fire.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *The model on the floor.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *That glass.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *The lights.*

LRH: All right. Put your cans in your lap now. All right. Squeeze the cans. That's better.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. Point out something.

PC: *That case.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *That chest.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *Uh – those wires.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *The curtains.*

LRH: All right. If it's all right with you, I'll give you two more commands and end this process.

PC: *Fine.*

LRH: Very good. Point out something.

PC: You.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *The sign.*

LRH: Good. All right. Is there anything you care to say before I end that process?

PC: *Just I feel more here.*

LRH: All right. Excellent. End of process.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Okay. Now, have you made any part of your goals for this session, which was "find the missed withhold"?

PC: *Yeah. That one doesn't seem very real to me somehow. That uh...*

LRH: That goal? Yeah?

PC: *Yeah. It just what's more real to me is that the chronic PTP is more handled.*

LRH: Uh, all right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Well, did we find something about this, and so forth?

PC: *Yeah, did, on that one.*

LRH: All right. Then you say "to get this PTP handled." Do you feel better about this PTP?

PC: *Yeah, I do.*

LRH: All right, honey. Very good. All right. Is there any gains you'd care to mention?

PC: *Well, just feel much more comfortable about you. That's a big gain.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Anything else?

PC: *Uh – there's another gain here, but I don't know how to put it. Yes, I do, too, know what it is. More willingness to communicate freely in front of a group. I didn't realize I'd be this comfortable about that.*

LRH: Uh, all right. Very good.

PC: *I didn't have to not-is them either. I was sort of on the edge of awareness that they were there.*

LRH: Well, I must say you came through excellently well with that little warning and that...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... much of a surprise.

PC: *I was totally uuu-uh when I came up.*

LRH: All right. And then, is there anything that you would care to say or ask before I end this session?

PC: *I would like to know the tone arm actions.*

LRH: Your tone arm action is not quite back up to 2 now. It's been down to 1. You've been varying between 1.5 and 2.

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: Running a half a tone division.

PC: *I see.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *Okay. Thank you.*

LRH: All right. Anything else?

PC: *No. That's all.*

LRH: All right. Is it all right with you if I end this session now?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. Here it is. *End of session.* Okay. Has the session ended for you?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Very good. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC: *You're no longer auditing me.*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *And thanks again.*

LRH: You're certainly welcome.

CRAFTSMANSHIP, FUNDAMENTALS

A lecture given on 3 May 1962

Well, how are you doing tonight?

Audience: Good.

You're looking better. Anyway, I'd like to make a few small comments on the session you saw last night.

Let's see, this is what? Three Mar. [May] AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, first lecture. Where is the pc? Is it all right if I make a comment on that?

Female voice: That's fine, yes.

All right, very good.

This lecture, in general, is what I expect out of an auditor. That's what this is. But before we go into that too broadly, I want to make a few comments on that.

There's apparently a considerable amount of surprise expressed here and there that one would stop buying skim milk. And if you were to replay that tape, you would find out at the beginning that the auditor spent something like five or six minutes getting the pc to say something she had done, not something she had intended. Got it?

A missed withhold picked up in a session is anything the pc thinks, anything the pc is withholding. That doesn't matter. That's a session missed withhold, you understand? Pc didn't tell the auditor he was uncomfortable. That's all right for a session missed withhold. But we were prepchecking, and Prepchecking means meat. We only buy meat in Prepchecking, see? We don't buy skim milk. See, we want meat. Preferably with blood dripping off of it. Get the idea? We want some meaningful acts; we don't want meaningless acts. That's a big difference, see?

We don't want antisocial acts, particularly, like "I picked my nose," you know, just because this is seamier – the seamier side of life, you see? An auditor can actually start specializing in just the seamier side of life. And they have nothing to do with anybody, didn't do anything to anybody, don't you see, and specialize in picking up weird and peculiar practices on the part of the pc. He didn't do anything to anybody, you understand, he just had a weird and peculiar practice, you know? It doesn't mean shucks! Heh! Worthless.

For instance, you could take some of the Book One subjects, like masturbation, something like that. Oh, this is embarrassing. Yes, it shows up as something of the sort; it's the

human race, you see? And it's not really doing anything to anybody, unless it is doing something to somebody. You get the idea? A lot of auditors specialize in embarrassing things, see, as the very thing you must pick up. To hell with them! You know? Well, pick them up, but *thathathabooh!* No, we're interested in things people have *done* to people. See? We're interested in *overts*. We is not interested in a withhold because it is simply seamy. Do you get the difference here? There's a considerable difference. He'd done something to somebody. He has an accusative attitude toward somebody, and we want to find out immediately afterwards what he'd done to somebody. Accusative attitude – so what? It merely means he's done something to this person, that's all, see? He's critical of Joe. Well, why is he critical of Joe? Well, he's critical of Joe because he's done something to Joe. See?

Heh, you pick up a missed withhold, "Well, I was critical of Joe." Balderdash! Nonsense! You can pick up 8,762, see, and the pc won't be any better. And all of a sudden somebody gets bright, and say, "Well, what have you done to Joe?"

And he, "Oh, this is nothing – slept with his wife. Didn't tell him. She committed suicide later. He always thought he did it. I realized all the time I had, you know?" Oh yeah. This starts getting something, see? This is more the comparative side of existence, don't you see? I mean, this is more factual. *Done* something, see?

Now, in this session we found out something – and a good auditor could have extrapolated from this – we found out affection was trapping people. See, it was a bad thing. Affection was a bad thing.

Now, if you reach way back into your fundamentals: Auditors either audit by fundamentals or by music. And the best auditors audit by fundamentals. But the job can be done auditing by the words and music, see? You know, just auditing by rote and ritual. Fundamentals. There's an old triangle, and if you think real hard you might be able to remember it. It's called the ARC triangle. And we have found the A triangle was an overt. So therefore, things must look pretty unreal. So therefore, communication of any kind is an overt; so therefore, the thing to do is withhold. And withholding is a virtue, not an overt.

So my next Zero question, having cleaned up the Zero question we went in on, would have been, "What communication, in some portion or another, added up to an overt act?" Got the idea? As a matter of fact, we were picking some up. "Hit a girl with a rock in the stomach." Communication, overt act. See?

Now, part of the present time problem was the dissemination of Scientology. If affection – let's just audit by the seat of our pants here, see? – if affection is trapping people, then communication of Scientology would be reprehensible reactively. You got it?

Audience: Hm-mm.

I'm sorry, pc.

Female voice: That's fine.

That's an evaluation.

Female voice: Thanks.

All right. But there it is. See that? She had two PTPs and we were cleaning up two chronic present time problems. And one of them was a continuing present time problem she's having all the time with her husband which enters into a communication battle all the time, see? See? Letters and telephone calls, and then she has an upset and can't get into session, see?

How could anybody sit around and look at this for a long time, you see, without doing something about this? See, at this point I should get cross with you, because obviously, obviously, there's something else. See? Must have been. But you didn't have the technology. You didn't have the technology down pat.

All right, let's get the technology down pat. I understand you had the technology down pat today, and that is it must have been a missed withhold of the magnitude of a doingness to cause a continuous present time problem – the withhold missed by the person with whom we had the present time problem. So that cleaned it up, huh? In the process of doing this, we didn't have a second session following immediately after this, but the second session we would have cleaned up the other side of the PTP, which is "can't disseminate Scientology." And we had the answer, right there, see? Got the answer gratuitously. See? ARC. If affection trapped people, then communication must do them up in a ball. See? All right, so we'd have to clean up communication withholds. That is, things that she had done with communication that were reprehensible. See? We clean some of those up and we find out, all of a sudden, the whole problem falls apart. We also find out any IQ difficulty that she kept complaining about – the IQ would soar. Do you see why it'd soar? See, it must be down, because she mustn't communicate, which in itself is a continuous withhold. And stupidity equals withhold, you understand? So she feels stupid, so therefore it's the area of withhold. Okay? That make sense to you?

Female voice: Yes.

All right.

That's auditing by fundamentals. See?

I wanted to call something else to your attention, which you might have found very, very interesting, is that we had twenty or thirty incidents on that chain that we never touched. The old man just went earlier. Do you realize I picked up the first incident on the chain? Huh? And went earlier? What was I doing going earlier? If the first incident on the chain showed that there was no sexual activity prior to the first incident on the chain, what were we doing going earlier? Well, I just went earlier because you go earlier. And did you see that the question nulled? Nulled beautifully. Do you realize there are twenty or thirty incidents the pc probably never recounted? Well, where were they? What happened to the charge? See, that's the mystery of it all. What happened to that charge?

Well, you pull basic-basic on the immediate chain by pulling all the underpinnings out of basic-basic, if you want to get it that way. Anything that added up to why she would do this, we pulled. The rest of it must have just gone brrrzt! See?

So if you go at it on the basis that you're running engrams called withholds, and you run every engram, do you see – if you're going at it on that basis – it's going to take you for-

ever. See? I think the pc will tell you we had a nice win last night. See? Yet we never did touch the upper part of the chain. We never even touched the subject of the PTP. Isn't that fascinating? There was only one comment on it and then from there on we cleaned it up. You see that? Audit by fundamentals. Get the earliest on the chain and release it. And if you can get the earliest on the chain, you can pull it out of the mud, and all the later ones go.

There was one oddity about this case that you might find real odd: is that basic-basic was a not-knowingness about a nothing. Fascinating, you know? That was fascinating. There was no basic-basic. The pc thought there was. And we looked in vain. And why did we look in vain? Because every auditor had always looked in vain.

How come you're always looking for a somethingness? This was a trick case. This was very trick. The whole trick about it was, is there was nothing at the basic. And she hadn't done anything but thought she had, and must have because auditors had kept her looking for it. But we must also add into the fact that she must have kept handing it to auditors. See? And then we must have had the auditor never look at the E-Meter.

Now, did you see this last night? I said, "What happened when you were four years old?" And we had some ticks and tocks, and we cleaned that up. Now, "What happened when you were four years old?" And eventually we could find nothing. There was no charge on anything happened when she was four years old. Obviously nothing had happened. That was very tricky and very freaky. But how come I found it? Well, I found it simply because I audit by fundamentals. A not-knowingness is a not-knowingness.

Wrote a story once called *Fear*. A guy lost four hours and his hat, you know? All you have to do is lose four hours and your hat sometime and you've had it, see? Particularly if somebody keeps insisting that something happened. I'm sure some of you, in college or around and about, have tried to convince some compatriot of the terrible things he did while he was drunk, or while she was drunk. Of course, it adds in a not-know because they can't say they did and they can't say they didn't. So you'll get a not-know basic which serves, mechanically – it is a not-knowingness that begins the chain. So, of course this chain stood hooked in because there was a not-knowingness about it. But the not-knowingness was in reverse at this time – there was nothing had happened. Right? It's just crazy.

You by the way won't find that ordinarily in auditing pcs. That was just freaky. But you audit by fundamental, and of course a not-knowingness at the bottom of the chain of course is just a not-knowingness at the bottom of the chain. It doesn't have to even be a not-knowingness about something. It doesn't have to be anything about the bottom of the chain. That's elementary. Well, enough about that.

This should give you some kind of an idea of what I mean by auditing by fundamentals. You just never give up on the fundamental. Now, I'll give you an idea here, see? Pc: "Yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, and I am tired of listing!" See? And "I can't think of any more."

Now, the reasonable auditor says, "Of course you can get tired listing." And it is true, he couldn't think of any more. This is absolutely true. But the auditor says, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" See, he audits not by reasonableness, but by a fundamental. When the pc gets nattery, he has a missed withhold. He doesn't care whether this missed withhold is justi-

fied or not justified, understandable or not understandable; he just audits by the fundamental that a missed withhold must be present, and you ask for it and pull it, and the fellow keeps on listing again. That happened today, and I was very, very interested to hear about it. See? You mustn't be reasonable, you must be fundamental.

There are certain basic truths and laws about the human mind. They are not very many. They are astonishingly few. You audit by those, not by how reasonable it is that something else would be the case. You actually have to isolate out for yourself what is true and what is fundamental. I could give you a list of things here and punch it down your gullet and get you examined on this thing until you were green in the face, you see? And I'd say, "These are the truths and that's all there is to it." Well, that's something like feeding this boa constrictor I was talking about, see? And if the auditor is unable to regurgitate the proper datum at that instant, why, he'd be sunk in any tough situation, you see, in an auditing session, wouldn't he? He'd be sunk, right there.

Well, actually, a stable datum fixed in by a confusion, and not by understanding, doesn't happen to be available in a tight spot. So you don't audit by fundamentals, you audit by being reasonable. So you must recognize a fundamental for what it is. A fundamental is a fundamental. I can go this far: I can say to you, "This is a fundamental. Damn it all, find out about it!" And tell you eight, ten, fifteen times, "It's a fundamental; find out about it!" See?

And then one fine day you say, "Well, I haven't got anything else to do; I think I'll find out about this. Oh my God, it is a fundamental." At that point it becomes a usable tool.

You can go on believing these fundamentals are fundamentals and never using them or never spitting them out at the time they're required and you'll go on being a ritualist. You go right on being a ritualist. All of a sudden, pc after pc you'll miss on. And you say, "Why am I missing on this pc?" It'll be something on this basis – since here was a pc we hadn't been missing on one way or the other – be on the basis of the auditor does not feel free to recognize that a fundamental applies here.

We're always asking this question, "What is an overt?" To one case it's one thing, and to one – another case it's another thing. But we had this gratuitously offered, see, on this case I audited. Case described an overt. Well, we're not much interested in sensation – auditing sensation – so therefore affection, see, traps people. All right, great. I can tell you a secret, that it isn't going to move very far in Prepchecking. Why isn't it going to move very far? Well, because you're just auditing straight sensation. You're saying, "Have you ever grief?" "Have you ever grief?" "Have you ever grief?"

"No."

"Have you ever – have you ever used communication so as to harm somebody?" or something like that. Oh well, now we're on real fruitful ground, aren't we? See, by taking the ARC triangle and moving around to another corner of it that does apply, we've got it. Well, that's fundamental.

All of you have ARC down real well. Well, it's fundamental. It exists. When the R goes down the A goes down, the C goes down; when the R goes up, then the C goes up, when the A goes up, you know, they always go up – all of them, all together.

So there's an opportunity to improve communication. And of course, lack of communication or jammed communication (withholds equals stupidity) – we could have made the case brighter. This is by fundamentals, you see?

One day you yourself will be puzzling around. You will be puzzling as to why a withhold makes people so stupid. And after you've sat there being stupid about it for some time, you will suddenly realize that it has something to do with something that has nothing to do with communication; that the reverse of communication must be happening here. And you'll eventually think the whole thought out all by yourself and look back on it and say, "Oh, well! Heh-heh! Huh. I sure been feeling stupid for the last five minutes! I wonder if I was withholding something? Well, I was withholding the answer to it," or something like this. And you suddenly add it up and say, "Ha-ha-ha! Withholds equal stupidity. Heh! For sure!" See? So therefore, lack of communication equals stupidity, you see? Quite fascinating.

But you can take these things, and because these data are known, you can get a hopped-up, speeded-up, enormously increased look at the things. You got a chance to look at these things and you will eventually see that they knock out other things. And you don't need these 8,655 superstitions like "I must not stand under a karo tree because it's what gives women babies," you know? I mean, other true data of the human race. I imagine there's girls right here that have been Polynesians or something like that, and have been part of a taboo-ridden society, and they don't realize why they always flinch alongside of lampposts, or something like that. [laughter]

And on the other hand, some of us have often lived a canine life. [laughter, laughs] But these are superstitions. And when you get down to the bottom of the pile, why, all these superstitions become understandable.

But what I expect of an auditor is to audit the pc that's right there in front of him by the most fundamental fundamentals that he can command and understand. And if he does that, he will always get wins. See, this auditor will always get wins. He won't go around in any kind of a fog about it. And he'll see that the Prepcheck system is put together very adroitly. But it becomes totally nonfunctional when you take off from a Zero question, get no overt, put down any What that should have been a Zero A or something, get no overt on it, buy a lot of "thinks" and "supposed-to's" and that sort of thing, go on down a whole long chain of meaningless stuff – you know, not even getting the soles of the shoe wet. And nothing is clearing up and it's all very arduous and just goes on and on.

When you've done that a little while, you get the idea "I wonder if there isn't some better way to go about it?" And you go for broke about that point. And I can put your attention forward to this point: that unless you get something the pc has done, you see, for your What question, a specific incident (I don't care whether you're asking for missed withholds because it all depends on the Zero, what you're asking for), but unless you get a specific incident, and it actually has doingness in it, and you make a chain at that point – you just spot that there's a chain here at that point, and word it at that – that you're not going to get anything happening. You will see this and then the mechanics of the mind sort of start unraveling, "Oh well, yes, of course!", you know? And after you've run some of these chains down to the bottom then you'll find out that all chains are anchored because of not-knowingness in the bottom incident.

I point out something to you: on two or three demonstrations you have seen that my What question was not on the button. See? It was close enough to have created a breeze past somebody's ear. See? But it was not dead center. Because the only time you know enough to ask the exact What question is when you've finished Prepchecking! See? And then you can ask the exact What question. And if you want to appear a genius to an instructor, why, never write the What question down until you've finished the session, see? [laughter, laughs]

The What questions are never quite on. They're just sighting questions, that's all. They're never quite on. Because you really don't quite know what's on that chain, you see?

So you should realize that if it's that unknown to the pc, what God-given, turban-wearing prescience do you have that you're going to know all about it when the pc doesn't, and you haven't found out from the pc yet? Well, you can't find it out that exactly. But because when you're auditing by fundamentals, you know something about it – you know about what's going to turn up – you ask a What question that will probably turn up something that resembles this. And I'd say it's the sheerest luck, one out of a hundred, that a What question is dead-on. We had a What question of "What about sleeping with men to trap them?" See? Oh, that's pretty good. That was pretty good. Served our purposes beautifully and went null gorgeously. But it wasn't the chain. The chain all followed that What question. We had a chain that went on from there, but we were actually taking it back from an incident and were asking questions which relieved the What question which wasn't described by the What question, which I thought was quite fascinating. But I never expect your What question to be any closer on than that.

Pc gave you an overt, you actually did get an incident, and the pc actually did something in this; and then you put your What question to it, so as you get a chain of that type of incident, and then go earlier, you'll almost always find yourself out in the blue if that was the first incident. But it doesn't relieve; there must have been a lot of other factors. And you find yourself asking questions about other types. They're almost on, don't you see?

They'll be on the same dynamic. They will be the same type of personnel, you know? And you get those erased and all of a sudden the rest of the chain will blow. Your What questions are almost never dead on.

You would be a swami beyond all swamis if your What questions were absolutely accurate every time, see? So you just get a What question which describes the incident, in its workably general – not too general – terms and 'ope for the best! And fire from there. And you'll work it out every time. And that's all you're bound and determined to have to get null, is the incident you found. And sometimes the incident will go null. Well, if you notice, in working a Prepcheck question, I will only go over these things a couple of times, with me eye on the meter – and nothing was dying down. And that told me loads. Because I tell you, one withhold system, you know, I mean, one "When," "All," "Appear," you know, and "Who," and it didn't blow, well, it's something like the curiosity: "Well, we fired an 18-inch shell into the middle of the jam tin and it still sat there!" There must be some other thing holding down this mirage called a jam tin. We couldn't possibly have fired at the jam tin. We must have an image of the jam tin. Now let's find the jam tin. See? And the jam tin always lies earlier. Nothing ever locks up because of a later incident.

And you all of a sudden, when you go down, you finally pick up this pebble, and you don't even use the withhold system on it; it just kind of goes *whhh*. And you go back up the line and maybe use a withhold system on something else that was a little bit hangy and then come back to your What question and just ask the What question again, and it's null, see?

It is an inexact activity. Prepchecking is not an exact activity. It depends on the pc in front of you. I expect you to be able to audit and understand the pc who is in front of you.

Now, here's what else I expect of you: because Prepchecking itself is an inexact activity, I ask you to do it on the framework of total exactitude. See, just groove that in madly. That sounds weird, doesn't it? But give it in a Model Session, God 'elp us! You see? Your TRs, marvelous. Your E-Metering, superb. And when you've got those things all down so that you don't think any more about them than you think about your coat while you're eating dinner, man, can you prepcheck. You see? Got an exact frame: You got the withhold system, that's exact; you got your Model Session, that's exact; your E-Metering is exact; the fundamentals on which your chains are stacked up in the pc's mind will be found to follow those exact rules – always held in at the earliest incident; it's a cousin to the chain – and you take your exactitudes and just play by ear from then on.

There's probably nobody plays by ear better than a symphony soloist. There's nobody better trained in music, you see? These jam sessions – you hear some of these boys whoopin' up down around N'Orleans. Huh! Got a record upstairs that tells how that impromptu jam session was put together, you see? They worked on it eighteen or twenty hours and managed to get its impromptuness to sound imprompt. But the upshot of this is, is – well, you take a symphony orchestra drummer. I don't know how come they get these guys into symphony orchestras, unless it's the high-class or snob-level something or other. And then they get them into symphony orchestras and they must trap them there in some fashion, because these guys make Krupas look awfully, awfully dim! They're technicians. Man, they're marvelous.

One guy, one night ... You know, your jazz orchestra boys, they all have to use these whiskers, or something. These whisks, you know? And they get one of these whisks and they go over the top of the snare drum, and it says *snif, snif, snif, snif, snif*, you know, that sort of thing. Symphony orchestra man does it with a pair of drumsticks, and it goes *whisk, whisk, whisk, whisk, whisk*, you know? And where's his whisker? It isn't anyplace. You know? I swear those guys could play snare drums with their kettle drums if you asked them to, see? They're marvelous.

But they are precision musicians. They really can play by note, you see? They really can do their stuff. And after that, why, hell, they can do anything, you see? But let's get some high-school kid and before he learns how to back up Wagner, why, let's let him extrapolate with some jazz. It sounds that way, too. Never seems to – . It's just noisy. See, it's just noise. And actually, at any – this is always the illusion of any craftsman, is that he can do it offhandedly. It looks as though there is terrific ease. There's just nothing to it, you see? You see Weller out here whittling a block of wood. And you say, "Well, anybody could do that" – or look at something he's built, or something like that – and you say, "Well, anybody could do that." Go ahead, see? It looks so easy.

The mahogany despatch boxes that sit on the back ledge of my desk back there – he didn't cause any fuss building those things. They're all hand fitted and hand carved, without any tools to amount to anything, you see? The guy is a craftsman. He's been at that for a long time. And you give old Jenner out here a pile of stone. You see, nobody can work stone. Give old Jenner a pile of stone and you say, "Build me a wall." Well, you can give him specifications about the wall, but somehow or another a wall happens. It's all so easy. You see him working out there and you see stuff going up and there's nothing much to it.

Well, now and then he makes a mistake. But the only mistakes he actually makes is when he and me come into a planning or design disagreement. And once in a while, why, we won't see eye to eye on some planning or design thing – something else is going to go up after that that he doesn't know about or something like that. But as far as actually doing it, it looks awful easy. It looks awful easy till you get somebody else in who calls himself a bricklayer. And the guy goes out, and my God, you know? He *works*, and he's got *bricks* stacked up, and he's got *mortar*, you know? And he picks up bricks, you know, and he puts them *down*, and he *smooths* them out and he gets the mortar on top of them, and it falls all over the drive and we've – . There must have been such a bricklayer at work around here, because one wall that we found out there was plumb. And he makes a lot of work out of it, and you wind up with no wall. Well, it's just basically because he just doesn't – the guy wouldn't know really how to handle mortar with a trowel. It comes down to little, tiny fundamentals, you know?

You take the fellow who does a great job of sculpture: He knows his clay, and he knows this and he knows that. They're not something he's trying to learn while he is making the sculpt, see? He's all set, and then he sculpts. He knows how to do these things.

Your old-time painters had this down to perfection. I know; I was kicking around over on that side of the channel, back in them thar days – I mean, the real old-timers around 1350, 1360 – the real Flemish school that the other fellows just hah! you know, came along afterward and *pspt!* you know? Rembrandt – *pfhooh!* Well, he – copyist. [laughs] But in those days you couldn't run down to the paint store. You could have run down but there would have been no paint store. [laughter] And the way you learned how to paint is you went and found a master someplace and you ground color for him. And your little girlfriend would be saying to you, "Jan, how come you is so blue tonight?" [laughs, laughter] And you'd mortar and pestle his color. And you finally found out all there was to know about drying and color and pigment and what pigment did and what pigment didn't and how it was blended and how it was put together and what constituency of it is – and the darned paintings painted with it are still there.

Fascinating. They must have known something, huh? When you got all through, you knew how to – you'd find out how to spread the stuff and how to work it, and so on. And you actually go on for years. And someday, one day, why, the master would give you a brush, an old used brush of some kind or another, and say, "Well, you see the wall over there; well, make a paint stroke on it." And then you'd go over and you'd make a paint stroke on the wall, you know?

And he'd say, "Oh, my God! Give me that brush," you know?

You'd say, "What have I done wrong?" you know? Well, he couldn't find out what you'd done right! That was ...

You look at the Japanese work with brush and that sort of thing. They don't do it overnight, you know? It looks so easy. You know, you look at a Jap and he paints his bamboo, you know? He paints it all up and so on. He paints. And when it's all finished here's a beautiful free sketch, you see, of a bamboo.

You say, "That's easy." You take some charcoal or something, you know; you take a big piece of paper and you say, "Well, now let's see." And go *bzupt!* and *bzupt!* [laughter]

Well, the little Jap, he knows where to get the ink-stone, you know, and he knows how to grind it up, and he knows how to mix it and he knows how to handle brushes. And he could probably write with a brush as fast as you can write with a pen. Amazing!

And all of those things, however, are built out of a great ability to do a small detail. That's the common denominator of all great art. It's great ability to do a small detail. And out of that you get great art. And that's why these schools of drawing that you see down in Greenwich Village – well, they're all lined up along the board fence and so forth, and why in fifty years nobody can find those pictures around. They're definitely not going for 285 thousand pounds for one sketch. More likely you find them filling a mouse hole someplace to keep the draft out. And that's because those boys went on an entirely different idea: They see the ease with which it is done and mistake the tremendous skill in the tiny detail. Because the tiny det- it looks so easy, you see?

They see one of these boys painting, they see the results of the painting; it all looks so natural, it all looks so easy. So they use the same abandon with which the master works, you see? They use the same abandon with which the master works to paint their paintings or sculpt their sculptures, and it's mud. It's mud. And the only thing that's missing is "How do you take a small brush and flip it across a palette to bring it out to a point, and paint an absolutely straight line?" How do you do that?

Give you some idea of this: Michelangelo used to go calling on his friends, and if they weren't home he'd take a piece of chalk and he'd draw a circle on the door. And they always knew Michelangelo had been to visit them. He was the only man in all of Italy who could draw a freehand circle that was perfect. He'd draw a perfect circle. All of his friends recognized it as a badge, you know? Craftsmanship is built out of these – the exact skill, the exact response, the thing. I don't care how great the man's name is, or how splendid the accomplishment he's trying to accomplish, or how tiny or unimportant the thing is. The factor is still there. It's still craftsmanship. And craftsmanship is built out of tremendous expertness on the tiny detail. That's all you really have to know.

Now, our tiny details consist of a meter. One of the reasons we can clear today and get further today on cases, and get Goals Assessments and find terminals on cases, is because we have a better meter. All right, that's all right. That's neither here nor there. It still takes an auditor who is absolutely fabulous on reading a meter.

I went through a session this afternoon that I – . Yesterday my auditor said – he sort of wound up the end of the session and he was sort of stunned because he thought – sudden

thought struck him which was: "What if some beginning student had been trying to do that goals check?" It whumped him for a second. He suddenly realized how far he himself had come. He was reading a microscopic clean needle, but it was microscopic. And he was reading some that were going sporadic and some that were going unsporadic, and were going naturally and well, you see? And it was a job of work, you see? And because he was centering in toward the center of a goal, of course he was getting suppressions and invalidations left and right because already he was stirring up its oppterm, you see? He was stirring up both its terminal and oppterm. He was picking off missed withholds, invalidations and suppressions, and getting the read, and getting the read off suppressions and missed withholds and invalidations, and getting the read back on the goal. Then he had to test all of the goals that had been there to make sure that each one of those didn't have invalidations or suppressions, do you see, or missed withholds on them and about them, you see? And then he had to check those to make sure that they weren't still reading – make sure they were null.

And he was working around on this for about an hour or so – well, more than that – checking out this goal line, you see? And the thought afterward struck him; all of a sudden he realized how far he'd come. I guess what thought really occurred to him is what would he have done a year ago? See? The guy was doing it very easily and very naturally, see? There was nothing to it. Meter was talking all the way. Now, he didn't have time to do that and worry about the meter and worry about rote and ritual, and so forth. He didn't have time to worry about these other things. He had to have a lot of things down pat, didn't he?

He had to know this meter backwards. He had to know exactly what this meter was capable of and so forth. In other words, his attention couldn't be on the meter; his familiarity had to be sufficiently great that he could take the meter for granted and it still wouldn't knock his head off. Furthermore, his Model Session had to be absolutely perfect; he didn't have any time to worry about his Model Session. He had to know the exact fundamentals of what he was handling; he didn't have any time to figure out what he was handling, see? The whole thing was wrapped up in the fact that he was right in the middle of a Goals Problem Mass goal, and all of its little masses and so forth were just kicking the living daylights out of the goal because he had them stirred up like mad, do you see?

And he read the thing out and the end of the line, why, perfectly fine about it. And as I say, it suddenly struck him that what if he'd been trying to do it a year ago? I think that's what hit him. But it was all made out of little pieces. It was all made out of little pieces; the tremendous ease with which he could run a meter, the no worry of any kind on Model Session. He didn't have to fuss around with his TRs, don't you see? He didn't have any worries about these things whatsoever. He was totally relaxed. He knew those things backwards. He knew them forwards. And he knew he knew them. So he had at no moment any worry about them.

Now he could think of fundamentals. And the fundamentals are – is goals get invalidated and rudiments go out in any session, particularly a Goals Assessment. So all he had to do was just outguess the next missed withhold, you see? That's all he had to do. And keep checking and keep rolling. And it was dead easy. But it would have been un... insurmountable, utterly insurmountable, if he had been – had any worry about his meter; if he'd had any worry about his sessioning, you know, his TRs; or if he didn't know for sure that if the pc starts doping off all you did was pull the missed withhold. You know, it goes like this: He

sees the pc start to get dopey, he pulls the missed withhold, see? And bang! the pc is right back there again. Get the idea? And he suddenly sees that the goal is not reading, and it was reading a moment ahead. Well, he doesn't say, "Thank God, we have nulled it out at last." He says, "Is there an invalidation on this?" Pang! "All right, what was that?" Clean it up. "Is there an invalidation on that? That's clean. All right." Now, he repeats the goal again, he gets no read on the goal. Now he says, "That's null." Careful workmanship, see? Pays off, all the way down the line.

How do you get to be a superb auditor? It's just by knowing all those little parts. That's all. And just knowing them perfectly. And if an auditor finds out that he is apparently creaking on one of these infinitesimally unimportant skills (you see, he'll be creaky on it) – if he ever is sitting there auditing and is saying, "I wonder – I wonder if that pc is getting my acknowledgments" – if he finds himself worrying about this or wondering about that, you see, I swear he'll never have time to do anything else. But what he should do, at this particular time, if he finds himself worrying about these things, ah, he ought to practice with some TR 4, get somebody there until he really gets that TR 4 in there, you know? Really gets it going good – or 3, or 2, or whatever else he's out on, see? That's the smart auditor.

The smart student of auditing would make himself a checksheet of these various parts of auditing. I'm talking now about the parts of mixing the pigments, you see? Grinding the lapis lazuli – that stage of the game. Well, just make himself a checksheet on these things, and go over that checksheet very carefully, wondering if at any time, in any recent session, he has worried about any part of his checksheet. See, make a checksheet which includes the various parts of the E-Meter. You know? The sensitivity knob, the trim, the dial, tone arm dial, something like – that he's had trouble with, or worried about. Just go over this checksheet which has all of these various parts and items and TRs and things like that. And go over that, and just ask himself honestly, "Now, in the last few sessions have I had any concern with this?" See? "Well, then, how about this one? I have trouble confronting pcs lately? Oh, yeah. All right. Well, we'll cross that one." And then just take those points he's crossed and just go ahead and drill them. Just drill them. Just treat it like a parade-ground drill, that's all.

A dancer: he finds out that he usually stumbles on his exit. You'll find him going out on the stage and practice that step that gets him exited until he doesn't stumble on his exit.

Only then will you be free to be a craftsman, be a master of what you're doing. Only then will you be free to audit the pc in front of you. You won't be free to audit the pc in front of you as long as you're enslaved with don't-knows amongst your auditing tools. Because you've got a chain of error which mounts in the session on the basic not-knowingness. And your session errors just mount like mad. "Oh my God, what am I doing?" And you eventually, checking these things off – and the chances are you might not find out what you're doing wrong for a little while, until you've cleaned some of the garbage off. And you suddenly find out, "You know, I – I really have never dared ask anybody because of embarrassment, but what is a null needle?" *Hmm-hmhm-mm!*

Well, that's what it takes – that's what it takes – to become a master of a craft. And don't think that you're going to get results, real honest-to-God results, if you're anything less. And that's the discouraging point of auditing.

Today's auditing is not aimed at the repetitive process: No attention on the pc; you just run a repetitive process on the pc and you hope for the best. Now, the funny part of it is, is that system circa 50 on – started to develop in 50, was best developed along about 52, 53 – that system actually does make a lot of people well. And you could be fooled by the fact that it does make a lot of people well. So does engram running.

See, there's a lot of things you can do with the skills of yesterday. And if anything, we are victimized slightly by the tremendous workability of what we have been able to do here and there. And any auditor who has audited consistently along the line – this person and that person and so on – well, has had some rather interesting wins. He gets hung on his own wins. Because we have never had techniques, before 1962, which reached all cases. And that's something we haven't all learned yet.

And the other thing about it is, is these techniques require a master's touch. They are that strong. They are that powerful. You can unman the pc's mind. His reactive mind doesn't have a prayer, you do these things right. You have broadly, broadly workable technology that's been going in that direction. But at the same time, we inherit along with it a precision of application which knows no second-class or "just as good as." All of the various points which make precision in auditing must be actually precise.

When you sit down across from an auditor who does his E-Metering so well that he never worries about an E-Meter; he does his TRs so well that he never worries about his TRs; he does his Model Session so well that he never worries about his Model Session; he knows what he's supposed to do with the processes he's given, whether they're a Routine 3 or a Prep-check or anything else, you see, and he does just these things. And honest, the pc, as a pc, he'll just say, "Gosh!", You know? "Gosh! It's so easy! I am so comfortable sitting here being audited." How come? What makes this? How did that combination of events take place? Is it because the auditor was born as the seventh son of a seventh son? Is it because he gave a present once to the Witch of Endor? Is it some fantastic prescience of some kind? Is it because his thetan can read your thetan? Well, it doesn't happen to be a single one of these things. It would be because the auditor knew the little points of auditing absolutely perfectly, did them as a whole, with perfection, so that he was under no tension by reason of auditing because he knew all the parts and could then apply fundamentals to what he was doing

When you will sit down, someday, across from such an auditor, you'll all of a sudden say, "Whew! Uhh!" And you yourselves, if you learn your business here, will go home and you'll sit down and start to audit somebody – somebody that you used to audit – and they'll say, "My God, what happened to you?" And there really wasn't anything happened to you except you are doing less and you're doing it much less arduously than you used to do. And the results just fly. Nothing to it. You finish up a two-, three-, four-hour session. You're perfectly calm. So what? You'd just as soon audit another two or three hours. Because you're under no tension. You're under no not-knows.

But first and foremost, in order to attain any result requires a technology. Well, we have those technologies. And you have to also get a confidence that when you sit down and audit somebody, he is – by these technologies – he is going to get a result. So that that takes out the last not-know out of it, is "Is the pc going to gain or win?" And what you're doing to-

day, you do it right, the pc keeps winning. That pc just wins, that's all. The pc goes on winning and you all of a sudden get confident in the fact the pc is going to win. If you audit him, the pc will win – bang! That's all there is to it. You'll win, the pc wins. Everybody wins. And that's the final tension that goes out of it. And after that, my God! The results you can get in auditing are just fantastic.

And frankly, that's what I expect of you here. That's what I expect you to learn how to be able to do: to audit like a master before you get out of here.

Thank you.

PREPCHECKING

A lecture given on 3 May 1962

Okay. Here we go.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 3 May 12. And it's lecture 2 and I haven't got anything to lecture to you about at all. Nothing, nothing to tell you. Everybody flinching. Oh, that's a fact. I haven't got anything to talk to you about, practically, nothing.

So I might as well give you an incidental lecture that doesn't have too much to do with anything, called Prepchecking. [laughter]

There's an alternate title on this lecture: "Oh, My God." And there's a subtitle below that: "How *could* you."

The art of making Prepchecking work. There is no science in the art providing – well, I'll tell you how to make it not work. Let me put it that way, see. Ignore the pc. Don't pay any attention to what the pc's doing and omit this interesting datum: Why do you suppose in Routine 3 it is easier to get deep in the Goals Problem Mass with a goal than with an item? You'll find out this is true. You can get much deeper into the Goals Problem Mass with a goal than an item. Now, why can you do that? Figure it out. Why? Why can you do that?

It's much easier for a pc to confront a think than a mass. And an item is a mass. And a goal is a think. And therefore in the mass he can pluck the think out of the middle of the mass without having to confront the mass.

So there he sits in the GPM comfortably, sometimes not quite so comfortably, but he's undisturbed because he knows the goal has nothing to do with it. He can confront that. He can confront the goal. Well, you could probably go all the way through a GPM confronting all the goals in it. I suppose. It'd be a horrible mess by the time you got through, and the pc would be splattered all over something, but it's theoretically possible.

You see, a GPM item is a thought chamber surrounded by mass. And the pc is perfectly happy to look at the thought chambers, but he is not happy at all to look at any of the mass. Do you see that?

So having whizzed him down into the GPM and had him pick up the mass item without confronting any of the mass – you know, he's got his goal now; he's actually sitting in the middle of "God help us," see – we then have him confront the mass on a gradient scale. So he confronts all the little locks which are the items and he confronts those little locks and the next little locks and then a little bit steeper. And how – why do you think it is that the goal usually shows up, and oddly enough, the goal starts showing up toward the end of the list, providing you haven't overlisted and got a lot of invalidations on it and that sort of thing. I

mean a smoothly taken rudiments-in goals list starts containing the goal toward the end of the list. It will be somewhere down there. That would be the ordinary practice.

It wouldn't be true if you were running a rough goals list. You know, with the rudiments kind of out and all this kind of thing. Lord knows where it'd occur. Sometimes by some freak it might occur toward the beginning, but that would be a freak. In the ordinary course of events, it starts occurring toward – late on the list.

Well, of course, why? Well, you're going *huh-huh-hu-hu* and he finally goes down to a point where it's – it's sticky, and that's why the goal keeps ticking. See, we've arrived in the peat bog. You see, and it goes tick-tick-tick-tick-tick. Well, you know it's part of a GPM.

Why does it tick? Very interesting. It ticks because it's surrounded by mass. And the pc, in confronting the goal, isn't altering the mass to amount to anything. And now we start listing the item. And when we list the item all the way on down we'll find the item will appear at the later end of the mass. Why is that? I mean at the later end of the list because it's mass. You're actually asking him to confront more and more powerful mass. And he does it sort of on a gradient and he kind of gets used to it. And he finds out he doesn't get his head knocked off by announcing the thing and so he announces mass down into the GPM and will finally give you the item. See?

You went there on the wings of thought. And you follow through with the ugly burr and buzz of heat, cold and lightning. See? It's something like the fellow who takes a trip in a jet plane from here to South Africa. See, and it's – you've got hot and cold running stewardesses, and everything is being served so very nice, and it's all so sweet, and it's comfortable, and everything is fine, and you don't hardly have to look out the window, you know. Everything is scenic. All right.

Now how about walking? How about walking from here to South Africa? Or taking an automobile from here to South Africa? I think you'd find – I think you'd find you'd get certain sensations on the route.

Well, that just gives you some kind of a comparison. Of course, the jet plane is, you get there with a goal. That's easy. Anybody can do that. And the funny part of it is, you don't know where you are when you get there. But then you walk or take a car – it all depends on what type of auditor you have.

Now, why do you suppose – why do you suppose it's like that? That's because pcs would rather – this is why 3D Criss Cross is more arduous and harder on the pc, you see, because you're not sending the pc anywhere much with thought. You're going down the Prehav Scale and you go that little shallow distance that you get with the Prehav Scale, you see, and take the first level that keeps banging and you list for that. And of course, you're – that was minimal travel by thought, you see. And then you make him travel by item. And traveling by item is much rougher. You don't get anywhere near the distance into the GPM by that system. It would all come out all right in the end. I'm sure of that, but there's the – there's the difference.

All right. Now this is not a lecture about this, although you might profit by some of that data concerning Routine 3 Processes. He does the same cotton-picking thing with his withholds and his missed withholds.

Pcs is built that way. They will confront any God's quantity of thought, particularly if it's a God's quantity of thought for which they have no responsibility of any kind whatsoever. They can confront an infinite amount of thought and ideas.

So you'll find that without the auditor pushing, shoving, getting out gunnysacking and put it under the wheels of the truck, getting out long pieces of timber and prying them against the rear axle, shoving bulldozers up against the tailgate every once in awhile, you'll find the pc will go no place except on the wings of thought.

And if you sit there and watch a pc wing his way around the bank and never follow it through with anything, your pc will never get anyplace.

Now, in 1956 I put this proposition up. I had noticed that a lot of think-think and figure-figure and a lot of confronting of thought and a lot of stirring up of thought and that sort of thing, didn't ever particularly improve a graph. Or if it did, sometimes it did, and most of the time it didn't.

So I had to say, "What do you confront? Do you confront thought or mass?" And that was the question I asked at that time. Do you confront thought or do you confront mass? What is this all about?

Well, it's taken a long, long, long, long time. I finally found out, oh, I don't know, a year or two or three ago, that you had to be able to confront the mass before you would get any pc anyplace, don't you see. But it took quite awhile to become absolutely sure of that answer.

No, it's confronting mass that gets the pc places, not confronting the thought, because the pc is working on second-hand thought. The pc is actually not thinking his own think. He is pulling think out of locks of the GPM. So he can pull these inevitably and forever. He can confront them for always. Sometimes they change. Sometimes this and that occurs. But unless these thinks are attached in some fashion or another to some mass, nothing much happens to give a permanent change of case.

The funny part of it is you – you will get fooled with this one because of such adroit processes as Rising Scale Processes. You do a Rising Scale Process and obviously it's all think. See, it's all postulate, you think. But really, if you did it and had a lot of good luck with it, it's because the pc accidentally confronted some mass, too. Even though you are asking him to think thinks, he winds up confronting mass. Or he changed his position in the GPM. Or there's a lot of little freak things that could happen there. But it gives you – it gives you an impure observation.

See, you do the Rising Scale Processing See. All right. You ask the pc to get the idea you can, get the idea you can't. See, "Get the idea you can drive, you get the idea you can't drive. Get the idea you can drive, get the idea you can't drive." And every now and then, so help me, Pete, the pc all of a sudden says, "Boy, I sure can drive!", you know. This is what fools you. This is a fooler.

You can get results handling thought – sometimes. But it's sporadic. And it's just accidentally, "What did you do to the mass while you were getting the thought think?" That theoretically is what happens when you do get a result with thinking thunks. See?

So don't say that you will never get a result if you always just buy the pc's thunk. See, you'll never get a result if you just have the pc pick up his own thinkingness and that sort of thing. Don't say you'll never get a result because you will – every now and then. And because a pc or a thetan is much happier confronting think, you are then given evidence which proves to you that it's all right just going on thinking thunks.

See, you've proven the wrong thing because of your willingness – your own willingness – to go on thinking thunks. See, it will happen often enough that you'll get this accidental rearrangement of mass that gives you a tremendous change on the part of the pc. This will happen often enough with Concept Processes, Rising Scale, getting ideas about this and that. It'll happen often enough that a pc has a considerable resurgent and drops his lumbosis or loves his wife or some other unlikely – or some other probable activity. And you get yourself – a beautiful red thunk goes across the path, you see.

And you now say to yourself, "Aha, aha. Thank God. Thank God." You'll say, "It's perfectly, perfectly okay. *Haaaah.*" And all we have to do is to get the pc to go on thinking thunks and I don't have to confront any mass and you don't have to confront any mass, and we go on from there. And the next time you do it, it doesn't work. You lay an egg. And think about it. [laughter]

Now there's why it was a hard problem to solve. Do we get there on the wings of thought or do we get there by shoving the heavy masses about? I'm afraid we get there routinely by shoving the heavy masses because that is what shifted when we went on the wings of thought. And it'll happen accidentally often enough to give you data which you then can prove the wrong point with. It's quite important to realize that because every once in a while you're going to get this subjective reality on the situation.

You said, "I had him think a thunk and he thunked it and he thunked it and he thunked it, and then so help me Pete, he now has absolutely no trouble drinking vodka. And it's marvelous. And so obviously we should have him think thunks."

So we say, "All right. What other problems does this pc have? This pc has problems? He beats his children daily. All right."

"Now, get the idea of beating children. Get the idea of not beating children. Get the idea of beating chil--- " Seventy-five hours later: "Get the idea of beating children. Get the idea of not beating children. Get the..." you can't audit the pc, you see, because his hands are too bruised to hold the E-Meter cans, you see, because he just goes on beating children. And you get a big – you'll have – this is a tricky one. This is a tricky one.

But actually, if you'd gotten ahold of the mass, which was the circuit which had to beat children and blew it – he wouldn't. And that happens every time, see. That is your constant. If you move the mass you get a constant gain. And if you just think thunks, you don't.

Now, it's like this in Prepchecking One of these days you'll be prepchecking somebody, and because it's so easy to confront a thunk, the pc will tell you he thunk a thunk, and

you, if you're too willing to confront thunks and too unwilling to confront actions and masses, will go on – let the – and let the pc do this.

And every few pcs you'll get a terrific Prepcheck win – every few pcs – every few sessions. And you'll keep on prepchecking because you say, well, it's not in vain, every once in a while we get a nice win. See, Prepchecking is not a complete waste of time, is the conclusion you will come up with, see. If you have that opinion right now that Prepchecking is not a complete waste of time, it is allied to this other fact, but you're letting the pc think thinks. See. You're buying thinks off the pc, not masses, not doingnesses, not flows, not actions. See?

You've got to get the doingness – the action, in order to get the pc to push around the masses. You got to have action to get a mass to move.

"Have you ever criticized anybody?" I don't ask you to make a test of this, but if you did, use your Zero question, "Have you ever criticized anybody?" And then find a time when the pc actually criticized somebody and put that down as a What: "What about criticizing women?" And then go the chain. And then work for that session and the next session and the next session and the next session and then run into the pc out in the hall criticizing women. Because that's a think. See? That's just pure thinkingness. It's all you're doing is running thinkingness. And you can go on get – getting up his thunks. And let me call something to your attention. It's like letting the frog walk up two inches and fall back two inches every night. Because a pc can add thunks to his case faster than you can pull off thunks. And if you don't believe it, find a goal on some pc sometime who is a bit disturbed and his rudiments are a bit out. And he can think more missed withholds than you can get them unthink.

Now, you have to pull thunks, you understand, when they're going on as thunks. You have to keep a session cleaned up. And remember there's nothing going on in the session but thinkingness on the part of the pc. He is not leaping, see. He's just thinking.

And if you say, "In this session have you – have I missed a withhold on you?" of course, you're going to be repaid with a thunk. And sure enough, your meter's going to read again. But remember that in that session he didn't have any opportunity to do anything but thunk.

And you're dealing in your most delicate sense with items which are closely allied to thunks until you get down to a final item on a complete list. You go in on the goals line and of course it's all thunk! So any think that the pc thunks, of course, will cancel out the thunk that you're trying to record, naturally. See, he can cancel out the thunks in present time.

Frankly, getting a pin stuck in your finger in present time is more important than losing your whole civilization a hundred trillion years ago. In other words, present time is far more important by emphasis in the pc's mind than the past. But of course, the past is far more important in creating aberration in the present, you see.

You got these two things always at work. It's much more important to the pc, this present time problem, see. You're trying to get off the blasted civilization of a billion years ago, see.

He didn't do anything there. He really didn't mean to. He was flying over it in an airplane and it was all by accident, and some mechanic – some mechanic back at the base there –

they had a bunch of bad mechanics at the base – hadn't fixed the trip, you see, on the bomb release. And he just happened to be flying across the capital city at that particular time that it tripped, you see. And the plane actually happened to have a warhead in – actually, shouldn't have had at that particular time, and he didn't know that it had any bombs in it. But it fell and actually wiped out the whole technical library and all the scientific center and the remainder of the capital and so forth – the bomb did.

On the second run you'll find out that he had some inkling that the plane was loaded with a bomb. And on the third run across this you will find more and more responsibility, see, gathering up, and you'll eventually find out that he was ordered to do it. And he went over and threw the lever and blew the place to smithereens, and then you'll find out that he was the fellow who gave the order. [laughter] See? You see your responsibility rise.

It's very wonderful watching these things. "Well, it was totally accidental," and – and so forth, "And there was – nothing was meant by it, but – " you're going to see develop into: "Well, I did it." See? It goes up the scale.

Well, present time the pc is being terribly responsible for everything. The pc's responsible for sitting in the chair and being in the body and all that sort of thing. So you're closer to the present time responsibility of the pc. So therefore the pc thinks a think in present time, it has tremendous importance on the meter. Actually not however, in his aberration.

Ah, that's nothing – the aberration. See, his present time thought is not aberrative. It's merely interruptive. It's terribly important to *him*. That's why your rudiments go out, you see. How can a rudiment knock out the read from blowing up the civilization? Well, it's just terribly important. His responsibility is very high for PT. Present time – responsibility high. Past time – no responsibility. You reverse this state of affairs, but the rudiments can go out.

Therefore, his difficulty taking a wrapper off of a candy bar in present time is far more important to him than something that happened a billion years ago. So you have to clean up the PTP.

The PTP is far more important. It outweighs every other consideration. It's quite amusing. And of course, this PTP has the power of aberrating him not at all. It has no power of aberrating him. In fact, I'll let you in on something. Nothing that's happened to him in this whole lifetime has had any effect upon his degree of aberration – not a single thing.

But auditing, let me call to your attention, is being done in present time. And therefore the pc is always trying to sell the auditor two things: One, that is his – it is his think that has got everything awry – his thinkingness has shoved everything awry. That's one of the first bill of goods he tries to shove off on the auditor. And the other one, that present time is far more important than anything the auditor is trying to go into.

He always tries to sell these two bill of goods. Why? Because they are built in just like the plates and grate on a stove. They're just built in to the pc. He isn't doing this maliciously or viciously.

Now, the auditor may not Q&A with his own grate and plate. See? What's got to be built into the auditor is the other consideration entirely: "The longer ago it happened the more important it is to the pc's aberrated state." That's quite different, isn't it, than: "Present time is

more important than the past.", you see, pc says that. The auditor says, "The longer ago it happened, the more influential it is to the case."

And then the auditor has to say, or has to work on the basis, that the doingness and the havingness are much more important than the thoughtingness. See? He's got to have doingness. That's as close as an auditor can usually push a pc to heavy mass short of a Routine 3 Process. So he's at least got to have doingness. And he's got to skip thinkingness. Well, the pc is selling the auditor thinkingness and he's selling the auditor presentness.

In the session the pc says, "Oh, what you are doing to me. You just missed a command. This is absolutely fabulous and fantastic. And besides, one week ago I something or other, something or other and something or other. And I have come to the conclusion that ..." and so on. And he fires off in some direction or another and actually thinks that this charge is prompted by something that has happened either today or in the last week. And of course that charge is not from today or the last week at all.

Now, it all depends on what an auditor is doing. An auditor can Q&A with this – just – not Q&A with it – but an auditor can pay attention to this and buy think, of course, if he's trying to keep the pc in-session. Because what he's doing in session has the relative value of what the pc is thinking in session. You get the idea. I mean the pc with a think in session can momentarily outweigh the pastness of things with his present time think. See?

You've got this – you've got this situation going and the pc is having a hell of a time, and the rudiments are out. And you ask the pc, "Missed withhold? Invalidation? Missed withhold? Upset? ARC break?" Anything else you care to ask the pc, and it goes *clang*. And you say, "What was that?" And he says it was so-and-so. And you say, "Thank you very much." And your rudiments are back in, and you carry on.

But the only reason you carry on is not because the pc is getting aberrated by these out-rudiments, but because auditing is being done in present time. And the pc's invalidations and out-rudiments are occurring in present time. And you do not have time or inclination to go back and clear them up on the whole track, because you are doing something else. So therefore, you clear up rudiments as close to present time as possible and prepcheck as far from it as possible. You get out of this a natural rule, you see.

The pc gives what's happening right now in session tremendous value. It has nothing to do with the price of oranges.

So you can pick it up as easily as it's going in. Now, if you think it has undue importance, you will try to pick it up too hard. You'll be like the phony strong man, you know. He's got five-hundred pounds written on both ends of this barbell, you know, and it's made out of balsa wood. And you'll go over there and you'll try to pick this up and you'll struggle – reading five-hundred pounds on the end of it, you will know that you have to exert five-hundred pounds worth of strength in order to get it off the floor. You're liable to throw yourself through the top of the stage.

But you can approach the subject as arduously as it's advertised. Then you find it blows up just like that. Bang! What happened? What happened? Where did it go? Where did it go? Mmm. Bzzzz. Oh, he has a terrible present time problem. You're only getting a little

tick on the missed with – I mean on the whole track withhold that you're trying to get off of it. Whatever it is. You're only getting a little tick on that. And yest – as of yesterday you didn't have it cleared, got a little tick. And today he comes in – he's got a half-a-dial drop, man!

He's agitated. You can see the physical agitation and so forth, and *huhhhh* and so forth. And you say, "Well, what's the matter?" And you go down the line and you read your rudiments in. "Present time problem?" Oh, there's that half-a-dial drop, you see. You say, "What happened?"

He says, "Well, Agnes didn't speak to me this morning."

All right. Now, if you think that weighs five-hundred pounds, see, you'll roll up your sleeves, you'll sigh deeply and you'll struggle out there, flex your muscles and biceps, you know, and pick this thing up as though it weighs five-hundred pounds. Actually, all you have to do is say, "Well, all right. Thank you." [laughter] "Do you have a present time problem? That's clean."

What happened? Where did they go? You'll notice that. You'll notice that phenomenon. But that little tick that you were working on that happened when they were seven years old keeps going *tick*, and it keeps going *click*, and you say, "Well, what happened there?"

And they say, "Well, so-and-so and so-and-so," and it keeps going *tick*, and it keeps going *tick*. You apply the withhold system to it again, you see. It ticks a little less and a little less, and it's wearing out a little bit slow. And then you find a little earlier basic on it now that you've worked it over enough for the pc to get earlier. You find a little earlier basic on it, get the unknownness out of that, and *bing*. And then it'll blow. But it took you a half an hour or so, see. It took you an hour. It took you an hour and a half. Do you see why this is?

Now, if you continue to believe that by pulling the thinks – you see, because you can do so much in the rudiments by pulling thinks, don't be so fooled – you think you can pull thinks off the pc and get anywhere in Prepchecking, you're going to be very badly mistaken. You can only get anywhere in Prepchecking by pulling "do's." "Whatcha done, Bud?" "Okay, Mac. Where'd you hide the hammer?"

He says, "Oh, I just didn't do anything to my wife. I didn't do anything to her at all. I never laid a hand on her much. And – I've been awfully critical of her. I-I actually had some uh, uh – really, when we got married I had some reservations. I thought to myself..."

See, you're liable to buy this if you notice how easily those thinks go out in the rudiments. You see how you can handle those thinks in the rudiments. You're liable to buy this as aberrative.

And then he said, "And actually I criticized her once to a friend," you know.

Well, you start soaring in on the line and you say, "Ah, you criticized her once to a friend. Well, very good now. What about criticizing?" you see.

Ah, pack it up. Everything from there on is just a waste of time. And it's, "Whatcha do, Mac?" See. "How'd ya splint up the broken bones?" "Where'd ya 'ide the corpse?"

He's done something. And unless you pull doingness, you of course, make no permanent progress. And he squirms around, and he says, "Well, as a matter of fact, I never did anything to her." And it goes *clank*.

And you say, "Well, what was that?"

"Oh well, that – that – *heh-heh*. It didn't have too much to do with it, but the night before we got married I slept with her best friend."

"Oh, what about sleeping with your wife's best friends?" It's your Prepcheck. Now let's soar.

Now, odd part of it is, it runs down to sleeping with his sister's best friend, see. And it runs down to having something to do with his mother's best friend or something like that, see. It won't stay on this groove absolutely, but you'll pull it all out down to the bottom. And you come back up and you find out that's null, and that's that. All right. And you may have pulled a major charge off the case, you see. And you'll get a resurgence. This person will look different and act different. It's "What'd ya do, Mac?"

Now, he will mark those dumbbells one ounce. And you go out there to pick up these dumbbells marked with one ounce and you give one yank, you see, and you go through the planks. [laughter] Got it?

We're working basically with a basic disagreement of evaluation between the auditor and the pc. Things that are actually heavily weighted are given minimal weight at first by the pc. And things that actually have no weight at all are given tremendous weight by the pc. Because the pc would like you to stay in present time and pull all the aberrations of yesterday.

He lived through yesterday. He remembers yesterday. Yesterday's safe. Furthermore he didn't do anything yesterday but think. And that's perfectly safe to think yesterday.

And furthermore, it actually seems to him to be tremendously important what he thought yesterday. So he's got all these sells. One, yesterday. Ah, that's nice and close to present time so therefore it must be tremendously important. And I thought, and actually I can confront thinkingness, so therefore thinkingness must be terribly important.

And the auditor knows very well that thinkingness has no importance whatsoever and that if he hangs around yesterday he will get a lot of nowhere.

So your auditor goes counter to what the pc would like him to go counter to. And if you continue to Q-and-A with this and do exactly what the pc thinks is important, hm-mm, you'll get nowhere with Prepchecking.

You have to drive with Prepchecking. You cannot hand the wheel over to the pc, because the pc will drive in the beautiful flight of thunk. He will soar through thunkingness and thunkingness and thunkingness. He'll fly with great beauty through this thunkingness. And he will stay marvelously close to PT because everything that's important in his life is important in PT.

The great saw that he will give you is, "Well, it happened a long time ago and therefore isn't very important. And we have forgotten all that now and we have laid it to rest." A psychoanalyst one time gave me that as an argument.

She said, "Well, now we had this psychoanalyzed two or three years ago and we put it all aside. And so therefore it happened quite a long time ago and it hasn't any value anymore, and so forth. And I'm over that. Now, what is really wrong with me is the way I was jilted last week and stood up for a dinner date by my boyfriend. And we haven't spoken since." See, this kind of thing.

So I had this psychoanalyst lie down on a bed – 1949 – and go back to the first moment that the death of the relative was imparted and go through it step by step. And man, you would have thought it was made out of solid sponge rubber the way she kept bouncing out of that. I put her through that and she cried several buckets full of tears. And we got the secondary off of it beautifully. Utterly changed the appearance of the pc. "But it had all been handled, and it was all a long time ago. And what was important was last week." See?

So if you had let the person drive, where would you have wound up? You would have wound up – after a long route through the world of think, you would have wound up at, "Thoughtport." And it would have been very, very close to where you were sitting right this minute. So you can't let the pc drive. You have to make it very clear to the pc that the wheels are being guided and the throttle is being handled by some other person.

And if you don't have a pc under good control, Prepchecking is almost impossible. You've got to have good auditor control. And you've got to direct the pc's attention to doingness and to yesterday. And that is what you direct the pc's attention to. To what he has done, done, done, done, done – a long time ago.

And the pc says, "Let me think, think, think, think yesterday, because yesterday is important." And if you let the pc drive and if you haven't got a solid grip on the wheel, the pc will stay with think and stay as close to now as possible. And of course you will plow nothing, you will get nothing done. The pc will not resurge, nothing will happen at all.

The funny part of it is you can often key things out by getting a yesterday, but it's a sort of a shallow job. You can get tired of plumbing the track sometime and kick out a lock that occurred last week and brush it off, but it all depends on what you're doing.

If you just try to get a pc's rudiments in, well for God's sakes, handle it that way. Handle it shallow. Just handle it shallow. Rudiments – buy think, buy close to PT – absolutely. That's perfectly all right. But that's rudiments. Now, the body of Prepchecking.

Well, he says, "When I – when I was thirty-two I had some difficulty with my father's business associates and so forth. Let's see, that was two years ago, and so forth. And I said some very nasty things about them as a matter of fact. I told some of my friends that they were old – I hate to tell you this – but I told some of my friends they were old fogies."

And although I am never this blunt unless somebody has circumvented me in all directions for about fifteen minutes, if they had been doing so I would say at that moment, "Well, did you – after you had stolen the money, did you take it out the front door or the back door? That's all I'm interested in. When you were six – we'll just shoot for six. Just – just ..."

They sometimes look at you and say, "How – how the – how the – how the – how the hell did you know? I used – used to r – r – rob the cash b – box."

"All right. What about robbing your poppy's cash box?" See? "*Do*" and "yesterday," and you got it all set.

And you say, "What about your father's business associates?"

"Oh well, what – what about them? Were we talking about my father's business associates?"

It's absolutely magical, you see? It looks magical to the pc because the pc knows that it was yesterday that was important, and he knows that thinkingness was important. And you went on the range of "way back" and "do." Now, with that artillery you blow him out of the water.

And he'll be stonied. He'll be quite astonished very often. He'll just sit there marveling. "How the hell did you get into that?" You know.

Now, the equation on which you operate is that the chain is long and has a bottom which is unknown to the pc. You always operate on that basis – the chain is long and has a bottom which is unknown to the pc. So the basic is there. You also operate on the assumption that it is totally available to you. It all depends on how quietly you climb down that ladder. You climb down and keep polishing up the rungs and by George, he can see a rung below it, and so on. You take him back as fast as you polished up the rungs, by the way. I don't get all the grit off the rungs. I make pcs work on awful dirty ladders just as long as I can get that basic. You see, by taking locks off the top you can arrive more positively at the basic.

It's true that the pc couldn't go back there originally, but by taking a few overts off the chain and polishing them up somewhat and differently, he can get to the bottom. See. Astonishingly. But he can only get there if he's under heavy auditor control. And you've got to have heavy pc – you've got to have heavy control of your pc. You tell him where to go. And you tell him where to go because if it happened once it happened before. And you operate on that as your magic formula. "If he is thinking about it now, he did it then," is your other formula.

And then you have a magic biblical maxim: "If thy pc is making a stink about somebody yesterday, he done him in two years ago." Whatever your pc is being critical of in present time he's done something to in the past. You'll find it's an infallible formula.

Of course, to reach ultimate depths – to reach ultimate depths on this thing requires that you go into the Goals Problem Mass. And in Prepchecking it isn't – that isn't your course. You don't go into the GPM with Prepchecking. But you can go a hell of a distance with Prepchecking. You can go back two, three, six, eight, ten thousand years. You might wind up in the most unlikely places.

And just remember that you are getting the pc at your behest to climb down a chain which he doesn't, as you started, think has any validity at all, has no R because he has no C. And you just ride him down this chain and you just get things scrubbed off, scrubbed off, polished up, scrubbed off, and he can see just a little bit deeper, and you dust this next overt off lightly. I don't care if it still reacts or it doesn't react. We're going down this chain because it isn't that the charge isn't there, see, because everything that is charged is dependent upon an early charge. And the charge is all on the earliest charge.

But you can, nevertheless, point his vision past something if you sort of show it doesn't have any individual charge on it. Any charge that it seems to have on it tends to disappear with your withhold system, you know?

You're saying When? All? Appear? Who? Do it once. Do it twice. He'll all of a sudden say, "Yeah, yeah." And he expects to – he's in a profession now. He's got a profession that is, "Wiping out my blacking my brother's eyes when we were seven." See? That's his professional ... He's perfectly willing, by the way, to work on this for the rest of the session because it's got lots of charge on it, and it's this and that and the other thing.

And you say, "What did you do to him when you were six? And five? And four? And three? And two?" Maybe your What question is, "What about blacking people's eyes?" you know?

And he's all set now. He's safe, see. He got down to years where they were both in diapers and they're both in separate couches, you see – cots. And they couldn't possibly have blacked anybody's eyes, you see. It was good.

"Whose eyes did you block – black in your last life?"

There's no charge. I mean you're down there, obviously, to a point where the thing is still charged and the charge isn't erasing, so you couldn't possibly be at the bottom of the chain. And the whole test is, is does it go *phssst*. It doesn't go *phssst*, so let's just scrub a little charge off of it and go south, man.

And the funny part of it is the pc can actually remember it. The pc can actually go there. Doesn't matter whether you think he can or not. He – he'll go. He'll go. If you find out he's still got charge on blacking his little brother's eyes when his little brother was one and he was two, we're getting at a margin. That's marginal. It must be leaving this life. And we can't go any earlier because he didn't walk until he was one year, eleven months.

And all of a sudden, why, we find him someplace and he's standing on the sands of Smyrna or something. And he used to have a nasty habit when he was a legionnaire. *Heh-heh*. He used to take a copper or a bronze ball on a chain, you know, and he used to always hit for somebody's eyes with it somehow or another.

Here's all these busted corpses lying around. And you think this is perfectly all right, but you find him doing it to his commanding officer. Something like that. And then you drift back – that – he's all set to make a profession out of this. Christ, he's never been there before, you know. *Heh-heh*. "Look at this," you know. "Palm trees, you know. Where the hell am I?" you know.

You see this thing isn't discharging, well, "Whose eyes did you black earlier than that, man?"

"Whose eyes did I black? What do you mean?", you know. "What earlier ... Oh, well, there's this ... Yeah, yeah. *Hmm*. You take a space gun and if you set it up on high gain, and you shoot somebody in the eyes, their eyes char. *Hmm*, I never realized that before." [laughter, laughs]

Go over that one. Go over that one, man. And by golly, you can make Prepchecking work that way. I'm telling you an extreme example now, running whole track. You wouldn't believe it was possible. And you scrub the overt enough so that you can see earlier. And then you scrub that overt enough so that you can see earlier, and it's all there on the chain. God 'elp ya if you go completely *clang-bang* into the GPM with it. But persevere. Find an incident that happened before the GPM. [laughter]

Memory is occluded by the charge on the last overt. That's what occludes memory as far as running a chain is concerned. And if you can get some of that charge off he can remember earlier, and if you get some of the charge off the earlier overt, why, he can remember earlier. And you get enough charge off so that he can see earlier, and that's all the charge you get off because actually all the charge is residual on the earliest one.

I'm not telling you, by the way, that you must run whole track with Prepchecking. But I'm telling you that the rule applies unrestrictedly. See, the rule applies.

You don't try to rub the charge out of every overt that you encounter. That would be nonsense, man. Be nonsense. Because all the charge is held in place by the first unknown incident, see. Of course, there can be seven hundred interim unknown incidents but they become known fairly rapidly. They become known rather rapidly. The incident that you're gunning for is the basic on that particular chain. And you'll find out that one will pull.

It's incredible that it will pull. You'll take people back into the backtrack who would sit there and swear that there is no past lives. Well, you want to rub out just enough to make it feasible.

Incidentally, a recovery of memory of who one was in the past life has a tremendous case resurgence connected with it. Quite fascinating to somebody – has practically no therapeutic value.

But it's fascinating. And the pc will stay with it. And it's a very interesting thing. And he can feel very good. He thinks this is good.

For instance, your pc finds out he was clubfooted in the last life and has always had trouble with his foot in this life. And you think we're all set now. We find out the last death and some of his overts in the last life, you see, and you get this all cleaned up, that whole clubfooted life, you get the whole incident out of the thing. Everything is just fine and polished up, you know, even to catching his foot underneath the carriage. And *aaaaah-yah-ah*, oh man, you're just excited, and he goes right on having trouble with his foot. That's because you, too, fell for the idea that it must be important if it's close to present time.

Well, as a matter of fact, the – he was the fellow who invented the lead boot. Something like that. That's eventually where you'll find his clubfootedness.

But Prepchecking has to be approached within this realm of understanding in order to produce interesting results. I don't want you to go on being afraid of stirring something up and not finishing it off. I want you to get the idea of working on a chain. And I'd like you to finish the chain up. Get the idea that you should finish up the chain. But don't get the idea you should finish up incidents.

Now, with Prepchecking today, you're prepchecking chains of similar incidents. And all charge, actually, is built up out of the first unknown. In Routine 3 you are not dealing engram by engram with the track. You are dealing with packages of engrams called identities. See? So Routine 3 deals with whole lives of engrams, all in a bundle.

Similarly, Prepchecking doesn't deal with incidents. It deals with chains of incidents.

Now, to get a Routine 3 item to blow, it has to have had all lock charge bled off of it, be totally identified and opptermmed in theory. If you got that package pretty perfect, why, you've got a chance of having the thing blow, because that's the mechanics of it held in place. And Prepchecking, all you've got to do is get the earliest unknown into view and you'll find the whole chain will blow up, see. These are the mechanics on which you're operating and these are the things which occur.

If you do your Prepchecking in that frame of mind you won't be making many mistakes. You won't be asking the pc ...

The pc says, "I got a big – a big withhold. I picked my toenails last night. I'm pretty ashamed of it. That's a doingness." [laughter]

"Well, all right. All right. Let's find out about toenails, huh? *Heh-heh-heh-heh*. There's no telling where we'll wind up."

"I thought my mother's hair didn't look good yesterday," probably winds up with, "So I struck this box of matches and set her hair on fire."

You know what I mean. That's the way it develops, you know. But has no importance on what I thought yesterday, of course, until he connects with the bottom and then it's all related.

That's Prepchecking. Don't expect anything out of Prepchecking except the pc understands his case better, sees where things come from, and feels better about life and the people and environment around him. Expect that will be a perfectly permanent gain and it is worthwhile attaining. There's no doubt about that. Don't expect it to solve the whole case from one end to the other. But adroit Prepchecking is very impressive to a pc. But it's only impressive when the auditor is going for the earliest and the doingest, and keeps the pc from staying with the thinkingnest and the most recent. And then you'll get yourself some good results.

Of course, I have heard that Prepchecking done in good Model Session with the TRs in and a considerable expertness on the meter is more effective than Prepchecking which is not done that way. But of course, this could only be rumor.

Thank you very much.

NEW TRAINING SECTIONS

A lecture given on 15 May 1962

All right. Here we are 15 May AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And we got a lot of territory to cover. I've had a week "off". Did any of you see the quotes around the off? I ought to take a week off one of these days.

All right. A new thing has happened after a year of teaching the Special Briefing Course at Saint Hill. Anniversary, you know, passed a couple of weeks ago. We always celebrate anniversaries. We haven't got our patent serve-it-up-in-a-hurry copper kitchen out here going, so that we can serve up a party real fast, so I had to change everything around to celebrate it.

And this is quite interesting as an occasion because it lays down a brand-new pattern for all training courses in Scientology and this course is laid down in the Academies.

Now as is usual, when you get a course overlap of this type, you get advanced material being taught at the fundamental level then it is up to advanced students to learn the fundamentals. And there's about where you fit right now. Oh, it doesn't do very much. It just makes it necessary for you take a whole HPA course while you're here. But you're doing that anyway, so what's the difference.

Frankly, no course materials have been altered. Course materials are the same as before, but a whole new section has been added and a tremendous number of checkpoints have been added to the course. And this is the advent of the Practical Section.

Now, as we have learned, people can confront doingness. They can confront doingness, when you kick them in the back of the head, hard.

With what glee will people confront thought. It's marvelous, you know. It's a – they go around and there's a thought and they'll confront that and there's a theory and they'll confront that and there's another thought and they'll confront that. And they're happy as clams and they'll just go around confronting thoughts.

Now, don't mistake it. I'm not running down Mike's section here. Data is very important. But there is something a little harder to confront than data. And that is its application and doingness.

And right away with the advent of the Practical Section – it ran fine the first day. You see, it's a little bit harder to confront the doingness of it all. You can get somebody to pass a bulletin that says, "At the given instant when the pc screams 'I do not want to be audited by you,'" you promptly say to the pc, "Shut up." You see, whatever the bulletin says, you see.

And you get the fellow in session. See, you got – you got the bulletin down pat. I mean Mike gave you the okay on it and everything. And you got that all set, so you... that was easy. And you sit down in session and the pc rears back and says, "I don't want to be audited by you."

And you say, "Uh – uh ..." [laughter] See, that's – that subtle difference. There's a lot ... [laughs, laughter] It's a very important difference, too. And sure enough, we put in – well, we put in a whole Practical Section to take care of this difference. It's the third pin of training. It's always been there more or less. You had the Comm Course, you've had Upper Indoc courses. You've had various doingness activities. But now this puts it in as a parallel section to actual auditing with a bunch of new TRs and a lot of other things.

But this doingness – people will confront thinkingness before they will confront doingness – is quite marvelous because the first day the Practical Section ran beautifully. See, there was quite a few people being checked out and everybody was happy about it and so forth. And I came down today, in the afternoon and there were four students with two Instructors.

In other words, not only will people do this, but the course started to dramatize it. Here were ten people in here studying theory with great avidity and only four of them had moved over into the Practical Section to brush up on their TRs and things. That's quite marvelous, because let me tell you, there's not a single one of you here could pass the Practical Section. And every one of you have got to go all the way through it. I know somebody who's just about ready to leave, you see. [laughter] You've had it, see.

But anyhow, and here were four students, see. Four students were sitting there, getting checked out on body motions to the E-Meter and so forth. And here were ten sitting in here listening to tapes happily and reading bulletins happily, you see and then the practical room was practically empty.

Now, this can go too far and you can get to a point where you won't do any theory. That's not what we want. We want a decent balance in these things. But right now at this particular stage of the game, those of you who can do practical, of course, would check out on it rapidly. See. And those of you who can't certainly better learn it.

And here's the background music back of this new course design.

You yourself could learn a great deal about the constitution of the human mind and reaction of pcs if your technical application of procedure was perfect.

If your procedure was perfect, you would never get any of these wild varieties which you think sometimes exist in the mind. They don't exist in the mind. They exist in your procedure. You see?

So a lot of your understanding of the mind is blurred for lack of an absolutely perfect application of Scientology to the pc. And you'll see these things just whir off, just whiz-whiz-whiz-whiz-whiz, see. And you'll see all the wheels and where they turn and – and so forth, you see? Because at no time is the pc being distracted by any oddball activity on the part of the auditor. See, at no time – at no time.

But let's look at this now. Let's take an auditor and every time the pc ... Well, the rule is that when confronted with the unusual, do the usual. And that is one of these nice, large, solid stable data that you can hang onto that will get you over more falls and slumps and crashes than you ever heard of.

Now, you see, the pc has a different case than any other case in the world. We admit this. We agree with this completely, except today there's not one iota of difference.

Yeah, but the pc, he thinks he's got a different case than everybody else in the whole world. Well, he hasn't. Not in terms of basic fundamentals. His case is – runs exactly on the same fundamentals as everybody else's case. He's a thetan. He's here. So all the fundamentals must be the same or he wouldn't be that knuckleheaded. You get the idea?

He's right here in this universe, see? He's here in this universe, so he arrived on the same course as all of his cohorts, buddies and fellow thetans. So it's obvious that he must be running on the same fundamentals. But everybody thinks they have a very unusual case.

So they sit down and give you a sales talk of unusuality. And you – I don't care what you expect from a pc, sooner or later the pc is going to sell you the unusuality of it all.

In other words, you look on the pc as a salesman of differences. A pc will always come up with the unusual. It's always different. It's always unusual. He's always going to do something else. Well, that's his privilege. Nonduplication might be said to be the common denominator of his whole case, so why shouldn't he come up with unusuals? Every time he starts in dramatizing, he comes up with something different, doesn't he?

He comes up with a nonduplicate of the human race. Well, that's what his case is – a series of nonduplicates. So he's sitting there and of course he's nonduplicating. What else can he do with the bank he's got?

And God help the auditor if he ever does anything but the usual.

The second the auditor buys the unusualness, the auditor teams up with the pc's reactive bank and the reactive bank of the pc and the auditor then process the thetan called the pc. See, after that there's nothing else happens. We've got a reactive bank busily processing the pc along with some help from the auditor. *Ha!* Happens to be the last checkpoint here on HCO Policy Letter 3 May 1962, PRACTICAL AUDITING SKILLS. There's a long checksheet here and on the last of it, it says "holding constant against adversity."

Well, adversity is just being solely unusual and holding up against it is just doing the usual. I mean it's as simple as that. It's terribly simple once you get the grasp of it.

But as long as everything looks all different to you, too, you're going to get the wildest ideas of the human mind you ever heard of if your auditing procedure is wild.

If your application of auditing to the pc is wild, inconstant, variable, wobbly, then you're going to get the wildest ideas of what the human mind is all about. And you get a lot of help in getting these ideas, too. You sit down and one day, why, you're auditing this – this well, this cop. And he's going *yippety-yap-bop-bop*, something of the sort and – and "The world really doesn't understand me. I am sweet and kind and good and every time I shoot

somebody, an innocent bystander or anything, people get down on me. And they're mean to me," and he's going on like this, you see.

And the auditor says, "You know, this – the world really is being mean to this fellow, you know."

And he's prepchecking or something and he says, "Well, who's been mean to you?"

And all of a sudden the cop makes a terrific resurgence of case. That's not according to the rule book. How do you make all this resurgence suddenly? Graph does a jump. He loses his lumbosis and his pistolitis – dreadful disease cops get. What happened?

And you say, "Well, you know, you really had better run motivators on the pc because if you don't run motivators, why, look it there. I would have missed this cop."

Of course, you don't notice in two months he fell on his head and shot the Chief of Police. But that's beside the point.

You totally misinterpreted what happened. See, you Q-and-Aed with the situation. You didn't hold up against adversity and you said, "Oh, you poor fellow. You mean to say these criminals groan and scream when they're being shot and you just – so that – you just – and it affects your migraine. You poor fellow. Now, what criminals have groaned and screamed at you?"

No, the only resurgence you got in the case is it's the first time anybody had ever gotten acknowledgment through to him. You see, you got the same case resurgence that you get if you acknowledged anything or anybody. It's pretty hard to punch an acknowledgment home, but in this particular case, what he did was interpret sympathy or something like that as an acknowledgment and he won in spite of the fact that you ran a motivator. See. And the motivator had nothing to do with it. And Prepchecking didn't have anything to do with it. You would have gotten the same effect if you had been sitting in his office, see?

So right away you say, "Well, is there something about this overt-motivator sequence?" you see and you go astray and so forth.

Well, now look, if you really, really knew your auditing head-on, the situation would have been something like it was, "Well, this guy keeps on going like this, he probably never been acknowledged, you know." And you say, "Well, gee-whiz, all right. Well, doggone. All right. And go on and scream. All right. *Mm*. Good. Bothers you, huh? Good. All right. *Hm*. Yeah, I got that. Yeah, I got that. Somebody really ought to give you a hand. Now, let's see. Now, what have you done to a criminal?" [laughter]

You see and you would have gotten the effect of the acknowledgment followed by the effect of the Prepcheck. You see how it could be misread?

Now, there's a terribly broad example, a rather nonsensical example but who would do anything but vary their procedure if they didn't have a good, tight, standard thing called standard auditing? See, if they – if they didn't know that existed, then who could ever blame them for varying their procedure?

In other words, they're moving on both sides of a highway and they don't know it exists. They're driving in both ditches and out across the plains and herding the ponies up in the hills, you see. And they don't know there's a highway there.

Well, instead of blaming auditors, I should say that it's only recently that I finally corralled all the factors that make up an auditing session. I've been watching auditors for a year and I know now that, thanks to the data, the final data that came home on this was missed withholds.

And I know now that for every action of the pc or everything a pc can do, no matter how unusual, there is a standard auditing response that handles it.

Now, you see, you couldn't call it a standard response unless it actually handled it, see. But if it actually handles it, now you can call it a standard response. You see, because Scientology is totally dedicated to being workable. I know this is not popular in some parts of the world. You'd never get a job in the US State Department with that type of a – of a motto. You know, "be effective." You never would.

And Scientology's peculiar that way. Our index rule is, "does it work?" Not, "is it true?" but "does it work?" Oddly enough, it has to be true in order to work, but that's beside the point.

Now, if these auditing responses work and work in all cases, then I have a right to lay them down and say this is what they are, you see. Only because they work. And then say, "Well, you go ahead and learn them. You learn these responses because they'll work for you. See, I know they'll work for you."

And then I've got a right to bite Quirino's head off and so forth – he's in charge of Practical Section – if he doesn't make the thing work, don't you see? Because there is something there.

Now, one of the favorite methods of teaching in universities on this planet is teaching against the hidden standard. You walk into class and there's students there and there's somebody lecturing and they give examinations and you can even get expelled from the college for flunking the course, don't you see? And the only thing they've overlooked is the fact that there's no course material.

You know, there – it's just growing in universities today. Most of you've been out of universities too long to appreciate the fact. But there are more and more courses taught in universities which have a hidden course. It's a hidden subject. And the student is there. He's very wise. And the professor's very wise. And it's a whole bunch of double talk, you know.

Did you ever meet a friend and there was somebody else present and you met this old buddy of yours and you started double talking with this old buddy and the friend had to stand there and he thought you were both saying something to each other. You know? And of course, you weren't.

Well, the student is an innocent bystander to this double talk and he sees the professor and he sees students and everybody is doing well, so he says there must be a subject here, you see. Must be one. And everybody is so sincere about it, you know.

Subject like art. You should read some of the late curriculums that have come out. Very, very interesting, art appreciation, music appreciation, domestic relations. Can you imagine somebody daring to teach a course on domestic relations who had never even heard of a corner of the human mind? What a dog's breakfast that life must be afterwards if led off these principles. The textbook is invariably written by somebody who murdered his first eight wives, you know. Something like that. And it's a hidden subject. And the world is getting used to having hidden subjects.

And everybody's got his re – trained response to the hidden subject. And the trained response to the hidden subject is, you look alert, you're agreeable, you go along with it, you memorize everything you're told to memorize, you take your examinations, everything. But actually it's just all a sort of a – an agreement because, really, we know there's no subject there. You know, Art Appreciation. Who the – who the – how the hell could you teach Art Appreciation? Yet they manage it. They manage it.

I ran into somebody one time. You should have seen that girl's home. She had taken Art Appreciation at the University of Southern California, LA. It was marvelous. The place was just full of books on the subject of art. Everywhere you looked, here they were propping up the bureau and bright maroon curtains, you see and scarlet table cloths with green pimentos on it. She sure had art appreciation. The person was wild.

She was taught this subject called Art Appreciation and it was the wildest double talk you ever listened to in your life, you know. "The *rigiflubit sallpupilob*" you know.

Yet obviously, hundreds and hundreds, thousands of students have been taking this course. Obviously, they were all in perfect agreement there must be a course there without anybody ever demonstrating a course.

Well, do you see, actually – actually, I'm being a little bit *mean* on the subject. Of course, you know, mathematics is an exact subject. Do you know there's a swindle called calculus that's been going on ever since Newton – I think he did it for an early issue of *Punch*. [laughter] It's marvelous, you know.

You go in there. The professors are teaching it and students are figuring out things with it and you go up to a senior and you say, "How many times have you used calculus in your calculations of various things since you had calculus in your freshman year?"

"I never have."

"Well, why don't you use calculus?"

"Well, it's ... " [laughter]

And of course, you get education's just become some fantastic grim practical joke.

But most people confuse education totally with thinkingness. So they get into a habit pattern of two things. One, they can be in perfect agreement that there is a subject without ever coming near the subject, see, because that's an automaticity in school. You can go through school without ever understanding anything. Give back the right answers, you're all set, you set out of school and at the other end people let you live. I think that's the reward of graduating from school. You got an old school tie on, you get issued your rations.

Now, that's combined with the fact that all of your earliest training is classroom-type training that is all based on data. Data, data, data, data, data. In the early days of engineering it used to be a joke. Engineers that came out of school could not compare to engineers that were out practically functioning and operating in the field. It'd take them three or four years to close that gap. Oddly enough, they close the gap much more rapidly than the practical engineer. They closed it much more rapidly, but they still had a gap to close because they had everything on think, see. They weren't – hadn't done anything practical.

Now, engineers in the last thirty years and so forth, they get things like testing machinery and they get a little bit of doingness mixed up with the engineering school. You got chemistry labs and physics labs and things like that, that is coming in stronger and stronger, but it is nevertheless not really doingness.

So we break up when we give doingness an equal part with theory, we tend to break up an automaticity on which everybody is sitting. And that's the idea that education is a confront of think. See, education is a theoretical process.

So in adventuring this new division of Scientology training, I know we may have a little bit of difficulty without my postulating it. It's going to be hard to keep in. Because it had only been in here 24 hours before it was out. You see? Now, there's – there's a parallel.

Now, when you stop and think that there are three sections and one is the Theory Section and the other's the Practical Section and then there's an Auditing Section. We've got two-thirds doingness for one-third confronting thinkingness. That's heavy, isn't it?

So you see, it'd be adventurous to make it 50-50. That would be adventurous enough. But we haven't made it 50-50. We've made it 66 and 2/3 – 33 and 1/3. So skin it down to one-third of an investment of your time on theory and two-thirds of it on practical and auditing and you should be able to get by.

But that's about what it takes. That's about what it takes. So this is a very heavy emphasis that we've embarked upon here. Much heavier, you realize as you sit there right this minute that this is – this is crushed. I don't know, I have not counted up how many drills have to be compounded according to this May 3rd Policy Letter, how many actual drills. There are a lot of repetitive things on the E-Meter that all come from one drill, but – two drills, you got your Model Session, you got various things of this character and you've got your practical process. But it means quite a few new TRs. Quite a few new TRs. We get a TR for each one of these pieces of doingness.

Now, this is actually quite a technical achievement. You might not – you might not grasp the thing at first glimpse, but after you're auditing one day up here three or four months from now and you're back home or something like that and you're auditing somebody and you suddenly look back on it and realize you haven't had any trouble with any pcs. You haven't had any trouble at all with any pcs. Nobody's ARC broke and nobody's busted up and some of the students you're teaching aren't, aren't that lucky. They open up their E-Meter and stick their foot in it. [laughter] And your reality on this will be shockingly great. Toward the end of your course, when the auditor across from you is auditing flawlessly and you all of a sudden recognize something fantastic is going on here, do you see? It's a tremendous thing.

And when you yourself are delivering this, you all of a sudden find that you have terrific altitude with the pc. And where the hell does altitude come from because you're not grunting or straining – you're not holding your mouth in some peculiar way. Haven't got your tongue out between your teeth or anything, you know. And there's no grunt, you know. And you say, "I've been sitting here, just got through auditing for five hours" and you feel fresh as a daisy. "What's going on?"

Well, only those things – those things would only happen if it were true that for every action on the part of the pc there is a proper response on the part of the auditor. And for everything you want the pc to do, there's a proper causation. There's a proper way to cause it. And if you cause it properly and respond properly and it's all very usual and these things are well done by you, you understand – well understood, well grooved, you will get this other result. And the other result will be just – it looks very, very relaxed. It's very easy and very satisfactory type of activity.

Now, there's a lot of these odd bits, but they're countable. And if you look over this sheet of May the 3rd, perhaps, of 1962, one of the – possibly your first reaction as an old time auditor was what? Is that the totality of auditing skills? You might have had a surprise that there were that few things could be put on both sides of one piece of paper. See, there were that few things that made up the actuality of handling auditing.

And you think it over. That's quite remarkable that on two sides of one piece of paper you could write down everything that you did in terms of a coded system, of course, and that they'd only amount to two or three dozen – a very finite number.

I bet a lot of people that first early on with auditing, they think there must be thousands and thousands of responses. They just must be uncounted responses. You have to be so clever. You know? And they count on their cleverness. And they hope they can be clever enough to handle the pc. There's no cleverness in handling the pc. There's standardness of handling the pc.

You start getting clever while you're handling a pc and you'll be up the river quickly. No paddle either.

No, that's – it's remarkable that there are these few practical auditing skills. There are not many.

Now, the way a student ought to move into this is on this basis: There are certain definite stable data of theory – if you did not know these things, you wouldn't even know where you were going or why – and those are the fundamental bits of theory. The very fundamental bits. And they, of course – and now we are talking about the HCO Policy Letter of May 14th, Issue II, CLASSES OF AUDITORS. And the – there are a few bits which are inescapable – theory. You really have to have those in order to proceed at all.

And then there are certain practical actions, which if you can't do them, the pc is liable to wind up in a tight ball of yarn.

And then there are certain auditing skills – that is to say auditing, you know, just straight auditing the processes – which if you did them on a pc, you would find somewhat successful or unusual in some cases.

And you can tie a bundle of these things together. You can tie a certain level of theory and a certain level of practical drills and a certain auditing activity, you can tie them up so they don't come into conflict and they tend to complement each other to some degree.

Now, there'd be many ways of doing this. And the way which we have laid out here on May the 14th, 1962, may not be the best and most refined way to go about this. Any old D of T looking this over has probably said, "This should go there and that should go there and if we just had the Auditing Section lag a bit behind the other two sections, everything would be much better." And yes, there's no doubt about it. That there – this will stand a small amount of shifting.

It'll be mostly the shifting of what we do when, rather than the shifting of the whole doingness, you see. There'll be some juxtapositions and that sort of thing. You can expect those.

But this thing is based on several things. And let me give you a very fast resume on which it is based. That if you took an auditor and you were going to make an auditor and you grabbed him by the scruff of the neck and ran Op Pro by Dup on him and SCS – that's all you did, see. We didn't give him any other auditing. He didn't have a chance, you see? We just ran some Op Pro by Dup and we ran some SCS of one kind or another. He'd get the idea that there was something to control. And you would knock out the two principal things which upset an auditor.

Op Pro by Dup. You know, was invented just for training. Didn't have any other purpose in the world. It isn't even a cousin to CCHs although it's included in that, in some of the lists given. Just invented for training. It's how long can you make him grind. How long can you endurance it until both the auditor of it and the pc of it find out that it – duplication – won't kill them. And they eventually find out the hard way that duplication isn't going to kill them and after that and *only* after that can you get this type of an action – Do birds fly? Do birds fly? Do birds fly?

Actually, with no Op Pro by Dup. You get something like this. You get tremendous, overwhelming necessity to say, "Do birds fly? Are our feather friends airborne?" [laughter] They won't duplicate an auditing command. And the – a D of T can go absolutely around the bend listening to this because it's so easy for him to do.

He doesn't ever realize he ever had any trouble with that. And yet you listen to these birds. It's – they know how to do it right. You change it. They just go on to obsessive change. Until you run most auditors on Op Pro by Dup.

One of the things which auditors to this day do very well is give a repetitive command. You can see somebody sitting in a session, why an auditor any day of the week. He's happy to sit there and give a repetitive command. "Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you. Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you. Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you. Look around here ..." Gad! You'll go on for five hours. And do you know that before he actually studied auditing or anything like that, do you know he just would have gone *bzzzzzzz* at the idea of repeating that single phrase twice.

So you forget how vital it is to have that one under your belt. Now, you understand these classes are laid out for Scientologists, not just for the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. So naturally, we have to start in our auditing with what an auditor needs most.

Now, it's all right to say well, maybe we ought to start him with a Straightwire. And maybe that's best. And they sit there. The fellow's probably already been in co-audit. He's probably done a little bit of this nonsense, you know.

Well, let's just drive him into the wall. Let's do it the hard way. You're going to have trouble with this, let's pick up what you're going to have the most trouble with at the beginning of the course and just give it to him.

As far as SCS is concerned, you do him very much SCS, you'll wind up with no allergy to controlling or being controlled. And you find out that runs out the badness of control. Most people you meet out on the street, you say, "Control good or bad?" They say, "It's bad."

You ask a motorist he passes in the road, "Is control good or bad?"

"Oh, it's bad." *Screek*, crash!

Number of automobile accidents has nothing whatsoever to do with the highway department. The better highways they build, the more automobile accidents they have. Has to do with the feeling people have that control is very bad.

Well, of course, they have been miscontrolled since birth in the society in which they find themselves and they've been busily miscontrolling themselves. And they get ahold of a piece of machinery and you miscontrol of a piece of machinery and you're a statistic. About all there is to that. It's simple.

Now, an auditor who will not control a pc has a hell of a time. Man, he just gets run over every day of the week. He comes out of a session, he's got tread marks all over him.

Pc says, "Well, I actually have an awful time with windows. Let's run some process about windows."

And the auditor says, "All right. Look at a window."

And the pc says, "Well, I'm tired of that process actually. I object mostly to those andirons over there."

"All right. Look at the andirons."

Never seems to get anyplace, you know. I think you will agree with me out of your own experience, those are the two worst hurdles for an auditor to get over – Control and Duplication. Long since, it's been learned in training that those are – those are the mean points. So, well, let's put them first. Let's put them first.

Now, that means that a student auditor in HCA courses in Academies is actually going to be run on Op Pro by Dup before they have a chance to do anything, see. That's a funny thing to be doing. Well, I don't know, you might as well crowd them and if you've got an Auditing Section, there's somebody going to stand over them with a whip, you can crowd them into doing Op Pro by Dup. Stand there and say, "Come on, come on. Give them another command. I know you're falling in. Give them another command."

"Oh, what is its weight?" [laughter] Aw, you can bull them through it.

By the time an auditor, a beginning auditor, has had it and received it, why, something will have changed. Something will have changed. Now, the only reason that we would include it here and try to run anybody at all on Op Pro by Dup here, is very many of you have never had it flattened. *Ha-ha*. We refer to case repair, of May 14th, HCOB. Maybe you've never had it flattened. I don't know how many hundred hours it takes to flatten it. But I'm perfectly willing to set up an experiment. [laughter, laughs]

Now, along with that, assists. Now, I will say this. That's probably written backwards. It should be assists and Op Pro by Dup and SCS. And how do you get somebody to do an assist when there's nobody hurt? I think a D of T can probably get over that problem. [laughter] But I'll bet you there are very few, very few HCA/HPA courses that teach very much about assists. They're quite spectacular. I've had more people absolutely swear by Scientology and they've never had any auditing but an assist. I remember a down-at-the-heels, that's what you'd call a tennis bum. You know, a professional hanger-on of country houses, gentlemen-type character, you know. He never has a penny in his pocket. Cynical, hard-boiled, everything. Nothing was true. Nothing existed anyplace. He one day thoughtfully closes his hand in the door.

And he comes in. He's holding his hand up, you know. Blood dripping, you know and "Oh, oh, oh, oh. I don't know what I'm going to do about this."

And I said, "Well, go back and touch the door until it doesn't hurt to touch the door."

And he – I made no effort at all, see. I didn't particularly care whether this pc went through the bottom of the earth or what happened.

"Oh," he said, "that wouldn't do any good."

I said, "Yeah, I'm not kidding you." I said, "After all, I'm the man who knows the subject of Scientology and that's Scientology. And you just go back and keep touching the door where you hurt it."

"Oh, I couldn't do that."

And I said, "Well, you're going to do it. Go on!" I said, "Do it!" So he walked back down the hall and I could hear him back there. Thud, thud, thud. Thud, thud, thud, thud, thud, thud. "Ouch," he says. Thud, thud, thud.

He came back in and he said, "It's all right." He said, "What happened?" He says, "That's Scientology?"

I said, "That's right. That's Scientology. Give me a cigarette there." [laughter]

The guy was practically climbing the walls to have auditing, you know. I would just – I didn't even give him an assist. That's the point I was making. [laughter, laughs]

So it's a very good thing for somebody to know. And you can get a good reality on giving assists and receiving assists and so forth. Very peculiar things happen sometimes. Touch assists and so on. But look it, that's all physical action, isn't it? That's sort of getting people's bodies used to bodies.

Now, if we're going to cut out the Upper Indoc, which has been teaching people erroneously to do CCHs too ferociously, we certainly had better have body mauling here someplace and where better to start than in the first unit.

See, the first activity. Let's body maul them. Assists. Op Pro by Dup. SCS. Let's get it off their chests right now.

And there's another point about this – is those are the least likely to goof up the pc if they're done wrong. Nothing much going to happen if you do those things wrong. Because they're self-correcting. Good Op Pro by Dup corrects badly done Op Pro by Dup. Good SCS corrects badly done SCS. And any kind of auditing will correct an assist. So what's the – what's the difference, see? So it's the most corrective kind of auditing because it's self-corrective auditing. Not all processes, you know, are self-corrective. Engram running isn't self-corrective.

You run the engram of running the engram and then you run that wrong and then you run the engram of running the engram and then you run that wrong and then you run the engram of running the engram of running the engram and the pc by that time is so looped up, he doesn't know whether he's "graming" or "eming." And the only thing that you can do about that time is start back and find something more fundamental and run out auditors. And look at the complication you're in, see. Not so Op Pro by Dup, SCS or assists. You just do more of them and it corrects what you're doing, see – self-corrective processes. So that gives us the auditing level.

Now, we're talking about auditing auditing – auditors. We're not talking about auditing the public. But anybody could be started that way. That's Class IA we're talking about as an Auditing Section and we get Class IB, we get ARC Straightwire done in Model Session and Havingness. That also could be reversed. You could have the Havingness first and then ARC Straightwire. Wouldn't matter much which way you had them.

But now you've got a sit-down type of process and it's not going to ruin anybody excessively because ARC Straightwire is actually not self-corrective, but Havingness is.

But why ARC Straightwire? Well, it gives them an idea of doing the repetitive process verbally, having done repetitive duplication physically. But, once more, it's not wasted auditing for the auditor.

Do you know every now and then through a unit, somebody is suddenly going to turn sane that didn't know he was nuts. And that process, ARC Straightwire, still has that power. A few commands of the thing and the fellow says, "Oh, it's fantastic."

But it gives an auditor a reality on a bank. In general, it'll give reality on a bank. Very few cases won't see something, contact something. They have to be pretty much of a black, black, black five, you see, to not get some reality on ARC Straightwire on the time track – the cyclic aspect of the time track and so forth.

Well, that teaches them volumes about time tracks, doesn't it and so on. But once again, the therapy value of it is, is every few cases you're going to get somebody who is really stark staring mad. He's at least basically neurotic. All mixed up, messed up. And you run a

little ARC Straightwire and he comes out of it. That process still has tremendous horsepower. A little bit of it, so on.

There is, by the way, just to bring you up to date, there's a later ARC Straightwire which is positive-negative. I really needn't say anymore about it. You just run the positive-negative versions of each one and of course it just – you can feel the bank just coming apart. *Bssssssah*. You know, communicate-not communicate. Real-unreal. You know. Affinity-no affinity. And you get all the seamier side of life tied up in it and these fellows that every time you try to run a pleasure moment on them they give you a moment of agony. Can't run ARC Straightwire very long without being in the middle of agony. Well, this keeps that from happening.

All right. Now, your next step up the line of processing, we would be into Prepchecking and CCHs. Just Prepchecking and CCHs, done preferably by form. You know, the old Form 3 and Form 6A. And supposing – supposing you had done those things, the first ones kind of badly – the first level Op Pro by Dup and SCS and assists, you know – kind of badly. And the next one you've done is a little smoother. Kind of bad. By the time you got that up and had these people so they could audit and they started auditing this, they would be coping with something. They would – you would start to get actual good case advances.

And that would be a fairly logical progress for a case. In actuality, if you knew all this and you were just auditing the public, of course, you'd just go into Prepchecking from scratch. But you can mess up people like fire drill with bad Prepchecking, so it isn't, of course, in the lower classifications. You can miss more withholds than people can count if you turn it loose in an Academy without any fundamental auditing. They're learning to prepcheck before they've learned anything about auditing and that's pretty crazy.

Now, of course, your next classes, as far as classes goes, goes up to your Routine 3 processes.

Now, how would you get somebody from Prepchecking and CCHs up to a Routine 3 process without doing any 3D Criss Cross? He'd have to do assessments of some kind or another. Well, that's quite a little puzzle. It's quite a puzzle. It may not be fully solved here. But we get to Class IIIA and we get here Havingness, getting rudiments in, Dynamic Assessment, Prehav Assessment, Problems Intensive and I could add any kind of an assessment you could dream up. Anything that gives them experience in assessing. And none of that has any therapeutic value except maybe the Havingness and getting the rudiments in.

But of course, if you just sat down and spent a lot of hours just getting rudiments in on a case, why, the guy would feel lots better. So it could be called processing. But get him to do a lot of assessment. You know? Get him – get him used to the idea of running down a column of things and finding out if they react or don't react.

And of course, a Problems Intensive is lovely for that. You can do a Problems Intensive, find the prior confusion to what hung up, scrub the whole thing, add to the list and do a new assessment. You can do Assessment by Elimination on a Problems Intensive list, see? See, you can do all kinds of things with it. But just practice in assessment before we turn loose on Routine 3.

And then as least as current processes go right now, you'd turn him loose immediately into a Goals Assessment when he got to a Class IIIB and you wouldn't monkey with anything else. That's because cases can be a bit loused up by doing a wrong 3D Criss Cross and whereas I can straighten out anything you've ever had happen to you here, this is also going to be done in Port Darwin. There is nothing in Port Darwin. You get the idea? See? Because this is set up, of course, for the world. Not just here.

All right. So that would be your progress in auditing. Now, let's take – let's back up a step here and let's take this Theory Section. Now, at a Class IA, you've got the Auditor's Code, *E-Meter Essentials*, basic scales and dynamics. That's your Theory Section. Well, that just gives some background music to the fundamentals of Dianetics and Scientology, doesn't it? That's all.

A fellow can't proceed very far without knowing these things exist. And you got your Practical Section and we hit that heavy.

We teach the fellow how to do some CCHs. You know, just drill, see. His zero, one, two, three. We teach him about Model Session. We teach him complete E-Meter check items. We're hitting him with an E-Meter. He's not even going to use one in his Auditing Section, don't you see. Because at this stage of the game, we couldn't – we couldn't hope that he could use anything. He'd just goof with it. He's not going to do CCHs at that particular level. But we look over here and we find the CCHs, *heh*, include Op Pro by Dup and two-way comm in the CCHs and that sort of thing.

And we're not going to try to teach him that, as he's auditing in that section, at all because we're not going to do Op Pro by Dup and SCSes with any two-way comm. We're just going to do it on the heroic level. See? There's several auditing styles amongst which there is the heroic.

And he's going to have enough to worry about trying to do his Model Session and ARC Straightwire up in his next class. And then finally he's going to have too much to worry about – about Prepchecking to learn anything about CCHs at a higher class. These are basics and CCHs – we teach him how to do the CCHs early. And then we've assuaged his curiosity and then he can do it the hard way later.

All right. And that's – so Class IA consists of this Theory Section with some of these fundamentals. Practical Section, whole bunch of stuff. TR, give him a Comm Course, give him various things that we ordinarily give him, you know. And teach him something about Model Session. We work him over at this level and then give him Op Pro by Dup and SCS. I think a student at that level, by the time he had reached the top of Class IA, would feel that he had achieved something.

He might be battered and I think he would be unbowed. But I think he would be in pretty good – pretty good idea that something was happening and that he knew something for the time.

And then we move him up into IB and we get the Theory Section and of course, the old comm formula. Well, that's taught alongside of ARC Straightwire. And if you'll notice here and after, your Theory Section is combining at Class IB and Class IIA. Your Theory

Section and your Auditing Section are hand in glove. They're happening both at the same time. And you say, well, the optimum way to handle this, of course, is to teach your theory in one class, you see and your practical in one class and then later on audit the things in the next class up.

Yeah, well, that's all right, but we're auditing students. And you're not going to be – you're not going to get a subjective reality on the doingness of this thing unless you audit at the same time they're studying it on these upper classes.

And they're going to say, "Gee, what do you know," you know. And their interest is going to be on it. And if you kept repeating this thing of Class IA of teaching early and auditing at an upper class, if you didn't stay in parallel with IB and IIA, your students would get confused because their interest, the interest of a new student when he starts – first starts running into ARC Straightwire, this stuff kind of, kind of – fabulous. Particularly if you were running on a plus-minus version, which you probably would be.

This is very fabulous. He'd get very interested in the communication formula. He'd get very interested in other things that goes along with that level, don't you see?

He probably would reach back and study some more scales. He heard of those in the class below. Well, what do these scales have to do with it? And he'd see some of these things in action. He'd think this was pretty good. And you get your Class IB would be your communication formula and E-Meter tapes and tapes on the theory and attitudes of an auditor and Code of a Scientologist, basic materials on ARC and ARC Straightwire and basic materials on havingness.

Your Practical Section is just drills, drills, drills on Model Session of the May 3rd HCO Policy Letter and your Class IIA, of course, is your HCOBs and tapes on Prepchecking and tapes on CCHs and Axioms. That's a sort of a knife in the back that you suddenly shove in there.

You'll be treating theory lightly right up to that point, you see and then you show him it has teeth in it.

And then you give him handling the pc, the Practical Section and pertinent items in the practical processes and then your auditing session which I've already given you.

Class IIIA, why, you give him the various tapes and bulletins on assessments and so forth. Well, there's one point I must mention here is the theory checklist – the checksheet must go to the most *fundamental* check item first because he's going to be auditing on this stuff and as he's auditing, he can then get the flowery ends of it. You get the idea?

In other words, right at the *first* of his theory checklist and right at the *first* of the practical, you give him the *most* fundamental that he is going to use in the auditing of that section or that class. See?

You give it to him hard – and right away. And then while he's doing the auditing, give him the fancier versions, the more expanded versions, the supplementary material, the lectures on the subject. You know, all of that kind of thing follows in while he's actually doing it and he finally finds out there's quite a bit to know about this. See, at first it looks terribly sim-

ple to him. Then it looks terribly complicated and he can't do it. And then he gets supplementary lectures and it finally brings it back into focus. That's the theory by which this operates.

Now, this course will be operating on the basis of a *checklist per class* which carries all three sections. In other words, all three sections for one class. You get one sheet of paper and it's got a class and when that thing is finished, you've got that class. And you get another sheet of paper and you get a class. Don't you see, with that? That's the way these things should be issued in the Academy, too.

And it's got all the materials on it ready to be checked out and so forth. Oddly enough, with maybe only tiny variations, as far as we're concerned here at the Special Briefing Course, your checklists are the same as they are. Oh, you know, we haven't changed the checklist. Your checklists aren't going to be changed any. But they'll be juggled as to where they belong in the classes, don't you see?

What you've passed, you've passed. What you have to pass, you still have to pass. But there's just – we'll parallel it with the classes not change the subject matter, so don't be getting the idea that you will now have to pass all of them all over again or something like this because that's not true. But you'll have to pass them for various classes.

Now the auditing – this I should mention – the Auditing Section has "done well" and "received well" certain processes, so it's got a check-off too. In other words, he's received Op Pro by Dup and he's given Op Pro by Dup. He's given SCS and he's received SCS. We're talking about just a worldwide checksheet, you see?

He's given ARC Straightwire, he's received ARC Straightwire. He's given the – a Havingness and had found a Havingness Process and audited some and he's received some, don't you see. That's just all part of the checksheet.

And then we get down and we're not interested in that for you guys. See, we're not interested in those two Auditing Sections for you because you're quite advanced as auditors. Although I might find some of it if I see – don't see better duplication.

Anyway, what you're mainly interested in is this Prepchecking. You actually get off the launching pad with Prepchecking. That's your first hard auditing assignment. And that is occupied with the form type of Prepchecking, particularly the last two pages of the Joburg and the Form 6A done in Prepcheck-Sec Check form as released recently.

You'll be getting off the launching pad with that as having given it and having received it, don't you see?

But actually, your pc will have to be checked out for unflat questions before you have passed it. In other words, we're getting your final examination down into your practical auditing so it doesn't take you so long to get it passed. Okay?

And similarly, your auditing given and received and so forth is checked out for your IIIA and your IIIB. I think you'll find this very easy to do on this particular class. It's very simple to carry through because you're doing exactly this except you've got some new TRs, and you've got your Practical Section which is going to be harder and tougher than it has been in the past.

But you're getting by very easy on the thing. At HCA/HPA level, of course, those two first grades will be very tough and they will look very tough and they'll look like a very high hill to climb for people. And you, frankly, are not even climbing either of those hills for a hill of beans because it's minimal as far as we're concerned. But we're very interested from Class IIA up. We're terribly interested and terribly detailed as we go on up.

Now, that doesn't say we're not interested in the *whole* of the Practical Section because I expect all of you to get a total checkout on all of the TRs of the Practical Section because I can't miss this opportunity of swinging you into line to a vitally important activity which is the delivery of highly standardized auditing. And you deliver that, you'll find out more about the human mind than you ever thought existed because your own errors introduced into the session aren't giving you false data about the mind all the time, see. And you all of a sudden will find you are looking at a very relatively easily understood set of mental mechanics. Water is never muddied up by something else going on. More basically, your pcs will be very happy.

This is – we are very interested in this and I want every student who is here to get a good cracking on this practical. I'd be very interested in doing that. And students who are well along had better just start sweating on it. You know, just get into the Practical Section and get checked off as fast as you can. Shouldn't take you too long to do that. Things will look much happier when you get there.

Right now the only thing that is wrong with your auditing at all is here and there you wobble. And every time you wobble, you get a session tied up somehow or another. And you – one zig and the pc hands you a zag and after that you're zigzagging.

But I think you're doing remarkably well and we're at a culmination point. And we're going for broke now. We're going for broke now. I'm trying to make Clears. And I said yesterday, I told a couple of people that I hadn't been trying to make Clears. That actually is not true. I have been trying for the last year. But I have been trying to make dynamic Clears and finding the road through to a highly stable, highly permanent state of Clear.

I'm not interested in any other state. And we could have been making other types of Clears and everybody would have been much happier with us. People would have been going out of here and in a month or two falling on their heads, but – and some of them remaining very stable and so forth – but as long as there was any question mark in it at all, I wasn't interested in approaching that hill at all. I'm just interested in making auditors, and pushing straight through the GPM, finding the road and the way through the GPM. I'm pretty sure we've got that very well taped.

We've learned a tremendous amount about auditing and we're going for broke right now to make some Clears. And who knows, maybe in the next four or five years we might produce one. [laughter]

And if you're not Clear in a few months, I'm going to be mad at you.

Thank you.

NEW TRs

A lecture given on 15 May 1962

Thank you.

Now, this is 15 May, lecture 2, 1962, Special Briefing Course, HCO WW. And we are taking up HCO Policy Letter of 3 May, 1962.

This is a fairly important lecture because I'm going to give you the first data on some of these TRs and this data will have to be used by you, because there isn't any written data on the more advanced TRs. And I will also shorthand this and get this stuff out in a mimeographed form. But you won't have the pat TRs yet, either. They have to be developed and you can normally describe an auditing action and then you have to work with it a little bit before you can erect a TR around it and say that's it, set in concrete. Otherwise, why, you've got some people learning something that is a bit false here and there, you know? And it doesn't agree with the reality of the situation.

So, I'm just giving you here a shorthand account of what I expect of an auditor, from my experience, in these various given reactions or situations.

Now, we look over this May 3rd, which was first released as a self-appreciation chart so that an auditor could take this and check off these various columns as to whether he was sure or unsure on it, but you still notice that accidentally we left lots of space over here on the extreme right for check marks to be made as to whether you could do them or not.

Now, there's no use going in TR 0 to 4. There's just no point in going into those. They have been terrifically well-covered in lectures; you have TRs concerning them, and none of you can do them. But – I mean, that after a while is the – is the sort of feeling you get about these after you've been drilled on them forever. Nobody can do these things, you know? But nevertheless auditors do that surprisingly – do them surprisingly well.

Now, let's take off above this point. And let's not bother to put TR numbers in, although TR numbers will be filled in. There is another TR which is "Auditor query." Now, this comes clear down – and also, we're not going to take up the CCHs for the same reason, as they've been terrifically well covered. Also Op Pro by Dup has been the subject of many bulletins, and so on, and written materials, and no point in wasting time on that. And we get to this first item which is actually a TR which is probably TR 5T or some such number. I won't even say that is its number. But it's the Two-way Comm TR.

And it's Two-way Comm in CCHs and oddly enough it's the same Two-way Comm, but will have a different number for use in Model Session. There isn't any difference between these TRs except one – the one we're – we have under discussion here – Two-way Comm and CCHs, considers a physical reaction on the part of the pc to be a pc's origin. And then of

course we do TR 4 – with this exception: The pc has originated. The auditor asks him what that was. See, the pc jerks his head and the auditor says to him, "What happened then?" or "What was that?"

And the pc says, "Oh, what?"

And he says, "That jerk of your head that you just did."

"Oh, that." Pc, "Oh, well, well I just had a – had a somatic."

And the auditor goes on and simply acknowledges that fact and he doesn't go any further than that. The whole object is to get the pc to notice that he jerked his head. And that is the only comm used in the CCHs.

Now, one of you the other day was running on and on and on and calling it Two-way Comm in the CCHs. And of course, there was no gain. The auditor – here's the fault. Here's the faulty one. The auditor says, "Well, what happened – ." Well, actually one auditor had reduced it to a system so that every time they did the drill the auditor says, "What happened that time?" The pc said something. The auditor said, "That's fine," or something like that. That is *dead* wrong. That is just wronger than wrong, you see? It's not a system; it's a specific pc origin.

Now, here's another example of a wrong one: The pc says, "I've got a terrible burning sensation in my stomach." Now, that's handled with TR 4. So we don't care what the pc said. We just acknowledge it. That's just TR 4. That isn't – that has nothing to do with this Two-way Comm in the CCHs.

Pc says, "Oh, I had a terrible burning in my stomach that time." And you say, "Good. Thank you." You understand that he had a burning in his stomach and you tell him so. And that's all that happens and that's just TR 4, see? No, no, that is not your CCH Two-way Comm. The pc actually originates with a physical action. You see their eyes start going. You see their – something happening. It's his shoulder – you see, shoulder goes suddenly, you know. Well, one of the questions – the only question about this TR is do you ask them then or do you complete the cycle? Well, actually by asking them then, you tend to put the pc in charge of the session, which would be wrong.

Pc is permitted then to interrupt your cycle of command, see, and that would be wrong so you wait till after the cycle of command is finished and then you ask him about it. But unfortunately, a large percentage of the time he will have forgotten about it. But that is not unusual because he usually didn't know he did it. So if he doesn't have any recollection of having gone [shows something] – well, that's – that's it. Just let it go by. Just let it go by.

Now, your two-way comm is a funny two-way comm in the CCHs – it's very funny, because the pc doesn't say anything; the pc *does* something we don't care whether he does it painfully – it's a painfully slow reaction. It's a questionable fumbling on the duplication. We don't care what it was. We don't care whether it was a quiver of his nose or a twitch of his cheek or the wiggle of his right ear or the hitch of his shoulder, but he *did* something. Now, remember this: CCHs are physical processes, not thinkingness processes, and our two-way comm is calculated to do only one thing with the pc, and that is exteriorize him from that somatic. And by getting him to look at it, we will exteriorize him from it in most cases.

And the usual reaction is he didn't know he did it. The only two-way comm you engage in then is to ask him what happened – and if he doesn't immediately tell you – you know, the origin was the twitch of the shoulder – if he doesn't immediately tell you about the twitch of the shoulder – he says, "My ear burned," Uh-huh. You say, "All right, thanks."

"But what ... ?"

"Thank you. Thank you. Good. Now, what happened to your shoulder there?"

"Oh, my shoulder. I don't know. Oh, my shoulder. It's – yeah. Yeah. Yeah, my shoulder. Well it's – funny, feels numb."

And you say, "Good."

Now there's the basic outline of that CCH. And you'll find out that it has only one purpose. And that is not to establish two-way comm with the pc particularly, but to get the pc – one: to keep the pc in session with you and to get the pc basically, however, to exteriorize from and notice what's going on and notice what he is doing, instead of dumbly grinding on through. Now, if the pc can actually dumbly grind on through and never notice what he's doing, then you'll make very, very slow progress.

Now, that is one specific drill and the most important one. That is the most important one. It is allowable, it is allowable to whistle the pc back into session or encourage him a little bit or something like that. You see, you're not a – you're not a dummy sitting there auditing him. Pc – he doesn't want to do it again and you say, "Oh, come on, come on." You know, cheer him up; push him on. "That's better," something like that. That is after, however, you finished a command cycle. Those comments, those statements, the "how's it going," cheerily, that sort of thing, can go on.

But the basic two-way comm in the CCHs is the origin by physical action on the part of the pc, the query of it by the auditor, and the action of the auditor to make him view it. If he can possibly get him to view it, he does so. That's all.

All right. Now we take up the E-Meter. The E-Meter is written up in all ways from the middle in *E-Meter Essentials*. There are certain drills by which the coach sits behind the auditor, (quote) (unquote) "auditor" and gets him to study body motion, which is at the bottom of the page there. Now, there's one point I'd like to make on that particular point which is not in *E-Meter Essentials* and I'd like to add the data to it. You must – give him all kinds of body motions, yeah, let them accustom themselves to seeing what a needle looks like with all kinds of body motions, just as given in *E-Meter Essentials* – but since *E-Meter Essentials* was written we have had brought to notice, "the selling pc." The pc that sells you things. The pc that influences the meter and you should learn those tricks. And those are the specialist tricks. You can – those things should be hit heavily – very, very heavily.

There is lifting one little finger off the can and replacing it to get a twitch on a certain item. Well, you say, pcs never do this. No, only twenty-five percent of them. They'll sell you a goal by lifting their little finger off the can and putting it back on. And if they're holding their cans this way, you can't see their fingers, you see. Hold the cans with their palm – with the palms up, you know, toward the can – the can up. You can actually – they can actually make the thing read. Twitch. And frankly, it looks like a finger-twitch. It does not look like a

tick on a goal or an item or anything like that. It looks like what it is. It looks like a finger being lifted and putting back on the can.

Another one is the way some pcs keep you from finding out anything in the rudiments is to gradually loosen their grip on the cans. And they can actually do a beautiful needle rise. Beautiful! You never even see their hands move. It's absolutely – all you have to do is just lift some of the skin surface of your hand off of the can at a very gradient scale and you get the most beautiful needle rise you ever saw. And any reaction to the rudiments is smothered in that rising needle. Pretty good.

Also, you can squeeze the cans – putting a little more and a little more skin on the cans – and get a gradual falling needle. They're unmistakable for what they are, once you know what they are and you've seen them. But those are selling techniques. There may be more of them, but those are the ones which have come to view.

One pc's rudiments was always in, except they were always wildly out. And the pc always had a rising needle whenever the rudiments were touched. One day Mary Sue got tired of this because she knew the pc's rudiments must be out by just looking at the pc, and detected the fact that this had been going on for a long time. This pc also responded to embarrassing Prepcheck questions with a constantly rising needle. It was the most beautifully masked thing you ever wanted to see. Why a man would want to cut his throat by falsifying E-Meter reads is – well, that's a subject for the Catholic church. We're not interested in it. [laughter]

Now, as far as the rest of these things are concerned, they're rather easy. When I say on-off switch, and that sort of thing, it's almost being sarcastic, isn't it? But, do you know that nearly every auditor I've ever seen monkeying around with it early on, fumbles for the on-off switch? And me, I've been auditing between a Mark III and a Mark IV. I've got the prototype Mark IV which is actually a Mark III. And it's different than the Mark IV; it turns on in a different place. I always turn each one on in the wrong place. You'd think fifty percent of the time I would get the right one. [laughter] But somehow or another it's always a hundred percent.

When the – you say on-off switch – in trimming, we want a smart setup of the E-Meter. On those two, see – whether they're in correct order there or not – this is trimming and on-off switch. We want a smart setup of the meter. In other words we want this person actually to be able to set up an E-Meter without bad, you know, knocking his brains out trying to find the plug, or whether the plug is in or out, or half in or half out, you know? Let's let him get used to this and find out where the controls are and how you hook it up and so forth, so that he can do it just brrrrr, and his E-Meter is set up and ready to roar.

Sounds like an elementary thing. It makes a hell of an impression on the pc. I'll tell you, a pc who watches an auditor say, [fumbles with the e-meter] "Heh-heh – I haven't got any leads here at the moment but..." It does something to his confidence. [laughs] He doesn't at that moment feel in an outpouring state toward this auditor. He catches the uncertainty of this moment. And actually an auditor may know his meter perfectly as far as operating a meter's concerned and just be very unpracticed in setting one up. You get the idea?

Another thing is – another thing to watch on this, is learn to set up a meter quietly – not with a snap. Don't set up a meter noisily. One of the ways you do that is let one of your

fingernails grow long and snap the jack with the plugs, down on your fingernail, and then ease it down. But you would be surprised. I myself have been knocked half out of session by a very, very loud and boisterous setup of a meter.

You know, you're sitting there all ready and you've got some data, and you're all – you're just – you know, waiting for – to get into session and all of a sudden there's these wild explosions going on in front of your face and your attention comes out on the auditor. And if you want to start a session with all the rudiments in, you will know how to get an E-Meter into action smoothly and quietly and very effectively and efficiently, so the pc doesn't even realize you've started to use an E-Meter – he's just sitting there with the cans in his hands. How did they get there? He wouldn't know. See what I mean? It actually has a – there's a purpose that you might neglect.

Now, we say sensitivity knob – you'd be amazed how much difficulty people have getting the sensitivity knob up for the rudiments and down for the can squeeze, and all of that sort of thing. And then they'll start with a third-of-a-dial drop on the can squeeze which they have run the person's Havingness Process on and tested it, you see. And then they'll run the next rudiment with the sensitivity knob set at the third-of-a-dial drop setting, don't you see? And then say, "Oh, excuse me." And then move it on up. A drill could be done to make that much more smoothly. I myself have made the mistake. You have made the mistake. Why make the mistake?

Tone arm handling: Well, at least know that you can handle it with your thumb. You don't have to cover up the whole meter with your paw and juggle it around and wave red flags in front of the pc's face and everything else just to set the tone arm. Actually, this whole tone arm can be handled with the thumb, with the hand underneath the E-Meter. Pc never notices that you're handling a tone arm. Can be done very quietly. Can be done very smoothly. You always ought to be able to handle an E-Meter in that particular fashion.

This – not so good, see? [demonstrates something] See? Get the difference? See, you don't even know whether I'm doing – what I'm doing with the tone arm. Because if you start doing this [demonstrates something; laughter] – the pc will come right out of session. He'll say, "What did the tone arm do?" And you say, "How did you know it did anything? I must be wearing a mirror in my tie."

Now, needle pattern reading is kind of new. We talk about a needle pattern in *E-Meter Essentials* but we don't talk about what a pattern is. Because at the time *E-Meter Essentials* was written we didn't know what a pattern is. A pattern is a series of missed withholds culminating in a constantly active needle.

A pattern can be a big dirty needle or a little dirty needle. In other words a wide-dial dirty needle, or a small-dial dirty needle. And you sure better know what a dirty needle looks like and what a pattern looks like for the excellent reason that if a goal comes up – whenever you say the goal, "to catch catfish," and you get a *bzzzz*. "To catch catfish," *bzzzz*. "To catch catfish," *bzzzz*. And it's a dirty needle, that goal isn't in. That goal is kicking simply because there's a missed withhold in connection with it. You get the missed withhold off and that goal is deader than a mackerel.

Now, if you're good at this you can tell whether or not the pc has a missed withhold or an invalidation. You can read it straight off the meter. Missed withhold always gives a dirty needle. And that's needle pattern. The pc's needle that goes – the stage four needle – the – any other needle pattern – constantly moving needle and so forth, is a missed withhold, one or more. It's actually the net product of too many missed withholds if the thing is wide and chronic, don't you see?

But you can correct that needle pattern. And you'd better get used to a needle pattern being correctable. Because the person's got missed withholds, they're going to be hard to audit. You know then when you've got your Prepchecking up to a point where everything can go along rambunctiously with Routine 3's, when the pc no longer has a needle pattern. Hasn't got a needle pattern – well, all right, you must have the bulk of his missed withholds. Therefore you've got a chance of keeping his rudiments in.

Don't you see, it is going to be very difficult to keep somebody's rudiments in whose rudiments are perpetually out. In other words, you never have a chance at current rudiments because the rudiments have been out for ages. And you'll find your Routine 3 sessions on such a pc are constantly and continually carried into Prepcheck sessions. You never really get a chance to do any Routine 3, because you're always correcting the pc. And that will always happen when you have a needle pattern. So you better get used to what needle patterns are and spot them for what they are, because, the – well, not the bulk of people that you audit – but, I don't know what the percentage would be, I'd say just at a wild guess about 50 percent of the people that you suddenly put on a meter have a needle pattern.

There are various types of needle patterns. There's the little tiny, *bzzz*, dirty needle. And there's the – it's not a nice tick, see, it's not a nice little clip. Pop-pop-pop – that's not a needle pattern. It's a – it's an instant read needle pattern. It's fantastic. But you say, "To catch catfish," *bzzz*. "To catch catfish," *bzzz*. "To catch catfish," *bzzz*.

And you say, "Boy, that's really something We've really got a goal, yeah. We got a goal. Who should have found out about this goal and didn't?"

"Heh-heh. My father. Heh-heh heh-heh. Heh. Heh-heh. He should have found out about it."

You say "All right, very good. To catch catfish." Where did it go? It's released that easily. That's very rare that you will find an instant read on a goal or an item. Very rare. But when it does happen, you're in trouble. And it can cause so much trouble that you sure better know all about it no matter how rare it is.

Now, you can sometimes get a goal on the list of goals reading on a missed withhold, that *you* missed. Or an invalidation that *you* missed. And the goal actually isn't in. The invalidation reads with a nice tick.

And you ask, "Any invalidations on this goal?"

And the pc says, "Oh, well yes, last night I was sitting up and I said that a man would be a fool to have such a goal."

"Is that so?" And you say "Good, to catch catfish?" All right. You say, "Were there any suppressions on this goal?"

"Oh, yes, I'd rather not have it. I can remember saying that to myself"

"All right. Is there a missed withhold on this?"

"Well, yes, you didn't find the goal originally when you were nulling."

"All right. Good. To catch catfish," tick. "To catch catfish," tick. "To catch catf.." Happened just as often as it vanishes forever.

Now, you get the test question, "Is there an invalidation on this goal?" Tick. You get it off. You either have a goal or you don't have a goal. But you certainly don't have an invalidation.

In other words, goals and items can be held in and made to look like goals and items from suppressions, invalidations and missed withholds. And this all comes under the heading of needle reads in general, but needle pattern is the wildest of these. That is the most interesting. Because you can get good enough that you sit right down, this person's got a wide swing and a tick-tick. And a wide swing and a tick-tick. And a wide swing and a tick-tick. Any time you ask him, you say, "Cows." And you get a wide swing and a tick-tick. And you say, "Well, do you ever comb your hair?" And a wide swing and a tick-tick. You say, "What's going on here?" Missed withholds is what's going on here. Who missed it? It's probably been going that way for a long time. Maybe his mamma missed it, or his schoolteacher, or somebody else. It's past. It'll be well back.

All right. It's the dirty needle that has given Routine 3 the most single amounts of trouble – the dirty needle. So I've already found out what the dirty needle is, so therefore it gets included in here. It's always a missed withhold.

All right and we come down the line here on a null needle. And that is horrible that all the auditors that were consulted on this in southern California were able to describe a null needle. I think that was the greatest achievement I have ever heard of. Everybody down there could describe a null needle.

Saint Hill graduate went back there and gave a lecture. Tremendous lot of data in this thing. How to run all the Routines, how to prepcheck, sec check, how to tear pc's upside down – one thing registered with the auditors who came to the lecture. "So *that* is a null needle!" Everybody came around afterwards and they were very intrigued. And that was a starting point of a reality on what needle reads are.

I've seen people sit in here when they first arrived from someplace. And you say, "All right, what's a null needle?" Mike would say. And they'd say, "Well, a null needle is – that." Give you a pattern, you know? Wave their arm around in the air like they're sending semaphore signals to somebody. That's a null needle. Interesting. Interesting

And of course, null needles, theta bops, rock slams, falls, rises, speeded rise, speeded fall, slowed rises and slowed falls, are the new ones that you normally don't see too much of. But here at Saint Hill, why, the older class that was here, my God, could those fellows read speeded rises and speeded falls and slowed rises and slowed falls. And before people were –

people who were – just been here for a short time, you know, they would watch these guys doing Sec Checking. The needle flying around at sensitivity 16, you know? And it just looked like the same needle, you know? It looked exactly like – just a fast flying needle. They – unable to detect the fact that at one little point the rise speeded on an instant reaction. And it's that degree of skill we're asking from a Saint Hill graduate. That – it's swinging up – it's swinging up like sixties, you know, it's coming right on up. But at what point did it suddenly move faster as the instant read? Reading a flying needle – it's quite tricky reading one of these things.

We're not doing as much Sec Checking as we were and I don't see so many people doing that. Furthermore, because we haven't been doing a heavily effective Routine 3 Process, sensitivity is not as loose as it was a few months ago. It will be shortly. And you'll have this problem where at sensitivity 16 you actually have to keep the needle moving yourself. You have to keep the needle moving yourself while it reads because, you see, you can't get the whole sentence out before it's traversed the entire dial. So of course you have to read – move your tone arm – I'm joking now; almost that bad though.

So, that's real – real postgraduate needle reading, when we get into speeded rises and speeded falls and so forth. And the darned thing flying through the air like sputniks.

And then tiny reads: How tiny can a read be and still be a read? Break out your microscope, Sherlock Holmes, because you – this is the way it's going to be sometimes. Sometimes it's this way the whole session. And sometimes you get enough invalidations off and get the reads so that people can see it.

And then testing for a clean needle: And there we get into a TR. And this TR is already described in HCO Bulletin – no, it's the H – it's an HCOB that just came out – it's a – TR is actually in there complete. It asks if something is free and then repeats the same action. It's around someplace. I haven't got a file of them here.

I will describe this one to you. It is going out by the same door you came in. And this is not one little TR that it only applies to this TR. This applies to all auditing. You go in the same door you came out. Otherwise you never leave there. I'll make this practical experiment. Find a room that has one door and windows which are not passable. Go into the room, close the door behind you, and don't leave by that door. And look around and you will find you're still in the room.

By "door" in this case, we mean the exact phrase you used must be the exact phrase you leave with. You want an invalidation. You say, "Has this goal been invalidated?" Not too good but, "Has this goal been invalidated?" Tick.

Pc says, "Yeah, well I think it has."

And you say, "That, that, that."

"Oh ye – oh yeah. Yeah, it has been. It has been. I invalidated it."

"All right. Thank you. I will check that. Has this goal been invalidated? Thank you, that is clean."

Now, let me show you the errors of your ways. This is how to get into endless trouble. This is you find this one room and it has one door, see. And so you enter by that door. You say, "Has this goal been invalidated?" That's the door you entered by. And then you leave with the phrase, "Are there any more invalidations on this goal?" Don't blame me if your pc gets ARC breaky and starts to blow session, and you can't find the goal, and so forth because you're still in a room. You never left that room. You're still there – as far as the bank is concerned. You never acknowledged the pc; you never found out if it was clean.

"Has this goal been invalidated?"

The pc says, "Oh yes, I invalidated it last night."

You say, "Good. Are there any more invalidations on this goal?" You're going to be still in that first room. Oddly enough, you're going to be still there. "Any more" – How the hell do you know if that one cleared? What are you doing asking for any more?

The pc goes berserk under these. Now, if you don't believe it try this one sometime, as far as the acknowledgment is concerned. You can almost make a pc go round the bend.

You say, "How are you today?" You can even do this and tell him it's a stunt. And he'll still go right down the chute on it.

You say, "How are you today?"

And he says, "Fine."

I – you say, "I asked you how you were today." And he'll say, "Oh, I said I'm fine."

"Yes, but how are you?"

Now that isn't quite as bad as this:

"How are you today?"

"I'm fine."

"Yes, but, how's your wife?"

"Well, she's fine, too."

"But, your boss, how's he?"

And the person gets a weird idea of, "It's going to go on forever." [laughter] It's pretty weird. The pc will ARC break on that lack of duplication. That's true of anything you ask the pc that you're – that is up against a meter, see. You're trying to find out if this goal is suppressed or invalidated, or if in this session there's a missed withhold. This applies to rudiments. This applies to anything that you're trying to find out about. You always enter by the same door you – leave by the same door you entered by. And let me give you this as a little tip here. When you check something, tell the pc you're checking it. See? Don't tell him you're disputing with him. And this is a terrific acknowledgment, you know? "Oh, well, that was really it."

This is the kind of illusion he gets:

You say, "Well, has this goal been invalidated?"

And he said, "Yeah. You know, well, I thought last night, something or other about it and I thought it wasn't quite right."

"Good. I'll check that now. Has this goal been invalidated? All right, that's clean."

Well, the immediate reaction of the pc, "Heh. Oh good! Heh-heh! Oh, good. What do you know. Heh-heh. Good." See. What he's saying is he had some attention paid to him.

So that is that type of drill. And any TR that compares with this would just be something that made the guy say the same thing twice. Which people almost never do. Particularly on this.

"Have I missed a withhold on you?" is followed by "Are there any other withholds I missed on you?"

And the fellow says, "Well, no."

And you say, "Yes, but has anybody else missed a withhold on you today? Well, how about yesterday? How about tomorrow?" And pc just feels like he's nowhere. He's moving in the nothingness of nowhere. And you never find out, and you just lose more withholds, and you miss more invalidation, you miss more meter data on that one single trick. That's just – that is an invariable. If you're asking something against the meter, you always ask it again exactly the same way that you asked it the first time.

So you can get yourself very easily into trouble. You will say, "When Bill and I were outside talking about your case just now and Mary Ann was in the room, too, did Mary Ann miss a withhold on Bill?" "Yeah, that – that – that – that."

And pc says, "Well, yes he did."

"Now let's see, when Mary Ann was in the – Bill was outside – uh, that's it. I'll get it in a minute. Let's see, when Bill and I were outside and Mary Ann was left in the room, did Bill miss ... No, that's not right."

And you know, you'll get some – it – you won't look positive to the pc. [laughter, laughs]

So it's very easy to get yourself all in foot tangles, you know. Get bird snares all over the big toe, you know, just by being too – too sloppily something or other, because it's just unrepeatable.

You get yourselves into the same tricks when you're handling old CCH 4 or something like that. And you take a book and you throw it up in the air and you sit on it, and you pound yourself on the back of the head and then open and close it three times, and then hand it to the pc, and he says, "But what did you do?" You've had it, you see. [laughter, laughs] Can't duplicate yourself. You can get caught the same way on one of these verbal clearings, see. Very important. Testing for a clean needle. It's always done the same way. And you'll find out that most – a lot of your ARC breaks, a lot of your pc restiveness in session stems from that one single error.

Now, as far as beginning rudiments are concerned and end – and in body of session, end rudiments, two-way comm – of course, these things are basically just drills on Model Session, done with TRs 1 to 4, but also done with this clean needle test. You see?

And then there are ways to make these things a little more effective, such as, "Since the last session, did you do anything you are now withholding from me?" or something like that. Don't you see? And it – narrow your rudiments down. Get your rudiments – to get the pc into present time. In other words there's ways – things you can do with these rudiments to make these rudiments more effective and keep yourself from running a full Prepcheck session in the beginning ruds. And then get onto the body of the session.

It's sometimes embarrassing when you intended to do Routine 3 in the first place. One hour and fifty-five minutes later you've just finished prepchecking the pc. Pc gets very uncomfortable because you didn't do any listing in that session. In fact I've heard pcs say so. You've helped them out endlessly, you've done marvelous things for their cases and all this sort of thing, but they just never seem to appreciate it. Because you didn't do any real auditing in the session. You got yourself tangle-footed with the ruds.

Now, getting out of the rudiments the other way with the end rudiments, there's ways of narrowing the withhold question. "In this session, have I missed a withhold on you?" Tick. "*In this session* have I missed a withhold on you?" No tick. Oh, what do you know? And you say, "Good." And finish off. Yeah, you've missed withholds on him, but that was – Prepcheck session, and you're going to take that up tomorrow, and you could go on till three-thirty and the auditing session's supposed to end at one. You know?

But, there's – these nice drills of getting *in* to the session rapidly, getting *out* of the session are basically based on the fact that auditors mustn't get tangle-footed in the rudiments. The rudiments are something you grease over and get into the session on so the pc can be audited. They're not something that you spend a session on in order to flub.

So as far as the auditing part of the Model Session is concerned, as far as just learning it parrotwise is concerned, yes, and then there's the other thing of actually using it. How do you use this Model Session?

Now, as far as handling the pc is concerned, we get this section – detecting missed withholds, we again have the same type of drill of course, as we had in the – testing for the clean needle. We used the same type of drill on this thing but there are other ways that you can indicate missed withholds – such as a dirty needle. Pc is getting restive, pc stops listing, pc boils off. Well, that whole missed withhold bulletin comes in here. And that could be driven home on a practical basis, you see. You could have the coach sitting there and the coach could do a number of things, see – all of which are in a doingness sector, and the auditor's merely supposed to look for a missed withhold, that's all. That's all. It's all very simple, you see. The coach could boil off, and the coach could get mad, and the coach could refuse to go on, and this is the triggering mechanism, see.

All right. Now, the ARC breaky pc, of course that's the same thing.

Getting off missed withholds. How do you get a missed withhold off? All right, there'd be two ways of getting off a missed withhold. They're both dependent on testing for a clean

needle. That's the same TR, you see. There would be two ways – one is right and one is wrong.

"In this session, have I missed a withhold on you?"

Pc says, "Well, yes, as a matter of fact, I had a small headache at the beginning of the session and you missed that on me."

And the auditor says, "Well, how is it now?" Now, he's just laid in more than he took off. See, he took off one wagonload and brought back two and dumped it on the pc. And actually, most sessions, when they start miring down, just mired down on that one weird button.

"Do you have a present time problem?" This is all under the same – same type of action. They're all classified as the same thing – the auditor makes the same mistake, see.

"Got a present time problem?"

"Yes, I had a fight with my wife last night."

"Well, all right. Did you patch it up with her?"

See, you've had it. The – and the drill is, you just mustn't ask a second question. See, the discipline is, is don't ask a second question. Only ask one question. You ask one question and find out if it's clean, is what you do. That's the correct way of proceeding with any of these things. Ask one question, then find out if that one question is clean. And it better not be a question, something on the order of, "When Bill and I were out in the hall and Mary Ann was ..." Better be something that can be cleaned, you see.

Now, getting off invalidations – that's – depends on this other – there's a specific way to ask for invalidations. And of course you get invalidations on Scientology, on auditing, on auditors, on listing, on processing, on nulling, on goals, former goals. You can have invalidations on a whole lot of things. And the odd part of it is they translate into the – they look like goals, and they look like everything, and it was that factor that made it so difficult for people to find goals a year or two ago. That was very difficult for people to find these things, because their invalidations and missed withholds were sliding all over the place. And something was reading and it was just reading because of an invalidation. Got the invalidation off and so forth.

Well, the drill is to get the invalidation off and find out if it reads. That's the way that TR would more or less go at the present planning. In other words, let's get the invalidation off and find if the original reads. That's the drill. We're interested in getting something to read, not just getting invalidations off. The stress of it is to get something to read. Read or not read, that is the question. Not whether it was invalidated or not invalidated, see. So you've got to get the invalidations off to find out if it'd read. Makes a slightly different type of drill.

Q-and-Aing with the pc: Now, the basic Q and A with the pc – I've just given you the example of. You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" and the pc says, "Yes, I had a fight with my wife last night." "Well how is she now?" See, that is the most elementary form of Q and A. Pc's worried about something so the auditor worries about it.

We had an old Q and A drill but it wasn't basic – it wasn't that basic. I think a coach in this particular line could have a lot of fun baiting the student into actually detouring, by being

terribly interesting on the subject of the buttons that the student might have. Something the student just couldn't help but ask something more about. You know, just try to make the student ask twice. Just try to make him ask twice. Do anything to get the student to ask twice, you know? "But this is still worrying me." See? The coach, you see, "But this is still worrying me. I still feel dreadful about this." What is the student supposed to do? Well, he's supposed to clear the exact rudiment that he is clearing. That is what he's supposed to do. In other words, we're going to face him with the usual.

Now we get into practical process; we get PTP processes. And the best PTP process is, well, frankly, there are a whole lot of them. The best of the PTP processes and so on, as a process, is simply Responsibility Process – the old one. It's fine, perfectly fine – works.

There's a slippery one, asking for the missed withhold on the other person. Auditors try to move in on this thing, however, and find out that it's nothing but liquid asphalt underneath their feet – they're stuck there for the rest of the session. So we kind of stopped monkeying with this thing. But I can sure get out from under it. Because if you're going to clear one that way, it better be a Prepcheck type of session. And as a matter of fact, just two weeks ago you saw me give a demonstration of the use of the missed withhold in handling a chronic present time problem – present time problem of long duration on a pc. That's the way you do it, but not in a rudiment. The rudiment PTP process is simply, well, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" until it's been – don't go stating the problem. Ask the first question. That's the door you're leaving by, except you're leaving just a little later.

See, your first checkout, it didn't disappear. So you're going to have – you run the process and then you leave by the same door. And it isn't, "Do you have a present time problem now?" That is wrong, you see. It is "Do you have a present time problem?" And the second that is null, no matter if the pc screams, no matter if the pc says yes he does have, doesn't matter, anything else. If the meter says he doesn't have, that's it. You stop running it right there. That's how long you run it. And that's all the length of time you run it. Various wordings have been on that old process; I don't know which the favorite one was. "What part of that problem have you been responsible for?" is the one that I've been using lately.

ARC break action: What do you do with an ARC break? Now, this is – we're getting practical here, see. What do you do with an ARC break? Well, of course, you run all kind of things don't you? Not today, you don't. You get off the missed withhold, check it and get out of there.

Finding overts: This is a whole drill. Now, you get it on this basis: The coach says – the pc says, "Do you have an overt?" or any kind of a leading "Do fish swim" type of question, see. "Do you have an overt?"

And the coach could say, "Well, I thought ..." And of course the correction there is, "What did you do?" See, it's – that – the whole purpose of that would be a TR which steered the pc into giving you a doingness whenever a think was offered. A criticism, a think, an evaluation – you need that one very badly. There was a session going on today – in which what – a person was actually getting aud- there were four things that you mustn't do in Prep-checking and all four of them were being bought by the auditor. You know what they are –

you know: mustn't take somebody else's withholds, mustn't take another person's thinking-ness, mustn't ... No, these things were all in full bloom in that particular session.

And yet at no time was the auditor saying, "What did you *do* to that person?" See, at no time. This person bought thought and – had other – there was explanation, the person was explaining why, you see. All of the various clues were there. They were all present, and so on. And that drill would be formed up to get around that.

Forming What questions: Now we've already seen something of that drill. We give an overt, "My sister ran away – I – scolded my sister, and scolded her and scolded her until she ran away with a policeman." And we just give that as the overt, as the coach gives it. And the student says – forms the What question. "What about running away with policemen?" or whatever it is. [laughs] See, you don't know it very well or you would've laughed. Proper What question is "What about scolding people?" See, the person's got to be able to form the What question out of the overt given. So we get a whole list of very involved overts. And the person's got to give the proper What question, or none of them. See?

We have – also this goes into this other drill of finding overts, because we have think replies in there, don't you see. And, "What have you done?" is the basic question.

The student says, "What have you done?" and just to – to say something.

And the coach says, "Well, I thought about chasing my sister one time around the house so that she would run away with a policeman."

And the student is supposed to form the What question. So, "What about chasing women?"

"*Flunk!*"

See, I mean that's – you get how that is done so that you get – he gets practice in forming these What questions, right now, right now, right now. What we need is a long list of involved overts from which you could form the proper What question.

You see, a What question can be too general, it can be too specific and it can be asked. Something else can be wrong with a What question. It can actually be asked. He actually did ask a What question. *Flunk!* See.

"I thought – I thought one time, about closing the door so that my sister would have to walk around to the backdoor."

And he's supposed to form the What question. So he says, "What about closing... ?"

"*Flunk!*"

See. Let him have it, good and echoing, you know. Really drive that one in.

The proper response – there's no What question about it and you never write it down at all.

And you say, "Come on. I want something you did to your sister." We're already working on familial Zero or something, you see. "I want something you did, did, did."

And then these things would be so arranged that you got the proper "did" immediately afterwards. The coach furnishes actually a did.

"Well, I just beat her a few times."

"All right, what about beating a ...?"

"Flunk!! You didn't get a specific overt." Get the idea?

"Oh."

See the type of drill it is? Eventually the auditor can sit there, and he says to the pc, "All right, we're trying to find out what withholds your family didn't find out about you," or whatever the Zero is, you know.

And, "Well, I was often very critical of my family."

And the auditor, "I got a reaction there. What did you do to your family?"

"Oh, I was often very critical, terribly critical. Used to go around the neighborhood being very critical."

"Yeah, what did you do to your family? Good. I know you went around the neighborhood being critical. What did you do?"

"Well, I denied them money lots of times."

And the auditor doesn't fall into that, you see. He says, "All right – one time there, one time. One time?"

"Well, it actually wasn't denying the money so much; it was stealing it."

"All right. But, what did you do there? One time, now."

"Nothing I never did anything to my family... *except* of course, I was very cruel to them. Very cruel to them."

"Look, I'm sitting here to find out what you've done to your family. I'm getting a reaction on something. Now, what have you done to your family?"

"All right. If you must know, I took them out for a ride in the car and I was drunk and I wrecked the car, and I killed three of them."

"Good! Good. What about ..."

And what is the What question? What is it? Come on, what is it? Come on, what is it?

Audience: "What about killing people in cars?" "What about drunkenly killing people?" "What about drunken driving?"

Come on, what is it?

Audience (gives different answers)

Male voice: "What about killing the members of your family?"

That's the biggest overt. And then you can move over in the margin, "What about drunk driving? What about this, what about that." But actually the chains you'd go back on –

you'll probably run all those chains back before you blew that because that's such a hell of an overt. But you at least are working on something.

You know, I think the dock strike, and everything else points in the direction of refusing to work. But I don't think auditors should go that far and ask the What questions I sometimes see on reports, just in an effort to not work, you know? We found – somebody here the other day asked the classic What question about paper clips. Somebody thought about stealing a paper clip. [laughter] Actually was asked by an auditor – horrible.

You see what that's – what these – what these forming the What question, you see how that would be designed? You see?

All right. Now, the drill, just the basic drill, of the When-All-Appear-Who system – just getting that drill down, till the person knows what to ask on that. Easy one. Finding the bottom of the chain rather than trying to find the later incidents on the chain. You know, the "go earlier" routine. Perhaps no TR, but we certainly ought to have an understanding of it and do it well.

Finding the Hav Process: Now we're off into another field. This is quite an activity – finding a Hav Process, covered by bulletins of a couple of years ago, and very involved and interesting bulletins they were. Exactly how you go about finding a Hav Process. There's no point in going over it, but a person has to be able to do that whole drill. And the best way to do it, of course, is to check out these various processes on pcs and find the one that works.

Of course, you actually can do this on a coach because the coach usually has a Hav Process. Some auditor has found his Hav Process already, you know. He knows what it is and what it isn't. Somebody's trying to find other Hav Processes and he knows that this better be checked into by the Instructor. You know, his Hav Process is, "Spit in that corner," or something of this sort. And the pc comes up with – I mean the student comes up with a Hav Process, "Look around this room and find everybody that's in it," you know. He's turning around – it's not even on the list.

Prehav Assessment, of course, is a very specific drill and is also covered by very specific bulletins and surprisingly few people can do these. You never know when one's going to come up and so forth. Prehav keeps fading away and dying and coming back to life again. So I'm beginning to consider that is one of the basic tools of an auditor.

Listing: How do you list? How do you test completenesses of a list? These are all doingness actions. That's very easy, by the way. You just take the pc's folder and read – take the coach's folder and read a few items to him, and you can tell whether the list is complete or not complete. Tone arm moves or it doesn't. Of course, the Instructor probably would rather not go into that case that level, but that is one way to do it.

Then nulling: How do you null? And then this comes – the doggonedest, mixed up, most impossible and difficult one of the whole lot – how do you check an item? And of course, it's composited of getting withholds off and invalidations, and going in the same – going out the same door you went in and everything else. I mean, if you do a good check off, that's a real good check off, and auditors are poorest at that single action right now in Routine 3 Process – not finding goals, because they do find goals – but by golly, they have trouble

checking out things. And they very often won't believe them when they are checked out. Had a case of that myself the other day. Auditor wouldn't believe it.

Checking: checking something out. How do you do it? It's a specific, direct drill. Very easy, but my God you'd think it was difficult, the number of checkouts that are wrong.

Getting off missed withholds is in here actually twice. And probably should be struck at that level. Getting item invalidations off – well, that means goal and item invalidations. There's a specific way to do this. You have to give somebody the idea of what it looks like. Actually an item will read, because it's been invalidated and an item will read because it is reading. You see? And sometimes when an item has been invalidated it reads and sometimes when an item has been invalidated it doesn't read. It's nice and constant.

And then we get into the next one here: getting suppressions off. Done the same way, but they're a special breed of cat – then cleaning a needle reaction – of course, that's a whole Prepcheck, pardon me – no, cleaning a needle reaction is very simple. That's just the same one that we had up here at the top. But cleaning a dirty needle, that is a whole Prepcheck. I was reading one line ahead of myself here. A script I'm carrying in the back of my head.

Getting more goals or items: How do you do that? Of course, you get off the missed withholds. You get off the invalidations on the subject of Scientology and listing. And you have to get off the invalidations sometimes on the subject of goals, listing goals, or listing in general. Get the missed withholds off on these things and you can always get a fellow rolling again. A specific drill, very specific.

Getting the pc into session: Now we get into something terribly, terribly, terribly fundamental. How do you get a pc into session. And you just do. You just do and you start the session. But how do you get the pc into session? What is used to do this? There's no trickery here, but people have trouble with it mostly because they think there's a lot more to it than there is. Getting a pc out of session, almost nobody knows how to do that. Hardly anybody will work end rudiments until the pc is actually out of the session. Most pcs leave sessions grogged, not cleaned. You can have a pc flying at the end of a session if you do your end rudiments well.

Controlling the pc's attention: This is a specific drill – a specific drill of controlling attention, that is all. You want the pc to look at a bottle and he won't look at the bottle. You get the idea? The coach won't look at the bottle. The student wants him to look at the bottle. Coach wants him to look at the bottle. Has to do it verbally. Coach sits there and gives him every reason under the sun, moon and stars why he won't look at the bottle. And the student has actually got to get the coach to look at the bottle. Got the idea?

And creating the R-factor: Hardly anybody does that. You've heard me do it practically every session that I've ever demonstrated. And yet I don't know how many of you are doing it yet. Creating the R-factor is telling him what the session is going to be all about or any ramifications to the session – describing the whole thing from your particular viewpoint. Even what you yourself are going to try to do regardless of what goals they're going to have later. They all – you create an R-factor before you begin the session.

You can also create an R-factor in the CCHs every time you start a new CCH. But create the reality of the situation for the pc – quite an important step.

Handling the p – holding up against pc suggestions: Now, doesn't that have a marvelous field of TRs? You know, the vista just opens before you there. Creatingness can run wild when it comes to a TR on that particular level. Holding up against the pc's suggestions. "Let's leave the room." What the pc – what the student is supposed to ask is, "Do fish swim?" And the coach is suggesting they do other things first. And I'm sure that a coach could be very good at this and could get to a point where he actually could trip the student into doing something else besides asking, do this. "Do fish swim?" "Could I adjust my chair slightly?"

You know. It's very funny, if you do this well, you can disarm – you can disarm a student in one of these TRs very, very easily. But this is again a beautiful contest there. You could figure out tons of TRs around that particular thing. Holding up against the pc's suggestions. Of course, the coach is there making suggestions and the pc – the student is trying to get something done. And of course the TR is that the student must get it done and *not* follow the coach's suggestion. A very wily coach using his tone modulations properly and so forth, can get anybody who is inclined to not hold up, to not hold up. This is quite amazingly easy, to get an auditor to do something else.

Now, holding a constant against adversity is learning to answer with the usual when the unusual is being demanded of you. And that is all there is to that one.

So you got an unusual situation – an unusual situation such as, "Well actually, to meet anything at all I have to list my goals in Sanskrit. *Heh-heh*. Sorry, you can't write Sanskrit. As a matter of fact I can. So I'll sit here and write some of these goals down. I will write down these goals in Sanskrit, you see, and then I'll tell you what they are and then of course, you can null them out."

And that sort of thing. How does an auditor get out of that situation? Well, leaving you with that puzzle see, because if you invalidate him obviously, you invalidated all of his goals, haven't you?

Well, leaving you with that puzzle, as to how you get that done – well, we've already shot over my time.

Thank you for your extra time. Good night.

TV DEMO: PATCHING UP 3D CRISS CROSS CASES

An auditing demonstration given on 16 May 1962

LRH: Now, if you just pull that chair a little bit closer.

Now, what we're going to do here – We're not terribly concerned with the auditing just now. I want to know how you're getting on, that's all. Going to check over your 3D Criss Cross, check over this goal, find out what you're doing. Okay?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. I'm just mainly checking up on the 3GA – getting you well started from this.

PC: *We haven't started the 3GA yet, Ron.*

LRH: No, I know you haven't.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: I'm just making sure we're – we're okay here. All right. Now, the main thing which I'm interested in ... Come on, stop looking so scared. What are you upset about? You upset about something? Huh?

PC: *Well, the strangeness of it and uh ...*

LRH: Oh, well. You let me worry about that, huh?

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: It's the strangeness of the room, huh?

PC: *And the situation.*

LRH: What's the situation?

PC: *I've seen all the others up here but I haven't been up here myself yet.*

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. All right. And, when you saw others up here – have you got any overt acts on seeing anybody ... Have you?

PC: *No, I think I've been very good, actually; I've shushed the others when they've been laughing.*

LRH: Oh, you have? You've suppressed some overt acts.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Okay. How you feel about that now? Ah, you still got a little bit of charge on it. Something might go wrong here some way or the other? Yeah. What?

PC: *Well – well, I – I feel not so awfully good about my own auditing actually. Not as a pc but as an auditor.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *And I feel that I've got such an awful lot to learn yet.*

LRH: Got some overts. Is this because we threw some practical course right in the middle of you?

PC: *Partly.*

LRH: Partly.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. You were getting all smoothed out and there you went.

PC: *Well, I don't know. Last week I had rather a rough – a rough time with my own auditing.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Everything. I was all thumbs and thumbs and thumbs.*

LRH: Yeah. Well, you recognize, don't you, for the lack of these little parts and pieces that it can go that way.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Right?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: So I think it's a good thing you got an opportunity to straighten those out. I don't know what you think on it.

PC: *It is.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It is.*

LRH: Well, how do you feel about being up here now? Well, there's still a bang on that. What's the matter? Is it me? Is it being checked over by me? No. Students? Kind of latent. This room? This room.

PC: *I have wondered where the television camera is. I ...*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Yes, that's it. That's the one.*

LRH: There it is. That one is on now.

PC: *Oh, I can see my own reflection in there yes. That's the one.*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: And then there's the room.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Where's the room ... ? Oh, that's the room one.*

LRH: Yes.

PC: *Ha-ha.*

LRH: That gives you the lot there.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *That's a bit better now.*

LRH: All right. Now, how are you doing on this now? That's fine. That's clear. Okay?

PC: *Good. Good.*

LRH: All right. Feel better now?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Is it all right with you if I check over your line plots here and goals and other things and stuff?

PC: *It is.*

LRH: All right. Now, you recognize that sometimes there's a sufficient amount of charge on a line that you can't go into a Goal Assessment ...

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: ...sometimes. I'm just making sure here tonight that is not true or is true, and if so, what one do we have to list. So I'm going to have to do a little bit to you here to get this needle quiet.

All right. Catfish.. Ah, you're not responding to my voice, so that's okay.

PC: *Oh, good.*

LRH: I want to check out these various lines that you've had here. You seem to have done a lot of listing on "hide."

PC: *Yes, we have done uh – a lot.*

LRH: All right. Hide. That is an instant reaction on that.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Now, did you get many somatics when you were listing that?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: You did!

PC: *Mm. For – for – for – for weeks. For weeks it – uh – for a number of weeks – two at least – it seemed to be all uh – sensation ...*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *... and then this last week, oh, it's been beautiful, with really good pain. But at least it was some pain I had, you know, I could feel.*

LRH: Hmm.

PC: *It was something solid.*

LRH: Hm. Hm. All right. Okay. Well, you got reaction on that line. All right. That's the main test. That's the only thing I really want to know.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: And we get a – still get a reaction on the Prehav level "hide." There's no damage done on this. It's just what was getting near the person.

PC: *Yeah. Very near.*

LRH: And let's test this next line, shall we? Who or what would be afraid to find out? Who or what would be afraid to find out? That looks awfully cool. I'll check it just once more. Who or what would be afraid to find out? I'm afraid I haven't got any charge on that at all.

All right. Let's take this next one. Who or what would suppress an identity? That looks very cool. Who or what would suppress an identity? I get no reaction on that.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Now, in listing "Who or what would be afraid to find out?" did you pick up a lot more somatics?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: You did have quite a few somatics? How heavy?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: How heavy were they?

PC: *They kept – they were – yes, they were heavy – uh – heavier than any I've had before anywhere in auditing.*

LRH: Is that so! Is that so.

PC: *Mm-hm. And they moved, strangely enough, from behind, seemingly, out there to the back of the body, to the middle of the body and then they came out in front here. And they appeared as – uh – forget how I described them to my auditor, but sort of mechanical things like dolls.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *They were not dolls but they had the mechanical appearance, the deadness of dolls.*

LRH: All right. All right. Well, that line doesn't seem to be very charged.

But you say you had heavy somatics on it, huh?

PC: *On "hide."*

LRH: No, no. On "Who or what would be afraid to find out?"

PC: *I beg your pardon.*

LRH: Oh, I see. Oh, yeah.

PC: *I was referring to "hide."*

LRH: Oh, "hide."

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. But "Who or what would be afraid to find out?" – did you have somatics listing that?

PC: *Very, very slight, light ones.*

LRH: Yeah, that's what I thought. And "Who or what would suppress an identity?", did you have any somatics listing that?

PC: *Hardly at all.*

LRH: No. All right. It's all over here on "hide."

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: You had me going there for a minute. I...

PC: *I – I do beg your pardon. Yes. Yes.*

LRH: Oh, that's quite all right. It's an overt that shall be forgiven. All right. What did you find the elephant on?

PC: *Uh – "Who or what would hide?"*

LRH: Ahh.

PC: *And a cardinal, too, before the elephant ...*

LRH: Yes.

PC: *... and I've never known anything like that happen before. It came to sight and it blew with violence.*

LRH: All right. Well, let's straighten out this line. Now, somebody, I think, started you listing on goals (which is perfectly all right; that can be skipped because you didn't go very far on that), and ... You'll have a good subjective reality on this, as somebody who was run on some earlier line – whether it was a goal or anything of the sort, that produced somatics and reaction and that sort of thing – the line has to be completed.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: But, if it were not a true line of some kind or another it wouldn't have to be completed – no somatics on it.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: What were you going to ask me?

PC: *There was something I'd like to say, is that uh – towards the end of running "hide" I noticed, or I felt, that the um – question, uh – as a process question, was beginning to, shall I say, skid; it wasn't gripping.*

LRH: That's all right. It would. It would. Three sides to the flow are all missing.

"Who or what would hide?" Well, that's a nice one. Let me work this out. Okay?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Your listing was "Who or what would hide?"

PC: *But, Ron, would it go on and on and on and on and on like this?*

LRH: Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah. Sure would. Not if listed four ways.

I'm going to take an experimental check of this, if it's all right with you.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: I'm just going to take several here at random, and I'm going to read them to you and see what TA action we get out of this. Okay?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Now, give those cans a squeeze, would you? Thank you. Your havingness is down. Give those cans a squeeze. All right, thank you. That's good enough. All right. Just hold on to them now.

A man hunter.

A man killer.

A man eater.

A stalker.

Anyone who stalks.

A stealthy stalker.

A stalker by stealth ... so forth.

There's still some reaction on this.

A masked man.

A highwayman.

A pope.

A statesman.

A subverter.

That particular aspect of it seems pretty cool.

PC: *That was the elephant part. The animal part.*

LRH: He blew, huh?

PC: *Yes, he blew.*

LRH: All right. Now, "Who or what would hide?" All right. Now, let's see if we can make a four-way flow out of this, okay?

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: That was what was listed. Now, the way we get this is we want – it's want, not want, oppose, not oppose. That isn't the order of listing, but that's an easy way to remember it. Okay?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Let's change this into the order of listing: Oppose, not oppose, not want.

All right. Now, which one is "Who or what would hide?" Is it want? It's not certainly ... Is it want? "Who or what would hide?", "Who or what would want to hide?" Is that right? That translate?

PC: *Not quite. Who – would you please give it to me again, Ron?*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *What it was – what – would you give it to me again – what it was, what you asked me.*

LRH: "Who or what would want to hide?", "Who or what would hide?" Is it the same?

PC: *Huh. It seems to be "Who or what would hide?"*

LRH: All right. So let's change this over to – we've got: "Who or what would hide?" And then we've got, obviously: "Who or what would not hide?"

What's the matter there?

PC: *Now I've gotten all uncertain.*

LRH: Yeah, I know you would be uncertain at that point. But it'd have to be,

to be opposite that, wouldn't it? I think we'll get a kick out of this on the meter. Let's take a sound at this. Who or what would not hide? That isn't too close. Who or what would not hide? Who or what would not want to hide?

PC: *"Not want to hide."*

LRH: Who or what would not want to hide? I'm afraid so. Who or what would not want to hide? There's a little better reaction on that.

PC: *Yeah. A bit more kick in it.*

LRH: All right. "Would not want to hide." Okay.

Now, putting these things together which are oddball lines is sometimes a little bit tricky.

PC: *Mm. Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Now. The next one would be "oppose hiding," wouldn't it?

PC: *Yes. Yes.*

LRH: Would it be "oppose hiding" or "oppose something that hid"?

PC: *"Oppose something that hid."*

LRH: It would be: "Who or what would oppose ..." I'm afraid it'd have to be "something or someone," wouldn't it? "Someone or something ..."

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: "... that hid."

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And "Who or what would not oppose someone or something that hid?" Hm?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Let me try those on the meter now. Who or what would oppose something or someone that hid? I just get a tiny little jolt out of that. Who or what would oppose hiding? Who or what oppose hiding? Who or what would oppose something or someone who hid? Something or someone that hid?

I get a kick out of it. I got a little dirty needle here. Is there a – a missed withhold on something like that?

PC: *Uh – yes.*

LRH: Yeah, what's the missed withhold?

PC: *The third one that you said back, uh – "would oppose," uh – did you say "hiding"?*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *That one gave me a little just a little jolt, and I didn't tell you about it.*

LRH: All right. All right. Thank you. Let me check that. Is there a missed withhold on this? That's it. All right. Clear.

Okay. It's – Who or what would oppose hiding? That's tame now. Who or what would oppose hiding? Who or what would oppose something or someone who hid? Which one of those seems right to you?

PC: *The last one.*

LRH: Yeah. All right. See if you can wrap your wits around this one: Who or what would not oppose something or someone who hid?

PC: *I'm in total apathy on that one.*

LRH: Who or what would not oppose something or someone that hid?

PC: *I – I – I've wrapped my wit – wits around it, but it just sends me into total apathy about thinking about an answer.*

LRH: That's a boy. That's a boy. That's right.

PC: *Yeah. Yeah. Oh, Lord knows.*

LRH: Well, then that's fine. And that's just exactly correct. Because these "not oppose ..."

PC: *Oh!*

LRH: ... is out there into the nowhere, see?

PC: *Whew!*

LRH: All right. There is your listing. And this one is listed One, and this is Two, this is Three, and that is Four. All right.

Now, let's see how these things are. Okay? See if we get a little knock on these things. Who or what would hide? It seems to be awfully clear that you've listed the living daylights out of it.

PC: *Seven hundred, I think.*

LRH: Yeah. All right. Now, who or what would not want to hide? All right.

Have I missed a withhold in this session? Yes. What?

PC: *I wondered what you were looking at through there.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Good enough. Let me check this. Have I missed a withhold in this session? That's clear. Thank you. All right. Wild, man.

Who or what would not want to hide? This thing is cool. Who or what would oppose something or someone that hid? Who or what would oppose some-

thing or someone that hid? Well, there seems to be something on that. Is that the one your attention hung up on?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Yeah. All right. Yeah, that's a gruesome one, isn't it? Yeah. All right. And who or what would not oppose something or someone that hid? Ah, there's a little tick on that. All right. That seems to be all right.

All right. Now, how are you doing on that?

PC: *I feel as if I'd like to get my teeth into that – those two – those two last ones.*

LRH: Yeah. Yeah.

PC: *Especially the third one.*

LRH: Well, we haven't got a good checkout here on "Who or what would not want to hide?" or "Who or what would not hide?"

PC: *Mm. Mm.*

LRH: Is that better?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Who or what would not hide?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Yeah. There we're getting a jolt on it.

PC: *Sounds rather like oppterm.*

LRH: Yeah, that's good. "Who or what would not hide?"

PC: *That lets the floodgates open.*

LRH: "Who or what would not hide?" Yeah. You're thinking about that now?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: It's going round and round, too. All right. That's the way we will do that then: "Who or what would hide?" "Who or what would not hide?" "Who or what would oppose something or someone that hid?" and "Who or what would not oppose something or someone that hid?" Okay?

All right, Mike. Now, how do you feel about this check over? How do you feel about this check over?

PC: *Good.*

LRH: Good. All right. Is it all right with you if we bring it to an end?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. End of check.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: You bet you. You're welcome, Mike. Put them down. You can go back downstairs. You're all set.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: Okay, Jim. Have a seat.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: We'll see what you're up to here and into.

PC: *Yeah, let's do that.*

LRH: I was particularly interested in this one, Jim ...

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: ... because of the level that was found on it.

PC: *Yes, I was ...*

LRH: Seem to me to be quite disastrous if we didn't get that level straight.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. So I want to find out how good that is or isn't. All right, pick up the cans, would you? Is it all right with you if I do a check over on this?

PC: *Yes, sir.*

LRH: All right. Here we go. Give those cans a squeeze. Ah, that's good news. Give them a squeeze. Give them a squeeze. Your havingness is a bit down, isn't it?

PC: *Hm, I don't know.*

LRH: Why?

PC: *I'm shaking like a leaf.*

LRH: What are you upset about?

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: I don't get any reaction here at being upset, particularly.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: But...

PC: *Havingness is down.*

LRH: Your havingness seems to be down. What's your Havingness Process?

PC: *"What's the condition of that (so-and-so)?"*

LRH: I see.

PC: *At least that – that was up until today. And Jan said I'd outgrown it. And now we have something like um – yeah, just "Point out something around here you can have," or something like that. Fairly – a straight process.*

LRH: Oh, yeah?

PC: *Have I made this clear?*

LRH: Mm. "Point out something you could have?" "Look around here and find something you could have."

PC: *"Look around here and find something you can have." That worked this morning. Up until then we have been using "What's the condition of that (so-and - so)?"*

LRH: Hm. You don't mind my doing something about this, do you?

PC: *No. Be delighted.*

LRH: Is it all right if I give you a very short session on this?

PC: *Yes, of course.*

LRH: Not in Model Session?

PC: *Any way you like.*

LRH: Is it all right?

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: All right. Let's check this one over here. Give me another can squeeze. All right. When you squeeze the cans just let them sit there ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... relaxedly.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Now just press on them. That's good. Fine. That's good. All right. Here is the first command.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Your wristwatch.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *This ashtray.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That camera.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Um – the balance.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The jacket on the bed.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Yes, I like these curtains. I could have those.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Feels better already. Um – that door.*

LRH: All right. Squeeze the cans, would you? All right. Let's try it again. Squeeze them. All right. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Your necktie.*

LRH: Okay. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Your binocular case.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The frame of that picture.*

LRH: All right. Squeeze the cans, would you? Yeah. You're getting a little more extension on this.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *This lamp.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Mm – that – uh – wire-robe thing.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *Pin. Right.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The telephone.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The green vase.*

LRH: All right. Squeeze the cans, would you? All right. That's fluky.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: That's fluky. That contracts and expands your havingness. It loosens it for a moment and then contracts it for a moment. Have you got any invalidations on a Havingness Process? Yeah, what is that?

PC: *Well, this has been used and turned down in favor of "the condition of that thing."*

LRH: Oh, I see. All right.

PC: *You know, when we ran through a couple to see which would work; and the "condition" one loosened up the needle, and those that Jan tried prior to that tightened the needle, and this was one of those that had previously tightened the needle.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *But not this morning.*

LRH: Good. Let me check that.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Has this been invalidated? Thank you. That is now clear. Have you ever failed to answer Havingness Processes? Thank you.

PC: *Well ?*

LRH: No reaction. You can answer it if you like.

PC: *No, but I thought that I had failed to run them well.*

LRH: Mm. Mm. All right. Have you ever failed to run a Havingness Process well?

PC: *Yes, indeed.*

LRH: Yeah. Thank you. Let me check that now. Have you ever failed to run a Havingness Process well? I still got a tick on that.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Can you shed some more light on that? Can you tell me when and where, and so forth.

PC: *Yeah, it was with Mary.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Mary.*

LRH: Mary?

PC: *It was subjective: "Mock up something. Shove it into your body." she couldn't do it.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *We tried it on the gradient scale.*

LRH: Was this an overt?

PC: *Well, it was a failure.*

LRH: It was a failure. All right.

PC: *In the process of trying to do it I was insisting that she did it.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *It became – uh – I became rather overbearing I suppose. It was way back about seven years ago.*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. Anything else you care to say about that?

PC: *Not especially. No.*

LRH: All right. Now let's check on this again. What was the first question? I wanted to know if you had ...

PC: *Yeah. The question we were just looking at now was something about invalidated process.*

LRH: Mm-hm. All right. Have you ever invalidated a Havingness Process? Thank you. That's clear.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let's try this just a few more times. Were you running that exact process at that time?

PC: *No, it was a subjective one. "Mock up something you can have and shove it into your body" was the failed one.*

LRH: I see. That's the failed one.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Were these cousins up till just a moment ago?

PC: *Well, they're both Havingness Processes, but one is quite different from the other. I never really cared for Subjective Havingness anyway.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. Okay. Let's run a little more of this Havingness now.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *There's a little baby chest in there I like the look of; I could have that.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *This carpet.*

LRH: Okay. Squeeze the cans, will you? Well, for some reason or other that went wider. All right. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Hm. The bedspread.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That camera.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The lamp.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Well, I could have the expanse of the ceiling.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. Squeeze the cans. All right. Now, that process is still tightening things, and so forth. And I'm now going to shift gears to another process. Okay?

PC: *Right. Yes.*

LRH: All right. The process I'm going to run on you here is "Look around here and find something you could reach."

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Here's the first command.

I don't mean to invalidate that process, and so forth, but it is still going through a cycle of tighten-loosen.

PC: *Hm! Okay.*

LRH: It's all right. All right. Nothing very catastrophic.

PC: Mm.

LRH: But I think this "reach" thing possibly would do better. Reach. All right. I thought it kicked on it for a moment.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: All right. Anything you'd care to say to me there?

PC: *Yes, I'm sitting on something here.*

LRH: What?

PC: *If that process I told you was the one Jan ran this morning, it'll be on the top of this morning's report. If I've made a mistake it'll be some other Havingness Process. That is, if she made a note of which process.*

LRH: By George, I don't find that process here.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Maybe yesterday?

PC: *You know, I take very scant notice of what she does in session. So I may have been mistaken about this.*

LRH: I don't see any notes on the havingness end of it.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: So I'll just take a shot in the dark here, and we'll see what we've got.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: We'll just take a shot in the dark. All right. Let me check something here for a moment. All right. Have I missed a withhold on you? There's a little bit of a throw there.

PC: *I thought of the – this being televised. This whole procedure.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Let me check that. Have I missed a withhold on you? Thank you. That's not clear yet.

PC: *Oh.*

LRH: All right. Let me ask you again. Have I missed a withhold on you? Bing, bing.

PC: *That was about Jan's auditing. I seem to be talking a great deal about it.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But uh – how would this be a mith – uh – a with withhold ?*

LRH: Yeah? Yeah?

PC: *Um – not since we sat – not since I sat down in this chair can I think of anything that you've missed .*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me check that. Have I missed a withhold on you? All right, that is clean now.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: Thank you. All right, let me run some of this reach process. All right?

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *That lamp.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The door to the bookcase.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The hook on the back of the door.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The light switch.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The pen in Fred's pocket.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *Your tiepin.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The receiver of the telephone.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *This triangular block of wood.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Good one, yes.*

LRH: Right. Right. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *Knob on the door – drawer.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Squeeze the cans, would you? All right. That's broadening. I'm going to give you two more of these commands and end this process, if that's ...

PC: *All right.*

LRH: ... all right with you. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The lens in the camera.*

LRH: Okay. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *Mm. The glass in – the glass pane in that door.*

LRH: All right. All right, one more test. Squeeze the cans. All right. Thank you. Okay. Now, that's the end of that process.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: All right. Now, quite interesting. We'll get your auditor to go into this havingness proposition with you. I'm not going to at this particular time. That is sort of a broad, shotgun process ...

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: ... that generally does these things – because I'd say you needed quite a few – quite a little bit of that.

PC: *Oh, yeah.*

LRH: I would like to see you get quite a little bit of Havingness run.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *Right.*

LRH: All right. Now. Let's get over into this scramble here.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: And you've been doing some goals.

PC: *Yes, sir. For three days we've been doing goals.*

LRH: All right. And have you been successful in ...

PC: *We have a list. We've nulled about 35 percent of them.*

LRH: Yeah, you seem to be coming along all right. Nothing seems to be upsetting this. Hm?

PC: *No. The session is mostly auditing. Very little time is spent now in end – end and – beginning and end rudi-*

ments. Which was the case in the beginning with auditing. We were spending a lot of time on rudiments and less time on auditing ...

LRH: Hm. That's peculiar.

PC: *... than we are these last few days. I mean ...*

LRH: Oh, you mean you were before spending more time on rudiments.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: But not now?

PC: *No. No. We're just whizzing through beautifully.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. All right, well, let me check up and just make sure with you, Jim, that we're not all fire-drilled on the subject of ... Has nobody ever done a line plot for you? Guess there was no need to, the only level you ever listed was apparently "drive crazy."

PC: *Right.*

LRH: And what was the question?

PC: *"Who or what would drive something or someone crazy?"*

LRH: "Who or what would drive something or someone crazy?" That is a nice tough one.

PC: *We have a list of something nudging on a thousand items there.*

LRH: "Who or what would drive something or someone crazy?" All right. Now, while you were running that, Jim ...

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: ... did you get a lot of somatics?

PC: *No.*

LRH: You got no somatics?

PC: *I got two ...*

LRH: Two. What were they?

PC: *... distinct ones, and I've still got them.*

LRH: What are they?

PC: *One was a pain in the shoulder blade of this side ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... and the other was a twitching nose. Right at the end. It looked like a rabbit. Like that rabbit we gave the kids.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *His nose twitches. And it goes on twitching in the most uh – I mean, unexpected moments.*

LRH: All right. Did you have a lot of big – cognitions or something of the sort on this?

PC: *Not big ones. But quite a lot of cognitions. It got realer to me. It seemed to me I went back to the very core of being, so that any departure from native state was the beginning condition of craziness ...*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *... and it was a progression on from there.*

LRH: All right. Well, that doesn't sound to me to be very violent. But you say you still got those somatics.

PC: *Mm-hm. But they're not worrisome somatics.*

LRH: Mm-hm. In doing this goal did you find yourself distracted or anything of the sort?

PC: *Not by those. Certainly not.*

LRH: Your attention is very nicely on the subject of goals?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Well, let me test the question. Who or what would want to drive something or someone crazy? You've still got a react on it.

PC: *Mm, yes. Well, your question was a little different from the one that Jan was asking.*

LRH: I've got "Who or what would want to drive someone or something crazy?"

PC: *We didn't have the "want" in there when we were listing.*

LRH: Just "Who or what would drive someone or something crazy?"

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: All right. All right. Let's see. I'll check that. Who or what would drive someone or something crazy? Who or what would drive someone or something crazy? This looks awfully quiet, but the needle gets very still when I start talking about that. I'll tell you what we're going to do in your case: we're just going to let you go right on with a Goals Assessment.

PC: *Fine.*

LRH: And we're not going to be upset about this.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: But, if after – what? – a complete 3GA ... Now, I'm writing here, "But if after a complete 3GA, nose and shoulder somatics continue, do a complete line ... "

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: "... listing on Prehav level 'drive crazy.'" All right?

PC: *Mm. Sure. This shoulder pain is uh – you know, I'd be pleased to be*

rid of it, but uh – it doesn't seriously interfere with anything.

LRH: All right. Well, I think it'll probably blow off ...

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: ... or something of the sort. You seem to be getting along all right with your Goals Assessment; everything seems to be fine.

PC: *I'm very pleased with it.*

LRH: All right. Is there anything you care to say before I wind this up?

PC: *Beyond thanking you very much, no.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, let me check just one thing.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Have I missed a withhold on you? All right. Thank you very much. That's clear.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: Okay. Put your cans down.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: Thank you very much, Jim.

PC: *All right, sir.*

LRH: You bet you.

LRH: Come on, Tom... There you go.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: Pick up the cans. Shove it a little closer there and pick up the cans. Okay. Now, let's take a look at where you're sitting here on the meter. Squeeze the cans. All right. That's pretty loose. Now, is it all right with you if I do a check-over of what you're doing here in listing?

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: All right. Now, we have a Prehav level here, "convince."

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: And you listed on that and we left the list incomplete and went to 3GA. How long did you list on that one?

PC: *Oh, not very long really. Maybe three sessions or less. Very possibly less?*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Oh, it weren't too long – about three sessions' worth.*

LRH: All right. And what happened during that listing?

PC: *Um – I did experience some somatics – uh – not very terrible ones – in the ears.*

LRH: In the ears?

PC: *Yeah. Just uh – they didn't last long. I had a – a jolt in the side. Um – eyes got a bit sticky – one eye. I had a slight somatic in the right eye.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *Just minor somatics actually. These are – these were new ones ...*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *... as far as I was concerned. Now, I have a – a chronic head ...*

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: *... that I've had in since uh - '56 - since we ran solids.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *And it's kind of stayed with me on and off.*

LRH: Well, did that turn on while you were doing this?

PC: *Well, I've had it so long, I mean, it's kind of a cousin of mine now.*

LRH: Yeah, but ...

PC: *It – it – it varied a little bit – little bit but it doesn't ...*

LRH: Did that line vary it?

PC: *A little bit. I think it did a little bit.*

LRH: Oh, it did, huh? All right. Let me find out what wording was being used on this.

PC: *"Who or what would want to ..."*

LRH: I just wanted to know, mainly, if it turned on something.

PC: *Well, that – they were. I got a jolt in the side. These were new ones.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *You know ? Ears. Little somatics ...*

LRH: Do you have any – are any of these still on?

PC: *No – uh – not – no. I've got the head . It's like uh – like I've got a woolen hat on all the time – pressure.*

LRH: But since when has that been?

PC: *Oh, I've had that for, oh, years, I guess.*

LRH: Now, Tom!

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: I am talking about a line that you just listed ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... for three or four sessions.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Now, did that line turn on anything new? Now, you be a good boy now.

PC: *New. Uh – those somatics I mentioned were new ones.*

LRH: Now, this woolen head one?

PC: *Ah, this – that varies on processing. It eases and increases ...*

LRH: But it has always varied on processing?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. So that is not new.

PC: *That's not new, no.*

LRH: Now, I'm trying to find out one thing here. Now, it'll make you much easier to answer. And I don't know what your auditor did with the list but it seems to be missing. I find no lists. I got some lists here.

PC: *They're already-done-with lists.*

LRH: Well, what are these lists?

PC: *These are – these are what we did.*

LRH: SOP Goals.

PC: *Prior to coming. Yeah. Yeah. Last year.*

LRH: Did you ... Oh! What is this?

PC: *That's a goals list. I think they came – the two together.*

LRH: Ah, yes, here we are! "Who or what would want to convince?" Now we're talking! "Who or what would want to convince?"

All right, Tom. Let me say this one to you. Who or what would want to con-

vince? Now, there's still a tick on this. It's still alive. But it's just a tick. But it's a little bit of a double tick so do you mind if I ask you another question?

PC: *Yeah. Sure.*

LRH: All right. Have I missed a withhold on you? Yes.

PC: *Uh – well, I thought then, when you looked at a goals list, this was contrary to your orders. We ran it, and I wanted to see what it did. Those – on running those goals – when we looked at those lists just now. Um – Conner and I had a bang at it.*

LRH: We what?

PC: *We ran those goals. They weren't touched here; this is something we did in LA.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *And uh – it was uh – contrary to your orders. That's all.*

LRH: Oh, that you ran them?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Thank you. Thank you. Let me check that. All right. Have I missed a withhold on you? Seems to be clean.

PC: *Very good.*

LRH: Thank you. All right.

Now, let me take one more look at this. Who or what would want to convince? Well, it's kind of latent.

You see, now, here's what I'm trying to do, Tom: I'm trying to make up my mind whether or not you should continue this listing.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: And you yourself will have to know how to do this. Whether you continue listing something that has been listed in the past or whether you can go on to a current Routine 3 process. See?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: There's a possibility, you see, that if a fellow got some somatics – and why I was scolding you a minute ago is, I only want to know if this turned something on which hasn't been turned off.

PC: *No, I wouldn't say so.*

LRH: I didn't put it right, see? You wouldn't say so.

PC: *Well, while you were talking earlier I was looking at these things and they were light somatics, they'd jolt you when they turned on. I wouldn't call them heavy ...*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *... but they were there ...*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *... and they turned off.*

LRH: Well, is this quite new to you to get some kind of a somatic or a sensation?

PC: *That type of somatic – the way it turned on and off – I – I would say yes.*

LRH: Kind of new.

PC: *It was quick. It hit me and turned off.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *See, when I get into anything, it usually is pretty heavy and it usually stays with me, you know ?*

LRH: Yeah. I get you. All right.

PC: *But this was short, sharp and sweet.*

LRH: Well now, look here, Tom. You have listed – well, there's maybe 150 of these.

All right. Now, let's bring up something here. You obviously have done something here, and there has been a goal found ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... and obviously a terminal must have been found.

PC: *Well, uh – we did; we found a goal and a terminal. We ran it. It was probably a present time situation. We ran the ter – the goal was "to be wanted." And the terminal was ...*

LRH: What was the goal?

PC: *"To be wanted."*

LRH: Right.

PC: *And the terminal was "a boy."*

LRH: All right.

PC: *We couldn't knock it out so we ran it.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Then you have listed prior to 3D Criss Cross.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Yeah. Well, all right. Now, that's all we want to get to.

PC: *Now, that goal when it was found it – it – it – it rock slammed for about three quarters of an hour – nearly blew the meter apart. So we guessed it was worth running.*

LRH: All right. But I just want to know now: It was on this list here someplace, huh?

PC: *Mm-hm. Yeah. Still blitzing me.*

LRH: All right. Do you remember the number?

PC: *No. I'm afraid I don't remember that.*

LRH: Don't mind my looking for it here, do you?

PC: *No. Not at all.*

LRH: I can't find it on this list. Everything has been nulled.

PC: *Well, it uh ... Well, we ran that goal .*

LRH: Well, yeah. I'm trying to find it on the list.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: That is the wording of it?

PC: *That's it. Mm-hm.*

LRH: "To be wanted."

PC: *That's it.*

LRH: All right. I'm going to check this goal out. Okay? What's your auditor doing right now with it?

PC: *We're not touching it, actually. We went on and just got those lists through. And uh – we're just um – completing goals lists.*

LRH: You're completing a goals list.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: But there was a goal found.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Well, was it found as a regular goal?

PC: *What do you call a regular goal?*

LRH: Well, was it found and checked out and it stayed in and ...

PC: *Yeah. We couldn't knock it out. That's why we ran it. And it blew the meter apart. It was a terrific thing.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *So we ran it.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Good enough. Sixteen May '62. And the goal was "to be wanted."

You listed a terminal for that thing, too, didn't you?

PC: *Yeah. "A boy."*

LRH: Mm-hm. "To be wanted." All right. Is it all right if I check this goal?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. To be wanted. All right. Okay. To be wanted. Okay. To be wanted. All right. Now, have you invalidated this goal?

PC: *Oh, sure. Yeah. I sure did.*

LRH: All right. How is that?

PC: *Well, I doubted it. And I thought when you issued the bulletin about present time problems and things like that ... Uh – this is a thing in the bank – I've got a whole thing I've been running for years, with women and boys and all sorts of things like that.*

LRH: Hmm.

PC: *And I figured on that. And when you issued that bulletin, I thought, "Well, this is a present time problem." It came up when we were running problems.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *Flashed across, and I said, "Put that down."*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And we couldn't knock it out.*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right.

PC: *That's how we got it.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Let me check this. All right. Has this goal been invalidated? All right, I still get a bang That's it.

PC: *Well, actually, it came straight out of an incident, I'm pretty sure. I dramatize it.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And I wondered whether it was out of a – a – some kind of an engram ...*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *... quite like this. But it was very real, and it lasted a long time.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I didn't think it was a real ... There might be a more basic goal, I thought.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *But this was so good I thought that we – we – we could run this with advantage.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me check that now. All right? Has this goal been invalidated? That seems a bit clearer. Okay?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Now, has anybody missed a withhold on this goal? Yes. That's it.

PC: *Mother.*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *Mother.*

LRH: What is it?

PC: *I thought of Mother.*

LRH: Yeah. Bang.

PC: *Carmen.*

LRH: All right. That's it.

PC: *Carmen's mother.*

LRH: All right. There's one.

PC: *Well, I – what I thought then – that all the people that I consider didn't want me ... I looked – uh – that's what I thought then.*

LRH: All right, then. Okay. What's that one?

PC: *Well, this is – uh – what I thought then was a kind of a game.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *Um – you reject them and they consider they don't want you.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That's what I thought.*

LRH: All right. All right. Thank you. Thank you. I didn't mean to keep feeding you more and more there.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: I just thought maybe I could run this one down. All right. Has anyone missed a withhold on this goal? Yes.

PC: *Well, I thought of Father then.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Let me check that. Has anyone missed a withhold on this goal? Yes, it's still live. Think of another one? That's it.

PC: *Um – well, I thought of the priest – Roman Catholic Church.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: [coughs] *Excuse me.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Has anyone missed a withhold on this goal? Yep.

PC: *I thought of nuns then.*

LRH: Okay. Thank you. Let me check that. Has anyone missed a withhold on this goal? That's getting cleaner. There's just a tiny, little tick left. Can you think of that one? That's it.

PC: *Well, what I thought of then – um – when I brought up some pictures on birth, they had nuns around the bed praying over me, apparently – by the bed ...*

LRH: The what? What?

PC: *Nuns.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *I didn't know about this.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *The priest came in to visit me – we lived next door to the convent, you see ...*

LRH: Right.

PC: *... and I didn't know about this. But apparently I was giving them a kind of a game and probably was expected not to stay. And they were just – they were trying to keep me around, I suppose.*

LRH: Oh, yeah. All right.

PC: *That's all. That's what I thought of.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Let me check that, Has anyone missed a withhold on this goal? Still bangs.

PC: *Now, I just ...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *... thought of a bishop then.*

LRH: All right. You got that?

PC: *Well, I'm wondering ...*

LRH: You thought of a bishop you said.

PC: *Yeah – who the hell the bishop is.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me check that. Has anyone missed a withhold on this goal? Now, we still get a tick.

PC: *Well, there'd be the family.*

LRH: There's one. Huh?

PC: *Family.*

LRH: All right. Okay. It's getting quieter. Let me check it again. Has anyone missed a withhold on this goal? It's clean.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, let me check this goal again. To be wanted. To be wanted. To be wanted. All right. I get a sort of a dirty needle and a sporadic read here on this thing so there's apparently some more on this thing. Now, have you ever – have you ever suppressed this goal? Yeah, there's a tick-tick.

PC: *Yeah. Yeah, I've suppressed it with practically everybody.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *Anybody that showed me any – uh – any interest in me, I – I used to turn this on.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Thank you. Let me check that. Have you suppressed this goal?

PC: *Continuously.*

LRH: Still a little tick. All right.

PC: *Well, this would apply to practically everybody I knew.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *I've suppressed it.*

LRH: All right. Good. Let me check that. Have you ever suppressed this goal? Get a fall, but it's getting cleaner. That's it.

PC: *Well, I thought about the army then. I left the service when I was wanted.*

LRH: Hm-mm. Hm. All right. Thank you. Let me check that. Have you ever suppressed this goal? All right. There's nothing but a bit of a latent on there now. But let's see if you can think of that one.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: That's it. That's it.

PC: *Thought of Mother.*

LRH: All right. That's it again.

PC: *Mother.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Let me check that. Have you ever suppressed this goal? Still get a bang. Not clean yet. That's it. That's it. That's it.

PC: *Carmen – I would suppress it with her. And ...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *... this – this would apply to everybody I've known, actually.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And everybody that has shown any interest in me, to help me, I've kind of taken off.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Let me check that. Have you ever suppressed this goal? Still a tick. That's it.

PC: *School.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Um – yeah, College of Science, I think I was uh – I think a professor there was trying to help me and I backed off of that, too.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Let me check it again. Have you ever suppressed this goal? It's getting cleaner. I'll check it one more time. Have you ever suppressed this goal? I don't think that's this reading; there's something reading here. I'll check it one more time. Have you ever suppressed this goal? Still a tick.

PC: *Well, I suppressed it as far as you're concerned.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *When you reached at me I didn't respond.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. Good enough. Let me check it again. Have you ever suppressed this goal? Yeah, that's getting clean now. That's getting clean. Let me make sure. Check it one more time. Have you ever suppressed this goal? I got a latent tick that time, just a little bit of a latent. That's the one. That's the one. That's it.

PC: *I thought of Iceland then.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Iceland.*

LRH: Oh, yeah. All right. Okay. Let me check it once more. Have you ever suppressed this goal? I've still got a bang here. There it is. There it is.

PC: *Well, I suppressed it in the first job I was in. Uh – when help was offered to me ...*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *... um – I refused the help there – took off from there ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: ... without much explaining.

LRH: Okay. Okay. All right. Have you ever suppressed this goal? Still got a tick on it.

PC: *Well, there's another family that were very friendly toward me.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *I cut adrift from them.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *Same way.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me check on this. Have you ever suppressed this goal? Got a tick. That's it.

PC: *Sisters.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Sister.*

LRH: All right. Sister. Okay. All right. Let me check it once more. Have you ever suppressed this goal? Still got a fall.

PC: *Yeah, that's with uh – uh – Vera – another one that uh – another person trying to help me.*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. Good enough. Let me check this again. Have you ever suppressed this goal? Well, I got a swing that time. Let me check it. Now, we're just talking about this goal.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Have you ever suppressed this goal? Still get a little hang here. Getting much cleaner; we're changing this.

PC: *Mm-hm. Um – well, this seems to be the – right the way throughout life actually; it's the thing I've done apparently.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *Uh – soon as anybody showed any interest or wanted to help me I just um – took off. That's all.*

LRH: Hm. Hm. All right. All right. Let me check this again. Have you ever suppressed this goal? I still get a bang on here.

PC: *Mm-hm. I thought of an aunt then that tried to help me in the art field.*

LRH: Mm-hm. All right. All right. Let me check it again. Have you ever suppressed this goal? That's getting clean. All right.

Now, let me check the goal itself. Just let me say the goal a few times. To be wanted. Now, the read is a little more consistent here than it was. But you get a couple of responses and then a no-response, so there's something else on this. All right. In this session have I missed a withhold on you?

PC: *No. Well, I thought I didn't – I thought of and didn't tell you was uh – I thought of a singing career that I was offered, that I refused, too.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *A singing career.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I thought of that.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I thought of that and didn't tell you it.*

LRH: All right. Good. Let me check that. In this session have I missed a withhold on you? Still got one. That's it.

PC: *Well, I – I seem to be suppressing the goal now, to some extent.*

LRH: Suppressing?...

PC: *The goal.*

LRH: Oh, yeah? Yeah? Right now?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me check this. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? Clean. Okay.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: All right. Let me check this goal again. To be wanted. To be wanted. To be wanted. All right. We got two slightly latent and one no-read on this particular activity.

Now, is there an invalidation on listing? Ah, that's clean. Have you been upset by a Goals Assessment?

PC: *Well, we certainly had battles on it um – when we were listing.*

LRH: Oh, you did, huh?

PC: *Oh, yeah. We fought ...*

LRH: Was that here?

PC: *Yeah, we – no, not here, no.*

LRH: Oh, on the goal?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Originally.

PC: *Yeah, we really fought our way through that.*

LRH: Mm-hm. All right. Let me check that. Have you had any upset on a Goals Assessment? All right. Clean. Okay.

To be wanted. To be wanted. To be wanted. Now, frankly, we do get a tick in this. It does tick; slightly, just a split late but it's checking out better. Now, without any recourse to the meter, is there anything you care to say about this?

PC: *Uh – no. Well, I felt it was probably uh – something worth running. I didn't particularly feel it was the goal.*

LRH: Oh, you didn't?

PC: *No, I felt it was kind of far down the track a little bit, in the right direction.*

LRH: Hmm.

PC: *I felt there was something below it.*

LRH: Hm. All right. Okay. You remember listing the terminal for it?

PC: *Well, uh – uh – yeah, I remember the terminal, yeah – "to be a man." You mean the list?*

LRH: Listing on it.

PC: *Oh, there wasn't many on the list.*

LRH: Very few.

PC: *Mm-hm. Wasn't many to it.*

LRH: All right. Now, I still get a slightly dirty needle here on occasion, from time to time. Now, did the auditor who did this assessment miss a withhold on you?

PC: *Well, if she did, um – I didn't know about it.*

LRH: All right. What was it?

PC: *Well, I – I figured uh – that I wasn't giving her the terminal ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... and I figured I wasn't giving her the goal.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. She didn't find that out?

PC: *Um – well, I told her that.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But the terminal, I felt, I was withholding.*

LRH: You did?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. All right. Did the auditor who did this Goals Assessment miss a withhold on you? Much cleaner. All right. Was this done in that LA course?

PC: *Nuh-uh. No. That was done off bulletins.*

LRH: Yeah. Well, was this before the LA course?

PC: *Yep. Um – yes.*

LRH: Done before the LA course?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *Before the rudiments were gotten clean.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, is there an invalidation on this goal? Seems to be clean. Has any auditor missed a withhold on this goal? I have to check that again. Has any auditor missed a withhold on this goal? The word "auditor" seems to start a dirty needle here.

PC: *Yeah. Well, it doesn't mean that – it kind of means something else to me.*

LRH: What's that?

PC: *"Auditor." Well, it kind of um – um – I'm kind of uh – mixed up with auditing – books and papers and accounts and things like that on auditing. It doesn't mean what we consider an auditor is.*

LRH: Oh, I see. Got it.

PC: *I – uh – I have difficulty with these things.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Has any auditor missed a withhold on this goal? I'm not getting any read on that particularly. I did get a dirty read on the word "auditor." Let me check this – yeah, I still get it. Auditor. Auditor. There's something going on, on that – on that word still.

PC: *Well, I think, myself, it's a – something I've never really been fond of as a ...*

LRH: As a word.

PC: *... title, or...*

LRH: All right. Good. Let me check this now. Has any auditor missed a withhold on this goal? That is clear as far the question is concerned. All right. Let me check it out once more here. To be wanted. To be wanted. To be wanted. All right. All right, in this session, have you suppressed this goal? Yes.

PC: *Mm. Kind of.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Well, all right. Okay. Let me check this again. In this session have you suppressed this goal? Still got one.

PC: *Yeah, I was hoping that um – the goals list wouldn't be touched, you know? I kind of thought that uh – maybe we'd get on the – maybe the other list and forget about that.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Very good. All right. Let me check that now. In this session have you suppressed this goal? Clean. All right. Once more. To be wanted. To be wanted. To be wanted. To be wanted. All right.

How do you feel about this goal?

PC: *Well, it means something. It's something I've tried to do.*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *Um – I got it.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *I came up with it.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *It made sense to me.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Something that I was trying to prove ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... in order to take off. It was very real. I've done this all my life.*

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: *so it meant something to me.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Felt we had to do something with it.*

LRH: Okay. Now, let's take another look at this "would want to convince." Hm?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Who or what would want to convince? All right. We get a nice read on that, by the way. Now, how would we four-line this? "Who or what would not want to convince?"

PC: *Seems less positive. Um ...*

LRH: "Not want to be convinced?" What would it be?

PC: *"Would," I think.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *"Who or what would ..." without the "want" in it.*

LRH: Yes, I know. But that's what you've gotten listed here. You listed "Who or what would want to convince?"

PC: *Yeah, that seems all right.*

LRH: All right. How about the line "Who or what would not want to convince?"

PC: *Seems less positive. The other one seems more real.*

LRH: Mm-hm. All right. Who or what would oppose being convinced? Who or what would oppose being convinced? [writes it down] Who or what would oppose being convinced? And who or what would not oppose being convinced?

PC: *Yeah. Seems right.*

LRH: Who or what would not oppose being convinced? Who or what could be convinced?

PC: *Seems real.*

LRH: Yeah. "Who or what could be convinced?" [writes it down]

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. And we've already listed [writes it down] "Who or what would want to convince?" And you actually preferred that to be "Who or what would convince?"

PC: *That's the way I felt when you read it out.*

LRH: Mm-mm. Well, let me check these two. Who or what would convince? Who or what would want to convince? Which of those sounds best?

PC: *The first one.*

LRH: "Who or what would convince?"

PC: *Yeah. Feels more certain.*

LRH: Hm-hm. Well, actually, as a person could continue this listing, they could just translate that line already listed to that point over to this other thing, and you'd get the same thing. All right. And we've still got one more. "Who or what would opposed being convinced?" "Who or what ..."

Now, "Who or what would not want to convince?" Make any sense to you?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: "Who or what would not want to convince?"

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: [writes it down] All right. Let me test this out. Who or what would not convince?

PC: *Seemed like on the other side when you said that. Either of those are over there, you know, kind of separate from me.*

LRH: Where are they – oh, yeah, yeah ...

PC: *The opposition.*

LRH: ... yeah. Oh, they're definitely in opposition.

PC: *At least that's the way it feels.*

LRH: "Who or what would not want to convince?" All right. Or "Who or what would not convince?" Which is the best line? "Who or what would not want to convince?" Is that easy to answer?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. "Who or what would not convince?" Is that easy to answer?

PC: *Well, that, you have to be more certain. I feel you have to be more certain about those answers than the other one.*

LRH: Very good.

PC: *More positive.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I think the other one is broader. The other one seems more narrow to me at the moment.*

LRH: "Who or what would con – would not convince?"

PC: *Mm – that's broader.*

LRH: That's broader ...

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: ... than "Who or what would not want to convince?" Huh?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: "Who or what would not convince?" Well, what we're going to do [writes] – we'll continue – continue existing line with "Who or what would convince?" and then run "Who or what would oppose being convinced?"

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: And "Who or what could be convinced?" and "Who or what would not convince?" Okay?

PC: *Seems fine.*

LRH: They're all hot.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: Okay? And as far as your Goals Assessment is concerned, you can go on and get your goal – perfectly all right. But I sense on the meter here that there's something in between you and this former goal. And so let's list this thing out;

it shouldn't take forever to list it out, you know?

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Let's list this thing out and then go on and get – with that out of the road, go on and get a goal. Huh?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right?

PC: *Yeah, fine.*

LRH: Because you did get somatics. They were changing somatics. You do have some chronic somatics. Okay.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Is there anything you care to say about it?

PC: *No. Thank you.*

LRH: All right. No other comment? Anything you'd like to say about this? All right. Perfectly fine. All right. That is it, Tom. And thank you very much.

PC: *Thank you, Ron.*

LRH: That's the end of checkout.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: All right. That's okay.

Okay. Push your chair forward there a little bit, Fred.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: A little more. A little more. Thanks. Chair! All right. Pick up those cans. Okay. All right here. Now, give the cans a squeeze. All right. Thank you. Is it all right if I do a check-over on this situation?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Anything wrong with my doing a check-over on it?

PC: *No.*

LRH: I get a bang there.

PC: *Well, I'm just nervous.*

LRH: There it is. You're nervous about it, huh?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Is it all right if I check over this situation?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Nervous about the TV?

PC: *No.*

LRH: No. What is it you're nervous about?

PC: *No, the – I feel I'm down to waterbuck/ tiger level on this here, and I'm all mixed up, heading in both directions at once, it seems.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *Goal and opposition goal, and terminal and opposition terminal, and I seem to have been hanging there for a long time.*

LRH: All right. Now, did you ever list a goal earlier?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Have you ever had a goal found on you?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Okay. And you've only got one line here – the only line you've listed, apparently.

PC: *No, I've had another one. It's a Prehav line also – "civilize." I think it's ...*

LRH: It's right here.

PC: ... *it's not – and the suppressor line "Who or what should be disregarded when you want to get something done?"*

LRH: Well now, what do you think about all this? Which is the first one that was done?

PC: *Well, "Who or what would civilize?" was done and abandoned. And when you brought out the suppressor line, that one was started and "civilize" was not completed . Peter Williams got the oppterm on that first, on the suppressor.*

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: *And Dorothy Broaded did the other side of it and got the terminal. And uh ...*

LRH: On what, the "civilize"?

PC: *No. On the suppress line.*

LRH: Oh. Oh, on this Line A that's already here.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Now answer ...

PC: *And then. ..*

LRH: Yeah. Go ahead.

PC: *And then she assessed – Dorothy Broaded, my present auditor, assessed me on another Prehav level and came up "to make unconscious." And – well, that's one of the things I've been complaining to you about for years that I dope off, dope off, dope off.*

LRH: Yeah, I know.

PC: *And that didn't run too well. And apparently she got instructions from Mary Sue to finish the line on "Who or what would civilize?" The one that Ellen had started. We did about a thousand on it all together.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *We did come up with "a reformer" and it didn't quite check out.*

LRH: All right. But tell me this ...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: ... the earliest one you did is "civilize."

PC: *The earliest one that was started, but not finished. And we ...*

LRH: Yeah. Well, that's "civilize"?

PC: *Yes!*

LRH: That's the earliest one.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Now, in doing that "civilized" one, whether the first time or the second time, did you get a lot of somatics? Heat, cold, pain, sensation – any of these things happen?

PC: *Not the first time. No. But the second time I started to get somatics on it. When we really listed it out to completion. When – until tone arm action was no longer in it.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *Then I started to get somatics on the left side of my body; all on the left side, including teeth that were no longer there.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And I think that's probably why I lost them – because of whatever was sitting there.*

LRH: All right. Now listen, Fred.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: You've apparently had "civilize" and then "to make unconscious"

and then "Who or what should be disregarded when you're getting something done?"

PC: *Well, not in that order. It was ...*

LRH: Let me get this order straight here.

PC: *..."civilize" first. Uh – the first assessment I've ever had in 3D Criss Cross was "Who or what would civilize?" That was run by Ellen Carter, and we got a list of about six hundred.*

LRH: "Who or what would civilize?"

PC: *That's right. And that was never completed.*

LRH: Good. All right. And your next line for listing?

PC: *The next line was "Who or what should be disregarded when you're getting something done?" And that came out as – you want the item? No. Okay.*

LRH: And your next line?

PC: *And the next line was "Who or what would make unconscious?" on the Prehav.*

LRH: Mm-hm. And the next?

PC: *And that was abandoned and we went back to "Who or what would civilize?" and finished that one.*

LRH: Got it. Thank you. Right now are you looking for a goal or ...

PC: *Yes. Right now we're looking for a goal.*

LRH: All right. What luck are you having with looking for a goal?

PC: *Well, it's tremendous auditing just to list for the goal. I'm again*

amazed that we're right down in the basic area of – well of – of what I want to achieve and the opposition to it immediately.

LRH: Hm.

PC: *I seem to be on both sides of the fence all the time. And uh ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... it's very, very uncomfortable.*

LRH: All right. Answer this now, Fred: If you yourself could choose what was going to happen or were going to choose, what would you do here? Which one of these lines? Or what would you do?

PC: *Oh, I'd finish the goal listing, by all means.*

LRH: You'd finish it off, huh?

PC: *Oh, definitely.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Not that the other was not uh – not productive, but I can see where the goals listing is – is definitely right down the ...*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *... center line. And why, just listing the goals is tremendous auditing for me – cognitions galore.*

LRH: Hm. Hm. All right.

PC: *And I seem to be exteriorizing from my difficulties, seeing both sides of the problem.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. Good enough. All right. Let me check over this list and just read these down the line. Okay?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: And let's see what readings we get here. In the first place, let me give you a null word. Just put your cans in your lap there. All right, let me give you a null word. Floor. All right, this is not going to get in our road.

Here we go. Who or what would civilize? Okay.

Who should be disregarded when you're getting something done? All right. Thank you.

Who or what would make unconscious? All right. Thank you.

Who or what would civilize? All right.

Goals. Okay. Goals. All right. Thank you very much.

Goals gets a read. The rest of these get a dirty needle.

PC: *Hm!*

LRH: So, what we're going to do is ...

PC: *There was a lot of – in the first listing of "Who or what would civilize?" – Ellen just said, "Well, anything that comes to your mind," and all sorts of – of the seamier sides of life just came to my mind and sort of boiled off.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *She listed down everything and – and there is a circuit of some kind having to do with stuck pictures of birth and sex, and ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... and this, whenever I'm getting audited, auditor gets a dirty needle and then – now I've – I've gotten toward*

getting them off on missed withholds. But these have been very embarrassing.

LRH: I see.

PC: *Yeah. But that – we finally got that off now. We used to – horse wrangling for an hour to get rudiments in.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Epecially with a female auditor.*

LRH: Right.

PC: *But now we can get them in, in a few minutes.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Oh, I feel that there were some missed withholds on that whole subject. You probably didn't say what you wanted to say or about running it or something of the sort?

PC: *Mm. No, I don't think I could get away with anything; especially not with Dorothy now.*

LRH: Yeah. Yeah. Well, I didn't mean that.

PC: *Oh, I see.*

LRH: I meant on the earliest run on "Who or what would civilize?" Yeah, there it is, but ...

PC: *Well, it's quite possible, because we didn't know about the missed withhold things yet.*

LRH: All right. Well, did your first auditor on "Who or what would civilize?" miss any withholds on you? I don't get a reaction on that particularly.

PC: *Oh, no. No, I – I'm not bashful. I get them off although it may be painful to get them off. You know?*

LRH: Yeah. Yeah.

PC: *But I get them off.*

LRH: Well, you're getting your bulk of your session going on goals.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Right? And you get a bang here on the subject of goals. Well, you get a reaction on the subject of goals. All right. We're going to go on here with goals, huh?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Good. Fine. [writes] And we're just going to complete a Goals Assessment. And sometime clean down all of suppressions, invals on the subject of listing. All right, that's fine. Okay. We got that now. All right. Is there anything you care to say before we end this up?

PC: *No. Thank you very much.*

LRH: All right. You bet you. End of checkout.

PC: *Thank you very much.*

LRH: There you go, Fred. See you later.

AUDITING ERRORS

A lecture given on 17 May 1962

Thank you.

Okay, I hope after this lecture there will be an upgrade in your auditing. I only hope.

All right. What are we here? This is ...

Audience: 17 May.

17th of May 1962, Saint Hill Briefing Course and ...

[Door is going, Audience voice: Sorry.]

... that's all right, we'll give you an infraction sheet. [laughter]

And, I already gave this lecture at dinner, so we can skip it! [laughter, laughs] And Mary Sue was going on about what you were doing and not doing. And I feel pretty grim, tell you the truth. I mean, that's terrible.

Well anyway, this is lecture one, 17 May 1962 and I'm going to talk to you about the sins that you can commit while prepchecking. And there's some vague feeling that because we have some drills, that the ability of the auditor to talk to the pc is reduced. Now, if you saw this in the demonstration last night, I was doing one of these drills very consistently. I don't know if you noticed that, you might not have recognized the drills being done right. [laughs] Snide tonight! Snide.

I myself was aware of the fact when first employing this, very harshly and so forth, that it did cut down my tendency to ARC break the pc with a bunch of meaningless conversation. I noticed this, in passing, that the – and so on. But I think all those people I checked over last night, I think they were perfectly happy with that checkout, weren't they?

Male voice: Yes.

Well now, did you feel better after the checkout, than you did before?

Male voice: Yes.

Hmm? I wonder why! Must have had something to do with the fact that the pc was acknowledged and the pc knew that was square and pc had some certainty on it – in spite of the fact I did – wasn't auditing last night, I was just doing a checkout. But in order to check out, of course, I had to do a small amount of auditing.

Now, you'll find that's inevitably and invariably true.

And when you first start using this, just as I noticed last night, using it very rigorously and harshly, yes, you feel sort of, "Oh, well, I can't go on and on talking to the pc – ha-ha!

What am I going to do now?" And that's because you have mistaken, as I recognized very readily, the drill for the fact of auditing.

There are two types of activity in which you engage in auditing. There's just two types of activity. And they're both very definitely different types.

And one of these things is the rudiments type of activity. Now, this is the type of activity where you're not really trying to dig anything up. You are trying to straighten something out. And you're trying to straighten it out right now. That is a rudiments-type activity. And you have beginning rudiments and you have end rudiments. But remember, you also have a nebulous thing called "middle rudiments." Middle rudiments do exist. And every time you are asking the pc for a missed withhold you are running a middle rudiment. It is just a rudiment.

The other type of activity is an auditing activity. Now, just as you have the body of the session and you have beginning, middle and end rudiments, you see, there's a difference here. This is "body of the session" auditing. And it is done against a tone arm, it is not done against a needle. You do your rudiments against a needle and you do your body of the session against a tone arm. They are two different items on the E-Meter.

Now, some of you might have noticed that when you move a tone arm, the needle moves. I don't like to put that that... bluntly, but anyway, if we were to set this meter up here, so that it were... Now, there sits the meter. But here supposing – now just look at the needle. We get that much motion on the needle. Do you think that's tone arm motion or isn't it? Hmm? That's tone arm motion, isn't it?

Audience: Yes.

Now, when we say how much tone arm motion is your pc getting during Prepchecking, we see that this thing can swing all the way over there and all the way back again and we have about a quarter of a – of a division of motion here, on the tone arm, which ordinarily isn't recorded. We don't, in recording tone arm, record these fast responses of the needle. But they do mean tone arm motion. Your long, wide swings of the needle you can classify as tone arm motion. You can classify those as tone arm motion.

We're interested in a stability of tone arm motion when we're recording it. We center the needle, we record it. In other words, we center the needle on set. Put the needle on set. And we record the tone arm. That's for a needle read.

You see, you're dealing with a relatively sloppy action. This is not a precision action. The recording of a tone arm motion is not a precision action. Because your needle can fly around considerably without ever your recording it. You understand? It – you're stretching at gnats. You're trying to shoot down butterflies with sixteen-inch guns or something like that, when we say, "Oh well, if we kept a tone arm record and the needle was at set all the time, all the time, all the time and so forth and we had this quarter division..." Well, you'd work yourself silly and it's to no purpose.

When we say tone arm motion, we mean you centered the thing and read it. But a needle that drops like this – that's just one swing, see. We don't call that tone arm motion, really. It isn't anything that we record. For the purposes of the body of the session, by definition I'm

just giving you, we do notice that as tone arm motion. That's what's known as "tone arm motion read on the needle."

We know we're getting tone arm motion, we know there'd be tone arm motion there if we kept centering the tone arm. I'm just calling your attention to something you know already, that if the needle is flying around, you're getting tone arm motion. It is not significant as far as items or anything else is concerned, because you're not going to read a needle flying around like this for items or something of this sort and for an ARC break or something like that. You're going to read the thing, it goes *clank*. You're going to read this type of reaction, see. *Clank*. See? Or this type of reaction. See, the little reactions. You're not going to pay much attention to this reaction. See, there's a wide reaction and you actually read while that thing is doing a wide reaction, you read its interim reaction, its internal reaction.

You say, "Do you have an ARC break?" and it – you know, it's swinging down like this and it goes – you got the idea? It interrupts itself or something like this. Or it's swinging back up. You don't read from a motionless needle, by the way. Some of you can always tell a brand-new auditor, he sits there and waits for the needle to stop moving so that he can read it. The only time you get embarrassed on this is when the needle slides by the end of the pin. And you've started your question and it all of a sudden goes by the end of the pin before you can finish your question and of course then you've had it, then you have to repeat your question. Which is perfectly all right.

You'll see on these demonstrations, I'm fairly careful to give you a read. That is to say I'm fairly careful to ask my questions with the needle more or less slowed down or motionless, so that you can see the thing. I'm not reading a needle as fast as I would ordinarily read a needle. But I'm not straining at it too hard even in that direction.

Now, the point I'm trying to make here is this motion that's going like this or the needle was coasting here at the end of the dial for a while and then came back up here and was here for a while and then was here, that's tone arm motion. Those are not needle *reads*, really, you see. They're tone arm motion. It's tone arm motion read off the needle.

Now, of course, if you're sitting here with your thumb on this tone arm motion, if you're sitting here with your thumb on that, yes, you could keep it centered all the time. But the trouble is while you are talking or asking questions of the pc, you're liable at the same time to be moving it with your thumb and that's very difficult to read. In fact I've never seen anybody do it yet, me included. You see. So there's no profit made.

Now, let's classify these two things. There is the rudiments-type read and the body-of-the-session-type read. Now, the body-of-the-session-type read is done on the tone arm. And the rudiments-type read is done on the needle. Already we have those two very broad distinctions.

All right, they are treated in an entirely different way by the auditor. The auditor's handling of these two things is entirely different. And what you've got to get into gear is slipping from one to the other and back again without upsetting yourself, God help us. And sliding from one to the other without continuing the other when you're doing the other.

All right, I'll give you an example of this. We're going along here, needle – needle is ... We're getting sweeps of some kind or another, so we know whatever we're talking about to the pc is sort of hot, you see, because it's swinging around, you know, and this says, well, the subject – the subject is pertinent to something or other. And the pc says suddenly, "That's the list. That's complete. That's it. That's all the items there are. No good to ask me if there are any more items, because that's all the items there are, the list is complete."

Now, I don't care if at first you crash your gears. I just don't want to see any gear teeth flying off. But go ahead and crash your gears in trying to change from one to the other. Because at this moment you've got to go into a rudiments-type question. And this is an entirely different presence. So he's had it now, you've said – you've said, "Are there any more items?" or something. You haven't even tested for it, you know.

And pc says, "No, no, that's complete."

And you say, "All right. Good." *Clank-whirr-crash*, you see.

Now, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" I don't care what you say, do you see. You're going to get a middle – a middle rudiment, see. All right, now that middle rudiment is handled with great precision. "Have I missed a withhold on you? Yeah, what's that? Yeah, that. That one there."

"Oh, well, ha-ha. Yeah, well I didn't tell you I'm bored stiff."

And you say, "All right, all right. Thank you, thank you. Let me check that. Have I missed a withhold on you? All right, that's clean. All right, fine. Okay, now. Now, we only have thirty items on this particular list. [laughter] And on all of your other lists you have three hundred and ninety-seven. So I think we'll have to do something about this. Now, how about another item?"

See, you've shifted your gears back again. There was no "Up, Fido" drill on here, you see. You did a *tsk*. You're right back at it again.

And he says, "Well, I don't want to list anymore."

"Well," you say, "you can think of another one. Come on, think of one. Think of another one. Repeat one that you've already given me."

"Well, there is one."

And you say, "All right, that's fine." [laughter] And you're off to the races, see. And you get him going a little more and then all of a sudden you happen to be noticing this over here and this thing appears awfully still. Appears very still. No TA action. Just looks awfully still. Or he gets a dirty needle once in a while when you speak or something, see. All right, you shift your gears, you see. And you ask once more for a missed withhold, invalidation.

You know – there – this is – this is just a note I will interject into this thing – did you know there are negative – negative middle rudiments? "In this session, have you tried not to withhold something?", "In this session, have you tried not to invalidate things?", "In this session, have you ref – have you been trying not to suppress anything?" See, they're done exactly the same way as any other middle rudiment. Same drill. Whatever you ask the guy, you leave by the same door.

And you find out there are two reasons why your pc starts picking up and getting more and more and more and more and more withholds. So finally every item you're picking up missed withholds. See, there's two reasons. One is, is you've *missed* a withhold, but good. See, that's one. And the other one is the pc has now become very alert to the fact that he mustn't have withholds, see. And he's busy there running the session and keeping his rudiments in.

I don't care what kind of a middle rudiment you do. "In this session, have you tried to keep the rudiments in?" Pc says, "Oh, yes, my God!" The same drill, you see, no comments from the auditor.

And you say, "Good. All right. Now, let me check that again. In this session, have you kept – tried to keep the rudiments in? That's it, that's clean." Go on about your business, you see. It's just this little shift of gears.

Now, it doesn't matter then what you use for a middle rudiment. Do you realize that you can bring a middle rudiment in like this: "In this session, have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?" Perfectly valid middle rudiment, see. Sec Checking-type questions where you're running lists: "In this session, have you told me any half-truths? untruths?" see? You just use your end rudiments, see. Clank! You say, "Well, come on, what's that?"

He says, "Well, I have, as a matter of fact, I've been stringing a longbow here for some time on the subject of my sister. And I've been trying to damage her, too."

And you say, "Good. Thank you very much. Now, let me check this question again. In this session, have I missed..." And that's your shift – your shift over. It's very simple when you get down to it. When you do a rudiments-type question – now, let's get the other difference going here – when you do a rudiments-type question you're trying to get something out of the road of the body of the session. You're trying to keep the body of the session from getting upset. That is the only thing you're trying to do.

You're not trying to help the pc a bit, even though it very often helps the pc a bit, as the people I was checking last night undoubtedly felt helped by the number of missed withholds and so forth which I picked up off of them so as to carry on a check, see. But you're not trying to really help the pc with that – an – that rudiments question. You're trying to keep the body of the session going.

And don't you ever get going on a body of a session or even on the beginning rudiments and let the pc detour you on to doing something else. You clean up a rudiment. If you're cleaning up a rudiment, you clean it up as a rudiment, you clean up that rudiment and you get off of that. And by definition, the shortest, quickest brush-offs are the bestest rudiment processes. It's what gets the rudiment in fastest – that is the ideal rudiments process. What gets the rudiment in fastest. We want the rudiment in.

Because *all* the action – you understand, it's terribly important to have the rudiments in. But all the action you take in getting the rudiments in is robbed from the body of the session. You're running on robbed time. So don't ever set yourself up to straighten out a rudiment the *long* way to. Don't start in on the thing and get down to "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" and the pc says – it says, clank! And the pc says, "No," and "I'm not

willing to." And you all of a sudden say, "I guess we'll have to prepcheck this." Oh, cut your throat, man! That is really the clumsiest piece of stuff and that is the favorite trap of auditors. They get stuck in this every once in a while. They find a beginning rudiment out and they immediately haul out the chessboard, the IBM computer, you see, roll up their sleeves, get three or four new extra sheets of paper to list things on. No, all you want there is a feather duster. And preferably a dustpan. See, that's the most equipment you want at that particular time. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Clank!

Well of course you can say, "Well, what's that all about? What's this all about here? What's that – that one?"

"Aahhah – so forth and so on."

"Oh, come on, give it to me."

"Well, so-and-so and so-and-so and, well, last night I was having nightmares about you auditing me."

And you say, "All right, thank you very much. Let me check that. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Well, that's still falling off the pin. All right. If it's all right with you – and even if it isn't [laughs] –I'd like to run a little process here, 'Who would I have to be to audit you?'" First question – *bang-bang-bang-bang-bang*. "All right, let me check this."

Pc has heaved a sigh or he has done something that looked like he had a cognition, or something like this. He didn't tell you anything, you know, you say, "Let's check this." And you say, "All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? That's cleaner than a wolf's tooth. That was the last question. Thank you very, very much." Get the idea? Just a feather duster, you know, and get it out of sight, put it under the corner of the rug.

That's all you're interested in, is a clean needle. You're not even interested in how long it'll stay clean. That's the reason you prepcheck, you get a needle clean so that it will stay clean. That's the reason you do body of session. You expect body of session to linger. The effect of body of session is going to be with us for a while. But a rudiment, a middle rudiment, we don't expect it to be with us, maybe it won't – it'll only be with us ten seconds. It was still clean, so we leave it. It'll become apparent if it goes out. Something won't be happening right so you can go in and patch it up again.

This rudiment-type question is the "sticky plaster" type of activity. And if you go and try to build a case out of rudiments you're going to be in trouble. You're going to waste time. That time is all robbed from the body of the session.

Now, if you wanted to set up a pc so that his rudiments would stay in forever, you would get that session's rudiments in and then take one of the rudiments questions and use it in the body of the session to put it in there with brass nails and tape and mahogany and anvils – you get the idea?

You can prepcheck a rudiment question and that's where you may get mixed up. But you would – you're trying to put it in forever. All right, put it in forever. But you'll only do that in the body of the session.

Now, in the body of the session it doesn't matter how gabby you get. And this is where basically you're going to get most mixed up – is shifting gears on a list-type Prepcheck. Because here the rudiment-question rule of ask it once is being used a little differently. And it's only because this Sec Check-type question is being treated kind of like a rudiment that you're going to get mixed up. It actually isn't treated the same as a rudiment. But you're going to shift gears somewhat along this way: "Have you ever stolen anything?" You're busy – you're in the body of the session now – your rudiments are more or less in. Your pc is rolling along and you get him this list and, you come to this question, "Have you ever stolen anything?" and the thing goes *whip!* You say, "Yeah, that. Yeah, that one."

"Oh, well, I, uh – used to have nightmares about being a thief." Well, he's said it. You're not going to correct him at this stage of the game. And you say, "Good, thank you very much. Let me check this. Have you ever stolen anything" *Whip!* Now, shift your gears. See, that's a gear shift the same way. You're now under no discipline of anything under the sun, moon and stars, except to make him give an overt on that Zero Question. That is now a Zero A. The first action is, after you've checked it and found out it's going to respond like mad, is get it writ down as your Zero A on your auditor's report. I don't care if you write it down by number, but put "Zero A, 16."

You say, "All right, now, let's get down to business here. This is reacting like mad on this. Now, have you ever stolen ... ?"

"No." The person says, "I remember in Sunday school, I mean they even – even thought of me one time as the Bishop of Algiers and never stole anything in my life. Well I don't know, the meter can't be wrong, you can't be wrong..."

"Good, think it over, now think it over very carefully, have you ever stolen anything? You know, purloined something that didn't *belong* to you, you know? Acquired equipment to which you had no title. You know, stolen anything?"

"Ah, well, you put it that way, let me see, have I ever stolen anything, anything at all...."

And you say, "It keeps clanging, see? That one? That one? Yes?"

"Oh." He says, "You're talking about that one?"

"Yeah."

"Well, I thought one time that it'd be a good thing if my friend had his car stolen."

And you say, "All right, all right, that's very good. Now, very good, thank you very much. All right, now. Let's get down to cases here. Have you ever stolen anything? That's what I want to know."

"Oh, well, you put it that way, I mean, well, it'd be very humiliating to have to tell you because it didn't amount to very much. But, uh – I once stole my sister's bicycle."

He said it. All right. You say, "All right, you stole your sister's bicycle. Very good, thank you very much. That's very nice, all right. We're going to take that up right now. Now, what about..." Just, just test questions – "What about stealing bicycles? What about stealing

from children? What about stealing from your sister? What about stealing toys? What about stealing vehicles? Vehicles? What about stealing vehicles? Does that make sense to you?"

"Aaaah-haaa." [laughter]

"All right. One: What about stealing vehicles? Good. All right, now this sister's bicycle of yours, all right. When was that? Is that all there is to it? What might have appeared there? Who didn't find out about it? All right, good. Now, when was that exactly? Is that all there is to that? What appeared there? Who should have located it or who should have found it? All right."

This thing is going crazy, see, and not diminishing, you've gone through it twice, you still get – out of the corner of your eye you can see that needle swing, which is tone arm action, see. That thing is swinging around. And you're saying, "Boy, this is – this is a hot line," see. And you say, "Is there any..." It's always earlier – "Is there any *earlier* incident where you stole something?"

"Well, yes, when I was a little boy, I once – I once – used to say my prayers in church all the time, you know, hoping I would never steal anything."

And you say, "Good." See. "That's real good. All right, we're glad about that one, that's fine, we like that one. All right, now, what'd you steal? Come on."

"Hmm! You mean you want to know?"

"Yes. What did you steal? Yeah, come on."

"Oh, well. I used to empty out my mother's cookie jar and give it to the other kids every once in a while."

"Thank you, thank you very much. When was that?"

"Well, that was lots of times."

"Good, just give me one. Just one."

"Oh, well, that one. Well, that was when she beat me so badly."

"I don't care which one it is, but how about that one? When was it? All right, good. Is that all of it? What might have appeared there? What was never found out about it?" just for the hell of it, see. "Good."

This thing's going crazy. You say – well, we're not going to waste any more time on that particular one – "Well, is there any earlier time when you stole something?" And we finally run into his robbing banks. We don't care what we run into, but we're going to run into the hot line here, and steer it back into vehicles, because that's what we want. And we find out that this individual – we don't care – we don't care when it happened or what it was all about – we find out he used to steal all the kids' toys in the neighborhood, their tricycles and things like that, and sell them to the junkman as a pastime, you see. And they used to get beaten for losing their toys and, you know, the thing finally builds up like mad. And he really had no clue of it.

Now, you make a mistake when you think the pc knew about this, by the way, just as an interjection. He didn't know about this. You've got to fish him into this, you've got to persuade him into this. He's getting into areas he doesn't know anything about. If you let the pc – weak Prepchecking is sitting there waiting for the pc to tell you and blaming the pc because he doesn't tell you. Well, the person to blame is the auditor. That's because the auditor isn't crowding the pc at it. You see, there are various ways of doing that.

All right, that's fine. And we finally get this thing where he was selling all these toys to the junkman and the kids were all getting beaten and everything of the sort. And then he used to tell people that he saw them throw their toys into the lake and he got them all in trouble and we get this, "Gee!" You know, he says, "I never remembered anything about this."

Well, I bet he didn't. And he got that all cleaned up. It's a nice significant basic on the chain and that sort of thing and you come back to your question, "What about stealing vehicles?" you see, whatever it was.

"Well," he says, "Well, there's a lot more of those, because actually I put myself through college stealing cars."

You say, "All right, that's fine. Okay, now" – change your hat, see, – "now, let's test this. What about stealing vehicles? All right, that's fine, that's clean." And you write, "null." "Now, let's test this Zero A. All right? Okay. Have you ever stolen anything? Ah, that's null. Thank you very, very much. Okay, now." We take the next question on the Sec Check list and just give it the business. All right, so he gives you one.

Now, here's a horrible mistake. Let me – let me show you a mistake. You can be all thumbs, you get that? I've given you the whole of it now but let me give you some things about – you can be all thumbs about this sort of thing. Well, you can actually drive yourself and your pc half out of their minds. One, by not thoroughly acknowledging everything the pc says. See, he says, "Well, I – I thought once about stealing a paper clip once."

Well, man, you're not going to use that for a What question; you're not going to have anything to do with it, but you certainly better say "*Good!*", so the pc really knows you heard it. Don't go at it like this: pc says, "Well, I thought about stealing a paper clip once." And you say, "Well, have you ever stolen anything?" *Ohh*, because your pc's going to go halfway around the bend before you get very far, you see. Whatever the pc gives you, give him a cheery aye-aye about it. "All right. Good. Good. Now, we're looking for a doingness here. That's fine, that one you just gave me, that's fine. But we're looking for a doingness. We want a doingness. You know? We want something you've done, done, done. We want a doingness on this thing. All right, now, I'm going to ask you again." Now that we've already found the thing wouldn't clear, you see.

All right. You know, I mean pound him into it and he eventually gives you one. And then you get your What question sorted out here and your administration. You actually – the second you transfer over from this one-shot, you know, on the list – second you transfer over from this one-shot on the list over onto your Prepcheck – oh, hell – that requires administration and writing and figuring it all out and getting your What question and running it down the line, talking to your pc, getting him to go earlier, cleaning up everything. You talk about individuality, you're certainly going to use your wits in full gear during that whole activity.

And the only thing you're interested in over here is – on the meter – is how much needle swing you've got. You're still getting needle swing, in other words potential tone arm swing, you're still getting it on this thing. You're getting change as you go down the line and you're getting into areas that are going to shift this case around. Is this thing getting any cleaner? You're right on – you're right on the "qui vive" all the time you're doing this. Actually you have to be good.

One, you can't accuse the pc of withholding from you. Throws him out of session at once. You got to help the pc find out about it, but if you're not very militant in helping him find out about it, he also is going to get pretty wishy-washy on you. In other words, you've got to be clever while you're prepchecking. But a Prepcheck is an activity that takes place on something that won't clear. By definition, it's something that takes place – you ask the guy, "Have you ever stolen anything?" He says, "Yes. I stole the ..."

"Now, let me give you the next question."

"Yes. Once – time I stole the whole contents of the vault of the Bank of England. *Heh-heh!* Yeah. Um!"

And you say, "Boy, magnitude of sin." you see, "It's tremendous here!" see. So we never bother to check it with the second question. And you say, "What about robbing the Bank of England? What about robbing the Bank of England?" Well there's no reaction on that. Of course there isn't, you goof. He blew it. Have faith! Have faith! Your pc does blow things!

The magnitude has nothing about it whatsoever. You say, "Well, have you ever raped anyone?" and the pc heaves a terrible sigh and, "*Ahhhh-aaaah*. Yes. Well, actually my sister and my mother and my grandmother. Yes."

And you say, "Boy! That's really a juicy line!" you know, and put your E-Meter aside – you just haven't carried out your drill, see. Because all too often you say to him, "All right, thank you. I got that. Now, have you ever raped anyone? That's clear, thank you." You never vary the drill. You see how you can make the error? So you're trying to form up What questions on things that have blown.

Doesn't much matter, doesn't much matter what the magnitude is, is did the pc blow it? Because let me tell you, if he let you in on the exact point on the chain, it has no underpinning. See, he didn't steal part of the Bank of England when he was two and steal another part of it when he was six, you see. And falsified checks on it when he was ten. And then steal the whole thing when he was twenty-two. This wasn't the way he went about it. He just robbed the Bank of England! Boom! No chain. If there's no chain, it'll blow. This is your pc – has never made a career out of missing – getting you to miss withholds on him.

See, it's a this-lifetime activity, last few years. Doesn't – isn't going to make any chain. There's nothing unknown about it, particularly. You get in, prepcheck this thing on the basis, "Has anyone ever failed to find out anything about you?" That's the last two hundred trillion years. Oh, I think that would be very fruitful. You'll get all kinds of wild things. As a matter of fact you'd go on and on and on, prepchecking with a Zero of that particular type. After a while you're liable to blow it, too, but it'd be too gruesome. It's too wide.

You see, now, where middle rudiments are handled one way and how beginning, middle and end rudiments, bear some resemblance to that Sec-Check-question-type procedure? Don't get the two mixed up, though. Because you're always willing to do something about a rudiment if it was wildly out. But you're going to do the shortest, quickest thing and you're only going to do something about it if you can't get it to blow right now. It's perfectly – perfectly valid, to find the thing's still alive and not want to spend any more time on it. You've checked it, you say, "Was there a little more to that?" It's still knocking, see.

"Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

The guy says, "I had a nightmare all last night." Well, yesterday this thing was clean, so it couldn't – couldn't be very much. And the fellow says, "Oh, well, yeah, well, I criticized you all during dinner last night to one of your fellow students."

And you say, "All right, good. All right, I'll check that. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Thank you, that's clear." You understand?

I mean you could ans – I'll go through the drill: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Clang! See. You say, "What's that? That? That? What are you thinking of there? There?"

"Oh, well, I had nightmares all night last night about you."

And you say, "All right, good. Now, I'll check that. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Tick, tick, the thing has still – still got something on that. "Is there a little more to that? Little something else there?"

"Oh, yeah. I talked to a friend of yours last night at dinner and told him how terrible you were as an auditor."

And you say, "Good, thank you very much. Now, I'll check that. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? That's clean, thank you very much."

That's all you do about it, see. Got the idea? You can ask it twice if you do the drill twice. You could actually ask it five times if you did the drill five times. What I'm trying to get – drive across to you is you always do the drill. The drill has a complete cycle. These are the errors you could make. This would be an erroneous – an erroneous action:

"Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Now, that? That? That? What is that?"

And the fellow says, "Well, I – I had nightmares all night about you last night."

"Well, what might they have proceeded from?"

It's, what mousehole? See? It's which – which way did he go? The pc gets this odd feeling – [laughter] "Where is it? Where'd he go? Where's the auditor?" See? That's a totally incorrect drill. If you've asked an auditing question, you expect it to be answered. And you see how antique this drill really is. If you've asked an auditing question you expect it to be answered. Now, the only thing you're doing with the meter is making sure it was fully answered. See? You ask an auditing question, you expect it to be answered. You're going to find

out on the meter if it was answered. I mean, what's – what's simpler? But you did it with a drill, so this drill is your beginning, middle and end rudiments.

Now, you're perfectly willing to shift over into a process. Now, here's the other one. If you're doing a beginning, middle and end rudiment-type question, it is with some trepidation that you shift over into a process. You're not going to process it unless you're practically beaten with a club. You're going to do this precise drill. You're going to do this drill at least twice before you give up all hope, see. And then if it was diminishing, on just what you were doing, for God's sakes, don't get in and do something else then, just repeat the drill again. And all of a sudden it's as clean as a wolf's tooth. Pc's satisfied, you're satisfied, everybody's satisfied. So don't lightly shift into a process when you're doing a beginning, middle and end rudiment.

But when you *do*, shift in *fast* and get out *now*. Don't hem and haw about the thing. Don't go rolling up your sleeves and giving the pc... You know, don't – don't say, "Well, all right, so you've got a present time problem. All right, present time problem, let's see here, now. Just a minute, present time problem. Now what'd you say it was about? Oh, that's the one. All right. Now, let's see. Let's see – well, we don't need that. What – is it all right with you if I run this process on you? What part of that problem have you been responsible for? All right, that's what we're going to run. That's what we're going to run. Is that all right with you? All right, good. Now, what part of that problem have you been responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem..." And on and on and on.

Now, you get toward the end of it, "Now, I am going to give you this process two more times and end it. If that is all right with you. Is that all right with you?" [laughter] "All right. What part of that problem have you been responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem have you been responsible for? Thank you. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process? Thank you. Thank you. Well, that's all right. We won't take that up just now. We'll take that up later. All right. Now, now we're going to go into the body of the session." [laughter]

Now, that is entirely the wrong auditor atmosphere. The way you want to handle is quite different. See, now, you're just doing your rudiments, you're going right on down the line. You say, "Do you have a present time problem? We've got something on that. That. Yeah, that. What are you looking at now?"

"Oh yes, I wonder how long the session is going to last, because I have an appointment ..." so forth.

"All right, thank you, thank you very much. Do you have a present time problem? That's – still getting a read on it. That."

"Oh. Yeah, well, I had a row with my husband last night about Scientology."

"All right. All right, thank you. Check that now. Do you have a present time problem?" You see, the thing is not diminishing. It's not diminishing. And you say, "Well, have you – have you – are you satisfied that you've made a statement of this problem? Is this problem satisfactorily stated to you?" so forth. "That. Yeah, that one. That one. All right, now we're going to check this. Do you have a present time problem? I'm sorry, but that is still

reading – about having a fight with your husband about Scientology. All right, that's – that's it. All right. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you very much. All right. Now, do you mind if I check that now? Do you have a present time problem? That's clear, thank you very much, that was the last question." *Pssswww!* He went that-a-way! [laughs, laughter]

Pcs will actually very obligingly get rid of things, by the way, that they don't think you think are very important. [laughter] You can actually do a tremendous, you can do a tremendous amount in weighting – w-e-i-g-h-t-i-n-g – a session. You can weight the thing up like mad. You know this pc has got scintillion overts of some kind or another on the subject of "vimenk" because every session he has come up with a goal for life or livingness, "To kill all the women I've known." And you know that he has some overts on this subject in this lifetime. Something has told you this. In other words your most fruitful sources of adjudicating whether your pc is getting there or not is check over his life or livingness areas for his PTPs. Because that isn't life or livingness goals, that's his PTPs. A wonderful list of them. Only never called them to his attention, until all of a sudden, you see, that's really getting there and you're into a Prepcheck of some kind or another, that's your body of the session and all of a sudden, wonder of wonders, he says, "Well, women. Yeah, I suppose I have done a few things to women in my time. I suppose." You can weight it.

"Ah, you have? Well, all right. Very good now. Let's – let's see if we can't check into it a little bit more here. All right, what was the Zero Question?" You've already seen the thing didn't clear. But you weight it, you see. "Women, all right, I think we'll be able to do something about this, now." You look at this very carefully, you see. "Been waiting to get to something like this on your case. All right, now. All right. Now, we want an actual overt. We don't want any of this thinkingness stuff. Now, we want something you've actually done to a woman. Now, give me, give me a good one. Something that's really significant, here. A good one. Good one. What have you – what have you done to a woman? All right. Oh, you soaked one's head in a rainbarrel. All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Uh – what – uh – what women have you drowned? What about doing something to women's heads?" [laughter] "All right, that's it, brother. And we've got it now! What about doing something to women's heads? All right. Now, you've got this rainbarrel thing, now. All right, when was that? Yeah, that's good. All right, let's get, let's really get this now. All right, when was that?" you know, important.

The pc will say, "God, I guess I'd better dig on this, you know? That guy is all ready to fire, you know? No telling what's lying underneath this! Maybe – maybe I'd better get interested in this subject after all these years! I thought it was a natural thing to drown women and – apparently there's some social mores has been introduced since I came from Saturn!"

And he all of a sudden starts rolling it off and his responsibility level changes. In other words, by apparently taking responsibility for the pc's overts, just to the degree of being terribly interested and thorough about getting them, when they really got on a hot line, it throws an element of responsibility into the session. They all of a sudden will come up with more data. These are just tricks of the trade. That's just trickery. But it works!

Now, you'll find that your greatest difficulty is shifting from the one-shot over to the process. Now, in a rudiment, you shift – you one-shot, you've checked it out, it didn't check out, for God's sakes, ask it again. Newly. Not on the checkout question. But you know, press it home. Say, "Well, it's dirty," you know. "What was it? That one?" You see? Check that one out. You got the idea? Take three complete cycles at it, at least, if it isn't cleaning before you surrender. And then move over into the process that you're going to do on it, like a startled rabbit and move back in again, you see, as though you have a complete allergy to it and it's totally unimportant to go on running it, you see.

All right, that is quite distinctly different from the one-shot question of the Sec Check form list, see. There you're going to ask him once, it is not clean and, boy, that's the one you've been waiting for. That's – your whole atmosphere is built up into *that* is the one. We've been sitting here the whole session waiting for you to come up with this one, see. Now, we take that down, we prepcheck it, we check our What question, boy, this is dress parade, see. And we really clean that chain from one end to the other. And you get terrific resurgences on your pc if you do that. So they slightly bear resemblances to each other but they're different, they're different actions entirely, do you understand that?

Now, what you want to do, is get your pc flying. Now, the thoroughness with which you do these various drills gets your pc flying. At first, perhaps you find yourself a bit tongue-tied in doing it. You feel terribly restrained. "Oh my God, I've got to ask the same question as I asked in the first place and the first question I asked was, 'In this session or any time during the last twenty-four hours...!' What the hell did I say?" You know? [laughs] If you didn't ... Why, I pulled a gag on you last night, I asked the pc what I said, just to give you an idea. He told me and I asked him and he was satisfied. Even though it looks like you make a fool out of yourself, come out right – come out right at the other end of this thing.

And get that down. But a drill is a drill. It is done with great precision, it is done without any variation. But that doesn't say that your ability to talk to the pc is totally curtailed. When you want to find out something from the E-Meter, when you want to get a certain specific thing done in a session, well, for God's sakes, your direct address to the situation with the drill that does it is certainly your best way to make it happen now. Not to vary it off, but that says don't – doesn't say anything about don't talk to the pc. This doesn't say don't ever coax the pc. It doesn't say anything about, "Rule A is to get as inhuman as possible." It doesn't say anything about that whatsoever. Of course you can gib-gab with the pc far too long and you can evaluate for the pc and suggest things to him and wrap him up in knots. But, as long as you don't do it in the middle of one of these drills, when you're trying to find out something, it'll still be all right. You won't upset anything.

And the amount of talk which you have to do to get a pc slid over into the right What question, may be considerable. The amount of histrionics which you sometimes have to exhibit have to be considerable, too.

Pc says, "Well, there isn't anything on that at all. Never had anything to do with little boys in my whole life."

And you say, "Well, this is rocking. What's it knocking on? I'll check it again. Did you ever have anything to do with small boys? It knocks. Here we go. I can sit here as long as you

can. What is it? In fact I can sit here longer than you can, because you're worried and I'm not." [laughter] "Dig up something, I don't care what you dig up. And I don't care how phony you think the E-Meter is, just dig up something! Ever done anything to small boys, that's what we want to know, man. Go on, talk. I'm waiting. Now, there's nobody under the sun, moon or stars that you could tell this to better than to me. Have you ever done anything to small boys? That's all I want to know. Now, I'm waiting."

"Mmm, oh, all right, you've told on one once. That's pretty good. What'd you do just before that, huh?" "Oh, all right. Very good. Now, thank you. I told you, you could. Thanks a lot. Now, let's get busy on this one right now. Here we go," see. We're off to the Prepcheck races.

Takes a lot of steering, takes a lot of doing. You think a drill cuts down. No, a drill leaves you more mind with which to handle the pc. There is the best definition. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you. Take a ten minute break.

PREPCHECKING AND ITS PURPOSES

A lecture given on 17 May 1962

Thank you.

Okay. Here's lecture two, 17 May 1962, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

I'm going to talk about Prepchecking. This is a general lecture on the subject of Prepchecking and its purposes.

A rudiment is that which is used to get the pc in shape to be audited that session – just in shape to be audited that session. And the body of a session is for the purpose of letting the pc live in that lifetime. In other words, he can – the pc can be audited in the session because of the rudiment. It's just that session, nothing else, you're not interested in anything else. But the body of the session, that's setting him up for this lifetime.

In other words, you've got duration. Whenever you have duration you have to get thoroughness. Therefore a rudiment is unthorough. A rudiment has to be clean. Don't ever make a mistake about that. But it is only as clean as it has to be. Of course, it is clean. But you have not cleaned up any fundamentals on it.

Let me give you an idea of a wrong way of going about this. "All right," you say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc goes *clank*.

So you say, "All right. Now do you always have present time problems in auditing sessions?" "What's the first time that an auditor failed to resolve a present time problem for you in an auditing session?" "Things always been grim this way in auditing sessions? Well, let me see if I can go back through your auditing reports here for the last few years and let's see if we can pick up something here that's a clue to why you always have present time problems in an auditing session."

Well, of course you've just transferred the permanency of it all from the body of the session to the rudiment. And having transferred it you're going to find the pc will stay there, with the permanency of it all, in the rudiments. And after you've put the pc into the permanency of it all in the rudiments, you're going to pry him out of there with crowbars, blasting powder, everything else, don't you see? You're not going to get him out of the rudiments.

Why aren't you going to get him out of the rudiments? Because you put him in the rudiments, with a *thud*. You said the rudiments are a permanent activity. You're going to make a lifetime profession out of cleaning up today's present time problem. That was the way you

weighted it and that is the way the pc's going to respond. And of course you're not going to clean up that present time problem for his whole life, not 'arf you're not. You're just going to waste time, that's the only thing you're going to do. Because in the first place the processes available to you are insufficiently fundamental to correct this thing all the way up the line.

So, rudiment, whether it's a beginning rudiment, the middle rudiment or an end rudiment, it's only for that session. That's all.

Now, the end rudiment has the additional apparent thing of bringing the pc back to the world of the living. But remember, you put him into session, it's up to you to take him out of session. So the rudiment is – the end rudiment is still just for that session, isn't it? The end rudiment is not for yesterday's session. Therefore I laugh every once in a while when I see somebody saying, "I didn't have time for the end rudiments. Is it all right if I put them in next session?" [laughter] Yes, you'll see that in auditor's reports in here quite frequently. Of course, that is idiotic.

They must have a tremendously heavily weighted idea of how long it takes to do rudiments and how arduous it is to do rudiments or they wouldn't be reserving half of next session to do the end rudiments of today's session. And then by the time they've done the beginning rudiments of tomorrow's session, of course it'll be the end of that session. And then they'll have to do the end rudiments day after tomorrow, won't they?

No, even the end rudiments are just for that session. And that's all they are for. Your middle rudiments are even more temporary than this. Your middle rudiments you might learn by experience are only for the next five items the pc is going to list. Might not even get it in for the session, see? Just for the next five items and then out they go again, see.

But there is your address to the situation. Now, we move over to the body of the session. We're going to do, in Prepchecking, something in the body of the session that is going to materially change this person's attitude toward living and is going to improve his ability to confront life in this lifetime. That is the only thing we expect to have happen, but that is plenty, man. So therefore, we're going to do anything we can do, aside run a repetitive process in the middle of Prepchecking. We're going to do anything that we can do in order to straighten out some point of askew attitude in the pc's lifetime.

Now, let's go into a theoretical look here at what an overt is. I actually never have said much about this in lectures. There's just been a little bit about it in HCOBs and so forth, but I've never really given you this piece of business here. And this – it might help you a lot.

All things are an exteriorization from and an interiorization into or an interiorization into and an exteriorization from. There is no beingness in this whole universe that is bad. Also, there is no beingness in this whole universe that is absolutely good. But there is a badness about it and there is a goodness about it. And that is the individual's ability to interiorize into or be something or exteriorize out of and not to be something. And when an individual no longer has power of choice over that fact, the individual can be considered to be aberrated on that point. Where power of choice has vanished, in the subject of exteriorization and interiorization, he to that degree is aberrated.

Now, how much do you mean power of choice? I mean, power of choice – how absolute can this power of choice be? Well, there are many ways by which you enter certain beingnesses. Let's take the beingness of an army officer. An educated career officer is expected to have had certain physical attributes by the time he got up to time to go to military school. And he's expected to have gone through certain basic schools and passed examinations, go to military school, study to be an officer, keep his nose clean, do the things, the now-I'm-supposed-to's and come up at the other end of it and he's an army officer, don't you see? He nevertheless has gone through the steps of becoming an army officer. All right.

Now, he one day says he doesn't want to be an army officer or something of the sort, something else has presented itself. He can resign from being an army officer and hardly anybody will say anything about him. That is the usual course of human events. This is not quite so with the private, is it? One day he's sitting there minding his own business at the garage and somebody gives him a letter and it says, "Greetings." Some queen or the president or somebody has said, "Hey, boy you is it. And if you ain't it within twenty-four hours, we is going to send some people over with revolvers or automatics on them and they are going to take you and bring you to this depot and are going to convert you into a soldier. Thank you very much."

So they throw him in the ranks and so forth. In the middle of the battle he says, "It's too uncomfortable here, I think I'll leave." And you know, nobody agrees with him. See, he hasn't a prayer. Probably it's that point, rather than that people get hurt, that give war a bad name. Because I don't see that getting hurt gives some activities a bad name. Look at race driving. Hardly anybody ever says anything about race driving. Sometimes in steeplechasing they say something about the horses. I never hear anybody say anything in favor of the jockeys. On the highway out here, they kill more people every year, I think, than the US lost in World War I. Pretty good. So it isn't the blood or the pain or the suffering they're objecting to, it must be something else. Yes, it is the power of choice. That power of choice, when that is too badly thrown aside, people object to this thing.

That is why slavery has gotten a bad name as a practice. In actual fact you look at the economics of it and you find a lot of things about a slave society which are quite interesting. You find a society which is – has no objection to this sort of thing and which can free slaves rather easily and you find a lot of people walking up and saying, "I want to be a slave." But slavery itself is this thing of a beingness, an enforced beingness over which an individual has no power of choice and therefore it gets a bad name.

You can almost evaluate practices and beingnesses over the idea of people with regard to their power of choice of being them and not being them. Where an individual has a fair amount of freedom we find a fairly high scale activity. This fellow has an idea – as a hobby he wants to be a dancer. He's going to take up dancing for a hobby so he's going to be a dancer. One day he gets tired of it. There's nobody going to say to him, "Oh well, Joe, you have to be a dancer. I mean, if you don't go on dancing you will be talking to Commissar Zero." You don't hear that kind of thing, you see. It's a hobby, so everybody thinks dancing is fine, don't you see. Perfectly all right to dance, perfectly all right not to dance.

Power of choice with relationship to beingness is a very interesting study all in itself. And you will find in the general put-together of life, that that is simply a surface view of an under-the-level-of-consciousness activity which is going on all the time. Now, here is the cycle – this is the reactive cycle of beingness, not-beingness, beingness:

The individual has decided to *be* this thing. And then for some reason or other he has found out he couldn't easily un-be this thing, so he has a mechanism which he uses of committing overts against this thing in order to cease to be it.

Now, he commits these overts and withholds himself from being this beingness on a repetitive cycle of action. And his overts will get worse and worse and his effort not to be it will become more and more and more violent until he gets out to the final stretch. And then after that final midpoint – the midpoint, this is the final distance he's going to get from it – after that final distance is attained, he will still commit overts, he will still have withholds from this beingness, but every new overt and withhold brings him closer to becoming the thing again. This is absolutely one of the ghastliest facts you ever wanted to investigate.

I'll go over this thing again because it's a little bit grim. This individual cannot unbecome this thing. See, it's beingness A. Whatever it is. He can't unbecome this thing by choice. For some reason or other, no matter how slight the reason is – you know, his mother loves him so he can't drop the body, he's got so many friends in the army he doesn't want to leave – we don't care what it is, see. But he'll decide that he wants to un-be this thing but he can't un-be this thing. Now, we don't care which came first, the chicken or the egg. Well, one day he made this discovery that he was in a beingness he couldn't un-be rather easily. And for some reason or other he wanted to un-be it. He just tried to postulate himself out of it and he didn't – it didn't work, you see? So he's got another mechanism that goes ahead.

Now, that understanding of that little area there is a bit rough. But let's come on to the next point which is much clearer and these things are irrevocably factual.

He will then start committing overts against this beingness. And he'll commit more and more overts – not just the beingness that he is, but any other equivalent being that is like that beingness that he is, see. And he'll go on and commit more and more overts against that beingness, have more and more withholds from that beingness and he will try to move out of being it by the cycle of overts and withholds. And he'll get out here thinkwise – there is no real space involved in it, but he'll think he is actually getting up there. He is really winning, you see. And then after that midpoint is reached every additional overt and withhold he has brings him closer to being a totally enforced beingness of that thing. And he gets into a complete overwhelm when he goes through the whole cycle.

Now, it's a complete overwhelm. He just can't un-be it, man. God. It's horrible. Because at this point he doesn't even think he has ever tried to un-be it. See, the ghastly travesty of it is that all knowingness on the subject of un-being it, now vanishes as well. He enforcedly becomes it. You might say he becomes it on an inversion.

So halfway through the game, why, he may be winning. But after that, because of the overt-motivator sequence, he will simply wind up even more thoroughly being it than ever before. That's what's the matter with overts. That's all that's the matter with them. But that is the use a thetan makes of overts. That is what a thetan is trying to do with overts. He's trying

to *un-be*. So he goes through that cycle and he eventually winds up right in the middle of the thing he's trying to *un-be*. That is the unkind fact of it all, of it all, of it all.

Now, that cycle takes place on all dynamics. Every dynamic can run that cycle. Edgar the other day had a pc uptown here, was an ex-communist. And he had the – for some reason or other he used this question, I'm not sure why, but the fellow said that "Individual Scientologists were pretty bad, but collectively, Scientology as a group, they were very good," this fellow said. And they – he got a hell of a tick on this, about Scientology as a group, so Edgar followed this down on something like, "What is Scientology?" And you know, finally, as the overts came off – he just kept picking overts off, you see, against individual Scientologists and groups and things like that. He just kept picking overts off and more overts. And all of a sudden the guy began to realize that Scientology as a group was absolutely no good, but individual Scientologists were pretty good. [laughter] See, complete volte-vis. He turned right around the other way to. In other words, we'd reversed on two dynamics. And he went out and finished it up the rest of the way.

But what a – what's more important about this, is the fact that there's communism – there's communism. See, the guy is trying desperately, absolutely desperately, to be a – separate from a group. And they just go more and more separate from the group and they get more overts on the group to be more separate from the group and more overts on the group to be separate from the group and go out here and out here. And they get to be "only one's," you see, 100 percent – climate of Russia's liable to do to almost anybody, if you've ever been there. And then overts against the group and withholds from the group and overts against the group and withholds from the group and overts against the group and withholds – they're groups. "We are a group." "The individual is no good." Which is an interiorization into the third dynamic.

See, you've got a whole nation who has practiced this, which is quite marvelous. They by the way have self-criticisms and that sort of thing. And one of our end rudiments goes out in most of these self-criticism sessions. Each one tries to brag a little more than the next one about what he has done to the group. And of course this gives a perverted alter-is on their actual overts and here we go and they just plow in even harder. If that was used right and anybody ran the end rudiments on them they'd actually be able to run themselves out of the group.

But understand they actually collectively get together and try to practice a therapy which will separate them from the group. They're instinctively, reactively, trying to get off their withholds and overts against the group. They're going mad on the subject. Every time you get a bunch of communists together why, they're supposed to get together in some basement or something of this sort and they're all supposed to sit around and say what they've done to the party. See, they're to – it's just reactive. They try to get it off. They don't know how to get it off. And it doesn't do any good. They just keep plowing into the group.

Of course after they get their overts off, then they're – the punishment is ordered. Church – some churches do that too. They say, "Eighteen paternosters and three nose blows." [laughter] That's beside the point. There is exteriorization-interiorization.

All right, there's some bird way back down the track someplace, he's been a god. This has nothing to do with any case present although almost every case sooner or later runs into the eighth dynamic. And he's been that, so he tries to unbecome one, one fine day and he finds out that he just can't do without that beautiful roast chicken smell or whatever it is that's been sacrificed to him. Anyway, whatever it is, he stops – he stops comfortably being the thing, you see. And he decides not to be it. But then there's reasons why he can't be it. And then he gets overts, overts, overts, overts. He starts committing overts, you see? And he goes out and then he all of a sudden enforcedly becomes it. Then one day you find it as the terminal or something like that. You see how that – how that cycle goes?

It doesn't matter with him whether it's the eighth or the seventh. Now, there are a lot of people around – spiritualists. And they preach about being spirits and, "my thetan is over there," you know. It's the wildest thing you ever wanted to listen to. They've got overts against spirits, overts against spirits, overts against spirits. Well, how can you unbecome yourself? Well, believe me they've managed it. They actually have managed it. And they've got overts on spirits up to a point where they're obsessively being a spirit. But of course, is the spirit there being a spirit? No, it's being some other spirit than themselves. It's quite upsetting when you finally come back and find the spirit you are being is not yourself. [laughter]

And your sixth dynamic. Of course your scientist who is splitting the atom, splitting the atom, splitting the atom. "Ashes to ashes and dust to dust, thou art dust, to dust thou shalt return." They take off from some religious background of the seventh, slide into the sixth. And they give you a philosophy of "man is from mud." And they keep on going and then they start getting overts against MEST. See, they decide they are MEST and then they decide they don't want to be MEST and then they get overts on MEST and then they get more and more and more overts on MEST and then more and more overts on MEST and you finally get so they put their hands in water and the mud runs down the drain, you know? They just become total MEST. They become a total enmested being.

Take your fifth dynamic. I one time called up the – called the insect exterminator company and told them that there were termites in the building that we had there in Phoenix. And they sent a fellow down and brother, you never saw a man look more like a bug. [laughter] His head was sort of an ant's figure-eight sort of a head and he wore his hair as though they were sort of feelers. [laughter] Man, you never saw him. And he came over. And it was a very easy job, all he had to do was shoot some poison into a few holes. And he says, "Well," he says. He looked it over very carefully and he says, "Well, I'll keep my eye on them." [laughter] You could see, you see, that just one more overt on the subject of bugs and he'd shrink in size, man. He had the form now, now all he had to get to was the size. There he had gone through that complete cycle on the fifth dynamic.

And the fourth dynamic. You very often run around up here and you get into the House of Commons or the Senate or something like that. And you're always running into some bird who's a plunged-in fourth. Everybody he meets is no good and should be shot but he's for mankind. You hear him talking you know, it's a marvelous thing to hear. And they're being this thing, "mankind." But all groups are bad and all individuals are bad and everybody's wicked and everybody's against mankind and so on. You will generally see that their structure and that sort of thing is accordant in general.

And then of course, I've already given you an example for the third.

A lot of people get stuck in a second dynamic beingness of one character or another. And boy, have a hell of a time, you see, because there's terrific rewards of one kind or another for being this second dynamic beingness, you know. But you'll see them, they're trying to pull overts on the second dynamic, you see. And they'll pull overts on the second dynamic. They – you know, big reward. They can't get out of it. They got – you know, *whoo-bang*. And of course a person can go into his own valence. God knows what that is!

You run into all this phenomena more generally in a Routine 3 process, but it nevertheless is tremendously present in Prepchecking.

Now, in Prepchecking you actually are working with the mechanisms which bring about a Routine 3 bank. These things are hand in glove. They are not separate at all. So much so that you could probably find some items by Routine 3 and then prepcheck them and do some interesting exteriorizations from them and so forth. Actually, you don't have to go that far.

It's easier to solve on your Routine 3 level than it is on many other – on any other level. In other words, what we're doing now resolves what we're doing and these individualities resolve one way or the other and unstack. All very interesting.

But remember, that the individual, if he is any one of these items, was it. And then wanted not to be it and couldn't un-be it and started using the overt-motivator sequence in order to separate himself from it. And by the overt-motivator sequence brought himself straight back into obsessively being it. And then it flies off some fine day in processing. Remember that cycle takes place.

Now, because that cycle takes place in this one lifetime, let me point out to you that the pc has a certain beingness. He also has greater or lesser connections with all dynamics. In other words, you're looking at an eight dynamic package, but the item which you are handling or trying to handle, is Joe Doakes. That's his lifetime, this lifetime. That's his name this lifetime. And your Prepcheck is actually slanted immediately and directly at trying to straighten up his obsessive efforts to un-be Joe Doakes. You see, if he could be Joe Doakes he'd cease to have trouble with Joe Doakes. The pc's name is Joe Doakes. So, if he could only un-be or be Joe Doakes fairly well, why, he'd straighten out. And a lot of things would be much happier for him.

Frankly, although you can go whole track with Prepchecking and very often find yourself slithering on the whole track, funny part of it is that if you were to locate your pc in this lifetime and hold your pc quite arduously into this lifetime and not permit him to answer any whole track, you might very well occasionally recover material which would otherwise be completely lost out of this one identity. Because the only thing you're trying to do is straighten out one identity with Prepchecking if you're trying to do anything. And of course, the more backtrack you go, you're just going on free track of other identities which are more easily and better handled by a Routine 3 process.

It isn't that you should break your pc from going backtrack and all – bust him up in business and so forth. But if the pc was flying around too much backtrack and so forth, I'd

sort of get interested in roping him down into this lifetime a little bit. I'd – I'd start spotting the years in which we were looking for something. Because you'll find that most all of these chains on this identity can be dead-ended in the pc's own lifetime. Most of them. Some of them, no. But that's the this lifetime restimulation of another lifetime. And sometimes you get across that chain and you do go backtrack. You can't make a hard and fast rule about it because this lifetime is not a pure entity. It's not a pure beingness. It's a beingness which is already tremendously colored and – by countless other beingnesses which the person has been in the past.

But you'd be surprised how much forward progress you can make by getting off the actual overts on the various dynamics in this lifetime. You can accomplish quite a bit. It's well worth accomplishing if you want to accomplish it. But in order to accomplish this fact, you have to be pretty good. And you may not be superficial. You cannot be superficial about this lifetime. You are not going to do a single thing for a pc in a hundred hours of Prepchecking, if all he sits there and does is get off the criticisms he has made of others.

Well, I'll tell you why. Criticism is the last shadow that's a total defeat. He can no longer un-be this thing, he can only criticize. He's – all he's saying to you is, "I am unhappy being Mary Lou." He's criticizing Mary Lou, criticizing Mary Lou. Well, all he's saying is, "I'm unhappy being Mary Lou, I'm unhappy being Mary Lou, she's no good and so forth. And I'm very unhappy being her."

Well, if he's so unhappy being her what did he do to her to make her an unhappy thing to be? Now, that's the question you the auditor are trying to solve.

When you say, "We're trying to get the overts off," you are simply making a mechanical statement. You actually are not. You haven't got that as your end product. Your end product is trying to find out how he, Joe Doakes, made Mary Lou such a miserable person to be. Because obviously he was being Mary Lou in this lifetime, not because he hated women. Well, he's criticizing Mary Lou. Remember, a lifetime – you live eight dynamics in one lifetime. They're stacked right up alongside of you. Any being that ever walks up, he'll at least be an atheist or an agnostic. He'll discuss each one of these dynamics in turn. He will tell you how he's no longer interested in mankind. He will tell you how he doesn't get along with groups now. But he's still – he'll still discuss very interestedly with you every single one of the eight dynamics. He's been them all this lifetime. Slithery, slidey, slippery, but nevertheless he's had something to do with each one of them.

Supposing you unplowed the fellow from the one he was most obsessively trying not to be. Then he could be that thing with freedom and it would blow up in smoke. You've returned to the individual his power of choice of beingness. And if with Prepchecking you can return an individual any power of choice on a subject of beingness or not-beingness, you of course, will get tremendous resurgence on the case.

You could go at it this crudely. This is not an advised method, but this crudely you could go at it. You could say, "Well, who don't you like this – who have – who haven't you liked lately?"

"Oh, well so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so."

You're watching your meter as he names a few of them off and one goes, *clang*. This is not an advised way of doing it, this is just a demonstration. All right, *clang*. Mary Lou. A question you want solved is, "How did you, in your estimation..." You never ask the pc this, but this is what you're trying to solve. "How would you, in your est – how did you in your estimation, make Mary Lou a perfectly horrible thing to be? How did you do this?" Well, another way of asking this is, "What have you done to Mary Lou?" you see.

So we run this chain – necessarily must be a chain because you've got to get to the first part of the cycle of Mary Lou. Therefore it's got to be a chain. One lone incident wouldn't have done it. See, so he – you run this on this cycle, you run it in and out and all of a sudden he tells you Mary Lou isn't such a bad girl, wasn't such a bad girl. His opinion of Mary Lou changes. He has said, actually in essence, "Oh, I'm willing to be or not be Mary Lou." And at that moment there's a sector of existence from which he is not retreating. Therefore his reachingness into that sector of existence is improved, his doingness of that sector of existence can now occur, because his beingness of that sector of existence has been reoriented.

There's many a girl who can't cook because she hates her mother. Well, let's just take a mother who was a good cook. Let's just ask some girl, "Can you cook?" you know.

And she says, "Oh God, no."

You say, "Could your mother cook?"

"No."

"Well, could your grandmother cook?"

"Oh God, yes."

Overts against Grandma. They obviously are there. That girl *will not cook* until you have rehabilitated the beingness of Grandmother. And you get off her overts against Grandmother and all of a sudden this girl can cook. It's amazing when you come to think about it. This person will not do anything that a beingness can do that they cannot be. Now, you talk about disabilities, they're there by the ton.

This individual says, "I'd love to paint. But I can't paint."

"Did you ever know a painter in this lifetime?"

Well, you might not hit it on the button because "painter" may be all the way down the chain. But you'd be surprised at how you could take the worry away on the subject by hitting this lifetime on Prepchecking. And you say, "Did you know anybody who could paint?"

"No, never knew anybody who could paint."

"Ah, well, good enough. Who could paint? I get a knock here. Somebody can paint."

Most people are always trying to rehabilitate their artistic things, you see. Perfectly fine. Say, "Who could paint?"

"Oh, come to remember my grandmother. My grandmother took art when she was a young girl."

"Let's see, what else could your grandmother do?"

"Oh, she was a good cook. And she was very patient."

"All right. Can you cook?"

"Oh God, no."

"Are you patient?"

"Oh, no."

See, you've done – you saw your be-not-be proposition. You found it by "do," you see. That's diagnosis by "do." And you say, "All right, let's go to town here. What have you done to your grandmother?"

That's just a test question. That's not a standard What question.

And the fellow says, "Well, I threw her downstairs. *Ha-ha-ha-ha.*"

And you check it again. It might blow on one, you know. It might. Check it again, *ha-ha-ha*, still there, you know. Get a What question. "What about making your grandmother miserable," or whatever the thing came out to be. Get it down, run the chain, knock that stuff out and lo and behold, your pc will be able to paint and cook. Magic. Because it's a zone of beingness that the pc can be.

Now, it doesn't matter a damn whether the pc – this doesn't matter whether the pc still has that person in the land of living or not. The other person may be dead. See, but it's a this-lifetime situation. You're not going any further than that with this. Because pcs, 99 and 44/100's percent of the bank, are on the backtrack, you're going to miss occasionally. This is not a hundred percent proposition. But as you look this thing over you will find time and time again that you can knock it into shape. At least it will come into shape so the person isn't walking around all the time saying, "Gee, I wish I could paint, I can't paint. Gee, I wish I could paint, I can't paint. Gee, I wish I could paint, I can't paint." There are other things he can do, you see, than walk around doing that all the time.

I call something to your attention, that the person while he's doing this is not painting and is not not painting. This person is just not. You can invest the time in other ways.

So you clean up the beingnesses. You clean up a whole stack of this life beingnesses with Prepchecking and diagnose them with doingnesses. I don't really care how you diagnose it. I wouldn't care how you got into this at all. But if you were to say to a pc – a little limited goals activity – "What have you been trying to do in this lifetime?" You're not doing a Goals Assessment, you understand. "In this lifetime what have you been trying to do? What do you wish you could have done during this lifetime?"

And the fellow says, "Oh my. Huh. I certainly wish I could have been a streetcar conductor. I would have been much better off as a streetcar conductor. They can strike, you know and they get raised wages and all that sort of thing."

And you can say, "All right. All right. Very good. Do you know anybody who was a streetcar conductor?"

"*Mmmm.* Well, my uncle Bill. *Huh*, that's funny. My uncle Bill. *Hm!*"

"All right, that's fine. Now just – we're going to prepcheck on the subject of Uncle Bill. What did you do to Uncle Bill?"

And we're going to make that first one, see, a test question and it didn't blow. So now we're going to prepcheck it, full-dress parade. And I guarantee this person will come up the other end at least not worrying about being a streetcar conductor all the time. Do you see? That's the least gain you're going to get.

But you could attack Prepchecking head-on. That's all I'm trying to tell you here. You can actually attack it head-on. Stop fishing around in the dark. Life is real. On the whole track the items might be quite evanescent, effervescent, meaningless to the individual or very meaningful. He may be full of pains and agonies or without somatics at all. These are things that the individual has laid aside and is – they've long departed, even from the bottom of the hope chest. Of course, to do that and to straighten all that out requires that the individual be straightened out on the whole track from one end to the other. You're not trying to do this with Prepchecking. Life is real, beingnesses are actual, his dreams and skills have existed, he knows about them, he can know about them, these things can be straightened out right now.

Now, nobody asks you in Prepchecking to heal an individual's leg so that he can walk again. But let me tell you, an individual is much better off being able to hobble about without pain than to be in the pain and misery he is in and not be able to walk at all, do you see? In other words, think of – think of a limited objective. We're going to improve his condition. Just going to improve it, see. We'll make it a bit better. We're not going to shoot the moon and give ourselves a lot of loses and that sort of thing. Let's find out who couldn't walk, not – not on the whole track, no, no, no, this lifetime. "Who couldn't walk? Who couldn't walk? Can't find anything? Well who didn't go anyplace? Who went everywhere? Who was a terrific runner?" You know, let's walk all the way around the edges of this thing, you see. Anything to do with walking, running, using legs.

And all of a sudden, why, we find Aunt Chrysalis. And where the hell she's been – the pc would never help us out. Because she is buried between the ages of eight and eleven and was there for three years and then died a beautiful death. And was totally crippled. And all the pc ever wanted to do was beat her head in with a club. And remembers her as "Dear Aunt Chrysalis" but doesn't remember her at all. Ah, we've walked through the whole cycle and the pc is totally being Aunt Chrysalis. And the pc never remembers himself. He never remembers what he's being because he's right in the middle of it.

You know, if you were in the middle of a subterranean vault and you didn't know where you had been taken to or how you had gotten there or where you were, somebody would say, "Where are you?" And you would say, "I don't know. It's just all dark." Take you outside and let you get a look at it and you'd say, "Well, I was in a subterranean vault." He didn't know it at the time. And because the walkingness into the situation is – was so gradually done, so smoothly done, so easily done, with overts, on this system, the individual winds up being he knows not 'ho. You never have, at the beginning of Prepchecking, Doakes in the chair before you. Doakes is at least being some other dynamic in this lifetime if there's anything wrong with him. Just in this lifetime.

All right. You could restore then, a lot of things to Doakes, providing you have actual overts. Now, the think about it is on the basis of the wish. And that is certain – just a harmonic of the beingness. He is wishing – he thinks all the time about what he'd love to do to his father or what he should have done to his father or something. See, he thinks, thinks, thinks. So he gives you the answer, "I had an unkind thought about my father." Oh, fry it, man. What's he telling you in essence? He's simply telling you, "I have been wishing I weren't my father." That is all he is saying to you. And you're going to pull this and do anything with it? You couldn't. All you're trying to do is pull his wishes not to be his father. No, you'll have to get his actions and determinations not to be his father. How do you get those? You get the system he's been using to un-be Papa. Which is a system of overts and withholds. And they're real overts.

Here's where you err in Prepchecking – is misinterpreting the wish. Because you see it's perfectly true, you recognize yourselves, instinctively – of course this person doesn't want to be this other person. And you let him get away with it all the time. You let him sit there and say, "I wish I weren't a schoolmaster." You know and, "I wish I weren't Father," and "I wish I weren't Mother," and "I..." You know – natter, natter, natter. "I criticize Mother. I had an unkind thought about Father." You let him get away with this. All they're saying is, "I wish I weren't. I wish I weren't.... "

And how are you going to make this person well? All right, this would be the same process. "All right. Now, sit there and wish you weren't... thank you. Wish you weren't Father. Thank you. Wish you weren't Mother. Thank you. Wish you weren't your schoolmaster. Thank you. Wish..." You think he'd get anything there? No, he wouldn't get anyplace. Well, he won't get anyplace with Prepchecking either because the criticism, the unkind thought, is just the wish not to be. No, you've got to hit it more head-on than that. It's got to be do, do, do, do, *done something to*. It's got to be *done something to*. And it must be something that the person didn't want to be. That's why a lot of your Prepcheck questions are as cool as ice and they get nobody off anything and they never move anybody anyplace. There's no charge on it. If there's charge on it on the meter, there is a wish not to be. Because it's a *disagreement with*.

All a meter ever registers is disagreement. Now, if this person was perfectly willing to be Papa – you said "Papa" to him. You get no charge on the meter because there's no disagreement with Papa. That could be at both ends of the scale, he's obsessively totally being Papa. But that's beyond his reality and beyond the level and scope of Prepchecking. It will take a Routine 3 process to get that far. That's buried too deep on the whole track. But these half-beingnesses, these things he can actually un-be, these things he could become again, you know. He can halfway be them, halfway un-be them, these things he worries about all the time and so forth, you can take care of those things in Prepchecking. No matter how you sneak up on this, it will register on the meter if the person can't be it.

You could look over all the present time problems of the pc. There – it's a whole index of the things he can't be, the things he's trying not to be. And what he's trying not to be the hardest is the thing he has done the most to. You get an image of the pc with sledgehammers pounding upon the chest of the thing he is trying not to be. Well, please run "sledgehammers." You're never going to un-be him with just the hope that he won't be. All right, "Hope you're not Papa. Thank you. Hope you're not Papa. Thank you. Hope you're not Papa. Thank you."

Same thing. "I thought a bad thought about my father. I regretted having such a father," so forth. Think-think-think-think-think-think-th-. Well that's going to do nothing. He's done something, man. He's put glue in the old man's shoes, you know? He's put the – poured the molasses down the drainpipe and put vinegar in the syrup pitcher. He's done things. He's gone around privately and pulled three of the spark plugs off of the V-8 engine just before Papa had to go out to carry on his professional calls, you see. He's done things, you know? He's even let some of the air out of a tire hopefully.

One pc I know of, he'd become a doctor. And he'd become a doctor apparently for only one reason: to have better access to poison so he could poison his father. And he never did anything when he went home. He did – he never went home without having several varieties and brands of poison in an effort to slip them into Papa's coffee.

But let me call something to your attention. We knew about those and he still hated his father. We hadn't changed him a bit. No, no, no. He could tell you about those, because they were only hopes, weren't they? You know, he never did even almost put any poison in the old man's coffee. He never did. He used to talk about it, think about it, dream about it, brag about it. But he never did it. What *did* he do to his father? He must have done something. And that would be your job in Prepchecking to find out what it was. And don't be so detoured by the wishfulness of it all. See. Don't run, "Wish I weren't." Run, "What did you do?" Because it's only the mechanisms of kicking the old man in the belly at the wrong time that got him into the state where he could no longer be a father, be his father and so forth.

You'd be surprised the number of things you can trace down in Prepchecking if you go about it intelligently. Talk to the pc, know your pc, do a problems – do one of these surveys – Pc Assessment Form, on a pc. Look it over. Say, where's this boy been going, you know. You learn a lot of things this way. What, what's he trying to be in life? What would he like to do? You know, think it over a little bit and look it over and say, "Wow, you know, every time I look at this, every... *Heh-heh*. I wonder. I wonder. I wonder." "How about maiden aunts? How about aunts? How about unmarried women? Yeah, that's good. That's good. Which one of these women was unmarried?"

"Oh, well, that one."

"Aunt Gertrude. Aunt Gertrude, Aunt Gertrude." There we are. All right. And here we're off to the races. Give it the one-time check, but it's going to be a waste of time. "Have you ever done anything to Aunt Gertrude? Thank you. That sure knocks. All right. Good. That one. Oh, you pulled all her hair out. All right, thank you very much. Thank you very much. All right, now let's check that over. Have you ever done anything to Aunt Gertrude? That still knocks. All right. Good enough." *Whewwwww*, here we go.

You go on down the line and you pick up that chain called Aunt Gertrude and the first thing you know, why the pc can do some of the most remarkable things. Aunt Gertrude was a piano player amongst other things. And the pc all of a sudden has some interest in music. He doesn't go start screaming every time – every time music turns on, you know? His nervousnesses and his phobias and the things he's worried about in this lifetime that don't amount really to a hill of beans, but the things that make him unhappy with the business of living, can be picked up in Prepchecking and straightened out.

And if you're very clever and adroit at this sort of thing, if you understand what I've been try – how this cycle goes and why a person does overts and what happens to him when he does too many. And that the person can never do the things of the things he – that the beingnesses he can't be, can do. When you understand those various things you can take Prepc-checking and boy, you can play it up, down, middle. You'll never get anywhere with Prepc-checking asking for thinks, criticisms, buying this sort of thing.

Don't ever limit yourself on the amount of argument you're prepared to greet the pc with when he won't tell you a doingness. If you're getting a fall on the meter on something or somebody, pc's done something to that person and never shake it otherwise. Don't let the pc sit there and hope. The pc has done something. The pc carefully put the hot-water bottle in the bed, carefully unloosened the stopper on a cold winter's night, and Aunt Gertrude got pneumonia. [laughter] Something has been done that has been done with the paws. It has not been done with the think.

As soon as you know those things, can add it up, you could actually take a pc, size him up, saying, "Well, they're having this kind of a chronic present time problem. All right. Now let's see. Now, who had that wrong with them or who did the opposite?" See, present time problem – bad foot. Always has a bad foot. All right. Somebody had a bad foot, that'd be totally obsessive beingness of the person, don't you see, and he didn't want to be. Or somebody sure used their feet. It's going to be one or the other. The other's a half-beingness sort of a thing. They sure used their feet. You want to know who had a bad foot, you want to know who used their feet. You'll eventually spot this thing down. You'll get a person a pc has not even vaguely in view. You'll have to work like a beaver trying to get this person in view. When that person is in view and you get some overts off against that person, you're at least going to get a change for the better in that foot condition. See?

If you work it right, you can do wonderful things with it. If you just sit there and let the pc drive, of course what's the pc going to tell you? He's going to tell you all the things he doesn't want to be without increasing his ability to be them and without really decreasing his ability to be them. He's not going to change his case. Because look, he's been living all these years and hasn't changed his case yet. He's complained about these people all these years just like he's complaining to them – about you in the session. See, he's telling you in the session all about this, too. Don't think he hasn't told other people. Until you get the things he hasn't talked about and the things he has done, you're going to get no change on the part of the pc. Okay?

Well, that's "body of the session." That's what you're trying to prepccheck toward and that's why. And that's why the overt-motivator sequence, no matter how unpalatable it is to some people, works. But it only works if it's used as actually an overt-withhold system. It doesn't work if used, "I wish I could perform another overt against the old man, but the son of a blankety-blank is now dead" and is unable to do so. And he's actually – really, he's saying, "Criticize, criticize, criticize, I regret, I regret, I regret. If I could only exteriorize from the old man I'd be much happier." You know that? Only the funny part of it is it's not, "exteriorized from the old man." "If I only had the ability to be this without being misemotional about it, I would be much happier." That's the equation you go on, not the equation he's going on.

So the pc is trying to drive on one road and you've got to make him drive on another. He's got to cease to fight being it and get so he can comfortably become it, at which time he will cease to be it. And very few pcs appreciate this. You say to this pc, "Now look. If you just wouldn't hate your colonel so much you'd probably get out of the army." Oh, he knows that's wrong. He knows the best way to get out of the army and that is just do *more and more and more* things to the *colonel* and also the *major* and the *captain* and the *lieutenant* and preferably the *army*, but because you can't do anything, take it out on the army equipment and sooner or later you'll make it. And sooner or later he does. He drives a jeep over the cliff and goes out of his head and picks up another body. But we're not – we're not particularly advocating that system at this particular time.

See, your pc would not really believe. He'll believe it about other people's troubles and he'll believe it in zones where he's not aberrated. But on the exact zone and area where he is aberrated he won't believe it. And therefore you have to be quite a little salesman sometimes sitting down there, see.

"Do? Do? Oh, the hell with doing something about it. I tried and tried and tried!" The pc's liable to say. "I've just beaten my mother and I've beaten my mother. I've taken hot flat-irons and laid them on the platter and tried to burn the house down. I – I – I've killed all her puppies. I – I've done everything I could do. And you know I just can't get away from her!" He'll tell you this. If he was thinking the thought all the way through he would explain it all that way.

"And you know," he says, "I still can't cook." "I can't stand to wash clothes. I have a terrible allergy, every time I smell something burning I – you know – my skin all breaks out in a rash. And so on." He'll hardly ever believe that it was from that zone and area because he's worked on that one. He himself, in person, has worked on that one very hard without any success at all. And now you, you nut, are going to come along and try to work in that same area? He knows you can't win. Why, he's been throwing radishes and carrots and baseballs and everything else he could at this particular person and he hasn't ceased to become them. And now you're going to pick all these things up and erase all his good work?

The funny part of it is when you've got all the good work erased, why the overts he's even forgotten about and are buried and are down at the end of the chain, all of a sudden go *zip*. He can cook, he doesn't have any allergies and the barking of a puppy doesn't drive him insane. How marvelous. But don't feel strange if he attributes it to something else and another part of the session.

So that's the secret behind Prepchecking. And I do want you to do it. I do want you to, to actually get a good reality on the fact that you can drive that down the right road. You can ride that bicycle. There is no point in it. It isn't just going through the drill that rides the bicycle though, it's straightening out the beingness of the pc.

Thank you.

ADMINISTRATION OF COURSES

A lecture given on 22 May 1962

Thank you.

Well, I see you're late again! [laughter] The – this is what? The twenty what?

Audience: The 22nd.

Twenty-second of May AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course first lecture. This lecture concerns administration of Academy and Saint Hill courses, which has something to do with you. Not that you may be teaching them someday, which you will, but you need this data here and now because you're in the midst – you have been in the midst of a change and you are at the end of the change but you have not entered into the solid fact.

Now, first and foremost, we ought to take up the fact of whether or not I ought to keep on lecturing to you and whether or not we just shouldn't just drop my lectures.

Audience: No. No way!

All right, that settled that. [laughter]

Female voice: Anything but that.

All right.

The data which you should have about training is that this planet, this particular oblate spheroid (is that high-toned enough?) [laughter] – Earth, you know, is not a sphere. It's always been a little bit ashamed of this fact. [laughter] Somewhere or another it got in a spin, you know, and it got its North and South Poles kind of flat and it got kind of swollen out a little bit at the equator and nobody's ever audited it. Terrible, terrible. I get on that very easily because it has something to do with my goal. Anyhow – I mean the first one up.

But this planet has actually never developed a system of education. That's the first thing which you have to face when you suddenly find yourself in the midst of trying to educate. In the first place they don't even have a definition of "education." There is *no* definition of "education." As close as there is to a science of education is found in the Logics of Scientology. Those Logics, there are about fifteen, something like that, and if you look at those you will find out that they are an outline of the whole science of education.

But there is no definition for this thing called "education." There has not been.

I worked on this some little time ago and was going to write a textbook on education and I kind of didn't bother. That's about it, because with – the outline is right there in the Logics. If you want to know what education is all about why you can put a whole science of

education together right straight out of the Logics, there they sit. It's just waiting to fill up. With this – with this one single difference.

Now, let me give you, not something you're going to quote word for word, but let me give you an understanding of what education is. Education is basically the relay of an idea, concept, a datum of some kind or another, from one being to another being. You see that in its broadest sense it is a communication, no more than that. But at the other end in education there is an insistence on receipt. So if you just take the definition of communication and then put in "insistence on receipt," you'll get education as it is normally – short. It's – that's not far enough yet, see? But it stops at that point. See, Earth education.

Look at the universities and look at these schools and people go to these schools and they take examinations and they – they have shown they receive it. They've shown they've received it, see? That's as far as it goes. And then they give them a tie. I was going to wear an old plaid gambler's tie down here tonight to show you what an "old school tie" is like – the Seaforth Highlanders or something. But I haven't been a member of them for years, so it would be – not for lifetimes actually. But that's what you get.

Now, you come into training in Scientology and you run into all of your habit patterns and expectancies, don't you see, of basic education. And they caught you young, man! They caught you young. You were there at yo' mammy's knee saying, "A, B, C, D," lifetime after lifetime, you know. And you get pretty good at it after a while. I could read in this life when I was about three and a half years old. And then I went to school and they kept insisting that I learn how to read. And you know, I never learned how to read in school. I could read, only nobody ever heard that. So there's no – ever – any backflow ever accepted in one of these things. You see, you can read, so then if anybody tries to teach you how to read and you won't learn how to read and you can read, why nobody ever finds out about that. See? So you've had it.

So, let's say we were teaching a course on how to be a rocket jockey. How to fly a Mark 14 interplanetary scout ship. See, and we're running a course on this. And we've got somebody and they had Mark 18s in their system and he knows all about flying one of these things, you know. Well, that's fine you know. Here's this, here's that and the instructor keeps saying, "Now just a minute. Hold it down now. Now, that is your circumlocutor." And the fellow says, "Yes, I know. And you pull it like this and you go like this and so forth; and it's for vertical takeoff, see. Yeah, well now, what I do want to know is, you've got a couple of dials here that were taken off the later ... ?" And the instructor says, "Now just a minute, just a minute, that's the circumlocutor." See. That guy has a hell of a time, see.

Well, this is a rough deal because there's never any guarantee that there is a backflow. See? You can never convince the instructor that you can already circumlocute a Mark 18 and you want it a little bit modified. You want to know – the only thing you're trying to find out is – what is this dial? It wasn't on a Mark 18 and they got later models, they took them off, see. "And what's this damn dial here?" You see.

You don't get that till the third year. There you are, stuck for three years. You see? This happens to you a few times and you get allergic to education.

Well, now in Scientology this is carried – although this is understood to be the case in most Earth education, it's never stated, as a matter of fact, none of this is ever stated – it's always, education is the worser for the unknowable or something. You've got the communication formula, guarantee of receipt and now in Scientology, something no medical school ever teaches, no psychiatric school ever teaches, no nobody ever – no engineering school ever teaches and God help a nuclear physicist school if they taught it – guy's got to be able to do something with it. That's the missing step in Earth education, see?

They say "Now, *hmm, hmm*. Now you sit around the amphitheater, *hmm*, now we take the scalpel, you see, and we slit open the patient's stomach like this and we pull it back and we put the sutures in the forceps and – where's my chewing gum?" You see and so on. "And then we – we take the appendix and we go *glmmp flmmp*, you see like this, *hm-hmm*, there it is, *h-hm, h-hm*. Now, on your term paper give a description of an appendectomy." So they give them a description of an appendectomy and they make the guy a doctor. And then you come along [laughs, laughter] – that's the asininity of the whole thing, you know.

Oh, sometimes they let these guys intern, puddle around, you know. But that's supposed to have something to do with it. They make some vague effort.

But the first thing you would ask in this thing that we're stressing, is, was the information there being communicated? Yes. Was there a guarantee that the information was being received by the student? Yes. Could the student then perform effectively this taught skill? So the first thing we'd ask the psychiatrist, "Can you make people sane?" "Ho-ho," the fellow said, "Well, what do you mean? I have a certificate here from the *hmm-mm-mm-hm-m*, the Washington *hmm-mm-mm*, School of Freudian Appendectomies and so forth. What do you mean, can I make people sane?" He's liable to get real mad. Also, he's liable to not understand what the hell you're talking about. He actually has never moved his understanding that extra step. And not having moved his understanding that extra step, he doesn't realize that anything is ever expected of him with this information. And there's the trouble you have with the student in teaching Scientology skills.

The guy says, "Well, I guaranteed to you that I received it. I have proved it utterly, so you communicated it, I received it and I certify that I've received it and I can pass an examination on it, so therefore I have fulfilled all the requirements of Earth education. So therefore I ought to be graduated."

And I come along and say, "Yeah, but can you make somebody sane?" you know. Aw, the hell with that, you know. I mean, that's putting it too far.

But understand that on this particular oblate spheroid in this particular Sun 12 system, that question does really not form part of the professions. Oh, it may perform something on the order of artisan work. They very seldom let anybody get out of that because they've got the bricks right in front of them. And they say, "All right, build a pier. Build a lancet-type arch," you know. If a guy's been around he can do this, so he can do this.

But professional activities are not looked on in this light at all. And also artisan skills are not looked on as teachingnesses, you see? So they've just separated, they've just gone off in all directions.

Now, you've got to realize in Scientology education, not to drag on about this, that we are trying all three of those steps. See, we're trying to commute thought here, to understanding here, to performance there. See, there's the communication, the guarantee of receipt of the communication and the performance of the skill. Now, we are in an interesting position to be able to do that because we can do interesting things. Even though you at Saint Hill are – find yourself out here on the far horizon and frontier of research and you get messed up about it every once in a while, when I find out that you can't achieve certain results, why, I'm about the first one that finds it out.

And you therefore get it all backed up right for the first step again, you see. Well, this causes you – this causes you randomness – there's no doubt about that. But you're approaching a point here where the precision with which a session can be done is not to be trifled with, frankly. We're in a type of auditing today where you – now this is a – this is a joke – where you can't miss. See, that's a joke. You can't miss in this type of auditing. There is no number four ring in the target. There is only a bull's-eye. We're in a type of thing today where you must not miss.

Now, I'll give you some kind of an idea of that. You can – you could sit down, take almost any Class I, old-time process, not open the session at all and sort of hold the guy in your – in the chair, you see, with your hand and say to him the first command of a bracket of some kind or another, some generalized bracket, you see? And go over and over this bracket just repetitively taking the bracket all the way through and repeating and getting an answer to each one. And that's all you'd have to know how to do and, what do you know. I mean, you get a large number of the people you did this to would have a tremendous resurgence. See?

Now we move up into just a little more complicated activity. And the second we go much more complicated than that we get into rudiments. And the second we get into rudiments we're in a must-not-miss area. There is *no* almost-right action in Scientology auditing. That's worth knowing. There isn't an *almost-right action*. There's no number four ring to the bull's-eye, there's only number five, the bull. One bull's-eye. You've got to hit the bull's-eye every time.

Because if you hit a near miss you have accomplished a restimulation. You are – you are handling so close in to the heart of things that if you bypass it by just that much you have restimulated the pc where he lives, man. You're – you're auditing straight into the heart and core, you see, of aberration and you mustn't miss it. It's got to be dead on.

Now, that doesn't apply so much to a Prepcheck question, see, that can be looser. Ah, it doesn't apply so much to what Zero you're using, you see, that could be looser. But boy, how you pick up a missed withhold, how you get the rudiments in, see, how you list, how you handle a list, how you get the pc out of session again – those are bull's-eyes. Every one of them has to be a bull's-eye.

Now, I'll give you an idea. More than one of you got an overwhelming reality this afternoon. And more of you are going to get an over – screaming reality tomorrow, on the fact that you missed somehow or another, a rewording of the beginning rudiments question. See? You missed on that. I'll take that up later tonight, you see. But you were not asking – you were asking, "Since the last time I audited you or since the last session, have I missed a with-

hold on you?" Well, it's already been ... Yes, yes, a lot were doing it. And there's been a bulletin out for a long time – but not solely devoted to that, you see, it's down in the second page of the bulletin – where that was changed. There was a change in Model Session. A long time ago. And it was, "Since the last time I audited you, since the last auditing session I gave you..." or whatever it was, " ... have you *done* anything that you are *withholding* from me?" Oh man, you'd say, that's not very much of a difference, you know.

Well boy, it was enough of a difference that at least two auditors, this afternoon, had the most marvelous sessions, *ho-ho-ha!* Never had such a marvelous session, because they used that right rudiment. And they got off this *tremendous* quantity of material that had gone on between sessions and before they had never touched this! In other words, we buried a datum.

I buried a datum, inadvertently, on the second page low down on a bulletin – it didn't come out as, "Model Session (comma), Change In, Urgent, Vital, Important," exclamation point, see? And we left a point where you could almost hit, see. "Oh," you'd say, "that's so close, that's number four ring of the bull's-eye. You're in the target! What are you crabbing about here?" Nothing, except it wrecked every session where you didn't use it. That's all! Because it restimulates, see? Because the pc couldn't quite wrap his mind around exactly what the auditor was asking. "See, have I missed a withhold?" "No, he hasn't missed a withhold on me." See? So "No." And it didn't register on the meter.

And all – all he'd done – all he'd done between sessions was break course regulations one to twenty-five. Hardly anything, you know. And left the session halfway through with his pc in an ARC break, you see, he hadn't done anything you know! And kicked the cat as he went out, you know. Hadn't done anything.

And sure enough, "Since the last time I audited you have I missed a withhold on you?" "No." Wouldn't register, see? And here's this whole chain of overts and the session sitting straight on top of all this confusion. You can't have a near miss on these vital points such as rudiments, whether beginning, middle or end, no matter, on the exact way you get the invalidations and missed withholds off, you know, and suppressions off things. In those zones and areas you cannot miss, you must not miss. You just – if there's any white at all between the bull's-eye and where your bullet goes, you have had it, because you've actually picked into a restimulation. You've asked a restimulative question. You haven't got the answer to it. Pc's going to go out of session.

See, you're auditing too close to dead center. You see, if you weren't auditing close to dead center, if you were just auditing generally and so forth, why, you could sit there with your feet on the mantel on the back of your neck in the armchair, you know, and move the – move one foot down to shift the tone arm once in a while, you know, with your big toe. Pc could sit there smoking cigarettes, you know, and I mean actually he'd make some gains. Class-I-type auditing without any Model Session connected with it, no withholds, no overts, nothing like this going on and so forth, well you can be sloppy as hell.

Well, you move into this next grade of auditing, with a Model Session and so forth and boy you've had it. All you have to do is just put that – just that amount of white between the bull's-eye and your bullet. Ah, you have promptly got an enturbulation that makes the vol-

canic upheavals of Kilauea look like stirring cold coffee. *Scream!* Everything will go out. See?

Did you realize it was that critical? Well it is. The moment that you move up into this type of stuff which is going to give you fast case gains.

Now therefore, a partially trained auditor is about as safe to have around as one of these human bombs. A partially trained auditor. See, this guy at HPA, lowest grade level, you know. Ah, he got results and then he doesn't know what happened. He went into this other grade and he isn't quite sure what happened but somehow or another his pcs didn't get along well. You see what he did? He moved over toward the critical target.

Inherent in that critical target is ultimate gain. There is no ultimate gain inherent at all in this sloppy, floppy, generalized session. You see, that'll only go just a little distance and everybody's happy. But you start going for broke on this, you've got to come over to the main target. And swinging from the broad horizon over onto this main target is fraught with *many* difficulties.

Now, in the understanding of that, that there is a bridging area between coming off from the sloppy, wide type of auditing over onto the very precise type of auditing, an understanding that that doesn't actually take place in a gradient, it takes place 1) broad horizon, see? "Recall something that's really real to you. Thank you." See? Just repetitive old scale processes. Goes over 2) dead center in the bull's-eye. No transition. You transverse across no horizon. At one moment you can sit there with your feet on the mantel smoking the cigar and blowing it in your pc's face and getting away with it gorgeously and then you are tapped on the shoulder and you're supposed to sit up in that chair and you're supposed to do it this, this, this and this, dead-on, absolutely perfect.

And of course, the process of making this transition is enough to make you blow your brains out. It's ghastly. In the first place the technology involved demands of you absolute perfection achieved in zero time. See, otherwise you're going to be in trouble, trouble, trouble. The gradient scale, if there is any gradient scale, is the closer the auditor gets to being dead-on the target, see, the closer he gets to being dead-on, the more trouble he is in!

Now, therefore the educational processes have to allow for this understanding and we have just – I've just been cranking up the lineup and talking to the Instructors and finding out what trouble you've been having and so forth. And we've altered the educational pattern and that's – I'm giving you now the reason why we have the educational pattern and the next one is, that you must have at least three stages for any type of Scientology training that is earnest training.

And that is represented in the three sections. These three sections are the Theory Section, the Practical Section and the Auditing Section.

Now, three sections does not mean three grades. We are so used to going into the first grade and then the second grade and the third grade that if we have three sections, we're sort of used to going into the first section, the third section, you know, in gradients. You don't do that. You're in all these three sections, in Scientology training, at the same time with this ex-

ception – that the earliest section doesn't have any Auditing Section in it. The Auditing Section is deleted.

So in the earliest lowest grade you have a no-auditing. What you have is a Theory Section and a Practical Section. And you're in that simultaneously.

Now, your upper grade, of course, from that, the second he's got – the obvious reason for this is the guy can't be permitted to audit at all, you see, until he has a little bit of theory and a little bit of practical and then he can be permitted to audit.

So you might have an Auditing Section in that which is devoted to something highly elementary or terribly simple, that combines some of that skill and which cuts in late. So you see, it's not simultaneous. You see, after he gets this item, theory, and gets it practical, and this item, theory and practical and this item, theory and practical, *then* and only then does the Auditing Section cut in, don't you see? And that would be true of all grades.

Now, let me give you a much more general idea of this. You have a checksheet. Every student has a checksheet. He has a copy of – in his own possession, but nobody counts on the student not losing it or it going adrift. So the master checksheet, the one that you really pay attention to, is in the hands of the Examiner who is also the Course Administrator and he is in charge of the Theory Section; he's the examiner of the Theory Section.

And this checksheet he has – can – is for a grade, pardon me – a class, that is a class. It's a classification. Let us say that it is Class 2A. It has three columns. And these columns are from the left to the right, theory, practical and auditing.

So we have over on the extreme left side the item to be studied – if that is an HCOB or a drill or a something or other. Now you – you understand that nearly everything you've got has both a theoretical write-up and a practical write-up. There are gaps in this at the present moment. Those gaps will rapidly be filled. But you've got then, this – like HCOB of 1st June 1960, you see – whatever it is. Maybe some notation there of what it is and then there is a little dotted – or a little bar line for the Examiner to initial for theory. And then there's next to that, to the right of that, there's another bar line for the Practical Instructor to initial and then there's another bar line as to whether or not it's been audited under the Auditing Supervisor. Very simple, hm?

Now this new principle enters in which you have not seen before and you're going to find out that at first you will think this as working a hardship upon the pc because it's going to penalize the pc auditing time. And it's going to apparently get in your road. But it's this way – we've always considered the Auditing Section to be inexorable. The Auditing Section has always been considered to be inexorable. No matter what else was going on, there was an auditing session that day and the auditor was there and the pc was there, don't you see? And that is the arbitrary which has made training difficult. That's the hidden arbitrary.

We find that the auditor in – let's take up the auditing session now – section. And the Auditing Supervisor finds out this fellow's prepchecking and he's getting – he writes the What question out as Zero, see, Zero, and then he writes the What question you see. And then he lists the various overts after that as he goes down the list, you see. And then gets maximum – maximum needle reaction so he leaves it.

And the Auditing Supervisor at this point, having inspected the fellow's folder and probably having looked in at the session, decides that this person should not be prepchecking. So he posts it as a cancellation. It becomes a cancelled session. Actually in the exact administration, is the person who is doing the folders finds these GAEs – gross auditing errors – and writes up a cancellation list. They don't – they don't just write in it everything that is wrong with this. They write some comments on it of course but if they consider it a gross auditing error, then it is simply posted on the board and the auditor would come in, in the morning, he'd find his name posted there, that means he – his – the session he gives the pc is cancelled. There is no session. They report to nothing. And they've got some time to study then. But under that it says, the item or the item numbers which must be reviewed.

In other words, the Auditing Section has the right to require a second examination by Theory and by Practical on a point that has already been passed by Theory and Practical, you see? So he says this guy doesn't know from nowhere so therefore we're not going to go on letting him butcher up a pc. We just cancel the session. But this of course gives the auditor time to look into it. That is, it gives the auditor – the session – gives him time to get his theory and practical. What we've been doing before the session went on inevitably and the fellow was auditing all day long and he was auditing wrong and he never had time to find out if he was auditing right, don't you see, or how to audit. So that's a cancelled session list. And it doesn't mean anything more than that – the session is cancelled.

Something's going wrong here and usually what had to be done again would be written there and then the Theory Supervisor can tap the student or the student actually reading that you see, his session, you know, in which he is auditor, has been cancelled and for this bulletin and that.

His first action should be to use that auditing period, no matter how he's stacked up otherwise, to just study that bulletin like mad and go in and pass it, theoretical again. So he gets a theoretical pass on the material again, and then gets a practical pass. The Practical Section takes over from that. Now the full – the checksheets have to be available to the Instructors and Supervisors in the Theoretical and Practical, and when something has been checked out theoretically it goes to Practical, don't you see?

Exactly how that administration is made up between the Theory Section and the Practical Section is pretty well up to them. But it's also up to the student. Now if he knows that he has had to pass the Prepcheck bulletin or maybe a couple of Prepcheck tapes that take up certain sequences or something, if he had to get those again, and he does get those, well he knows doggone well that he had better report to the Practical in order to get his practical because he won't get back on auditing again, until he does.

Then he goes back on auditing as soon as he's passed these two things. I think you'll find the case gains are faster. Even though it's cost people some auditing time, you'll find the general case gain is faster. That's the economy. It's because of this – you must hit the bull's-eye, you can't go in the number four ring, you see.

Now, Auditing Sections, all auditing sessions are for gain not for practice, you see.

But I received this from the technical activity in London: "Do you want Op Pro by Dup in Grade 1A, do you want Op Pro by Dup and SCS flattened or just run enough to find

out if the student can run it in the Auditing Section?" *Yaaaa, see? Haaa, weeeooo!* Imagine every HPA being partially flat on Op Pro by Dup and SCS, see?

So we mustn't regard the Auditing Section as an interchangeable Practical Section. Yeah, in the *Practical Section* you get him to do it long enough to find out if he knows how to do it. But the Auditing Section must hold up before the student at all times, that this is for blood and nobody is going to hold his hand. And if there's too much arterial bleeding thereabouts, he is simply going to be amputated from the Auditing Section, you see, and put back through Theory and Practical until he gets there. Got the idea? This will cut down the amount of "bad auditing," and so on.

Now, this will work out this way, in framing up – in framing up sessions and in posting sessions, this will mark out this way. We'll find that the person who is not giving auditing will get balanced out by not receiving any. See, that'll be a point that the person who is arranging the Auditing Section – see, the Auditing Section does the posting of the auditors and pcs. So supposing we have gotten halfway through a week and cancelled an auditor. Well, this has penalized a pc, hasn't it? Well, the net result of that, if we just started in at the beginning of next week, you see, and we kept that same team going endlessly, why we would be penalizing the pc all during the next week, see.

So it means change of auditors, but auditors become more interchangeable, oddly enough, when you have a perfection of Model Session. That's more easily done. We're trying – we're trying to hit a happy medium between not too many auditors per pc and not everybody penalized. So if the fellow is actually giving auditing, why, we give him an opportunity to receive auditing by a juggled list on the next week's posting, don't you see? He's giving auditing, he receives auditing we try to keep that rule in. It won't balance out well. You can't do it very easily or evenly with total justice, but you can attempt justice in that direction. I mean attempt to make it as equitable as possible.

For instance, you don't want somebody who is – his auditor has been off the Auditing Section for three weeks, the pc of that Auditing Section has not been off Auditing Section and has been delivering auditing for three weeks. That's kind of a situation that would develop there. We don't want that type of situation to develop, if we possibly can.

This then brings out this interesting fact, if we try to keep an equity there, we try to keep it that people who are giving auditing also receive auditing, don't you see? It will obviously push your best students up closest to the top of the barrel; in other words, it works on a principle which Scientology itself has always worked on or tried to, which is to make the more able more able.

The tremendous gain gotten in the London County Council schools when we worked on the genius student was marvelous. You never saw the like of it. Some of the data on this is absolutely staggering, but the data was never really assembled and published for the excellent reason that Scientology was used for the backwards classes. Here's Scientology being used, and of course it wiped out their backwards classes where it was used. But they thought that was marvelous, you see; Scientology is marvelous because look, it's wiping out all the backwards classes. Well, this is a tendency of man, you see. Marvelous.

But they never looked at this other fact, that when it was applied to geniuses in the school, these guys all of a sudden *really* started to fly. The amount of tremendous surge up the line in IQ and everything else which these kids got – you see, the kid would start in with an IQ maybe of 118 you see, 120 something like this and he'd wind up with an IQ of 185 or something quite staggering you know. Kid be bright as a dollar and doing Earth arithmetic in his head and marvelous, could be a surgeon. Nobody has ever paid any attention to that.

But that is a factor which would become manifest if you started using this other principle. In other words, your better auditor would get more auditing. He – and the better auditor would be doing the auditing and getting the auditing.

So therefore you disconnect the whole time schedule on training, from the schedule. Time – time has nothing to do with it. See? Whereas how fast does somebody get through these grades? Well, he gets through the grades as fast as he gets through the grades. So this then doesn't give you the exact amount of time in school, student to student to student, which is unfair anyway. But is liable to put somebody in an HPA or Saint Hill class, put them in here at – three months and he's so Clear that when he's jostled in the hall he rings like a bell, you know. And he's got all of his checksheets and everything is gorgeous and he goes home, you know. 1890 [sic], something like that, why you keep bumping into this shadow. And then somebody says that isn't a shadow, that's a student from 1962. And he just never did get up – the longest he was ever kept on an Auditing Section list was one morning – was one morning in 1975, when they just had a new Auditing Supervisor and he put him on that morning and took him off that afternoon. But at the same time you wouldn't get a case being cut to ribbons, don't you see?

Now, you can actually get a case cut to ribbons with the stuff we're doing, see, so it requires to this – this much degree, particularly at Saint Hill. Not quite as important in Academy classes because after all they're doing these broad, generalized processes. They don't swing into Model Session until they've been there for quite a while. And you've got a different – a different view.

Now, the theory is that anything a person learns he can learn to do better. But of course there is a limit to this. There's a ceiling to where a person no longer is improving because he's not doing. There's nothing more ghastly – they found this during commando troops. The commandos were invented in World War II, early World War II, and in England, and they invented these fellows in order to make a strike-back and they did. They made a couple of minor strike-backs across the channel after Dunkirk. It was quite interesting. And not very effective but at least it was an aggressive action which the British believe in militarily.

All right, the army said – this was the army commando that they were developing, you see. And the army said, "What can these commandos do that any platoon in *my* regiment can't do, *ho! ho! ho! Hoo, hoo.*" And the commandos stayed home. They were restrained thoroughly from further action until almost two years had gone by. The minor actions which they undertook were greatly impeded in the War Office. The War Office was not about to use any commandos, see?

And those poor guys – those poor guys, there was only one worry about commandos after a while, is they were so overtrained with no doingness that they were just going raw rot-

ten, that was it. They were just going to pieces. They had been trained and they had been trained and they had been trained and they had been trained, and they never got a chance to perform any of their skills. And that was the basic trouble with commandos and the basic worry about commandos was the fact they never got any doingness. It was very interesting. You'd have thought the trouble with commandos is commando casualties in any landing were 50 percent. You'd have thought that was the main trouble with commandos. Who the hell would join them? No, that wasn't the case. It was just never letting them lose their 50 percent! Such is the idiocy of man.

But the point – the point here is that you can't have practice, practice, practice with no doingness. But in Scientology training you must not have doingness with inadequate practice. So there's a happy balance, educationally.

Now, of course there are many fields of endeavor here on Earth where you couldn't permit these three steps to take place. I don't mean the three sections, but the communication thoughtwise, the fact that the fellow had received it, in other words he gives you proof that he has received it and at the far end, can actually do it in a practical way, those three sections wouldn't work on every endeavor here on Earth because look at nuclear physicist. He's being trained to blow up the planet and there's just one planet, you see, and so on.

However, we're not in that state. I want to point out to you that there are two and a half billions, plus, of *Homo sapiens* and we're not going to run out of targets this particular way. Nor is it a wasteful activity as in psychiatry. They have one case and you give a psychiatrist one case, you then have one less case. You see, it goes the other way. It's a matter of a sort of an attrition. The way they – the way they handle insanity is some way that Hitler was trying to handle the Jewish problem. I don't think that – I think that these things are a direct analogy. I don't know quite how, but true, you see. See, they were getting rid of – not insanity – they were getting rid of the insane and they – one for one, you see. Well, their supply will run out if they keep that up, you see, so that's not a – I wouldn't say that was an endeavor.

Your supply will never run out because after everybody gets Clear, of course, they'll want to be aberrated again. And [laughs] – not particularly true. But somebody – we used to gag about that, that in a couple of hundred years our biggest study will – how to get people aberrated. You have cleared everybody.

Anyway, we demand then of somebody that he get an intellectual grasp of the situation, that he can demonstrate the second one – stage – is that the intellectual, the theoretical – he has understood it to a point where he can apply it practically. And then we let him *do it* and there are your three stages, and they follow out the definition of education, as we have it.

Now, the faults of this particular system, lie in these zones. The person who is having the most difficulty passing his examination is most in need of auditing. Now, that's a – that's a flaw in the system. And he's going to have the hardest time because, of course, he's going to get the least auditing.

Now, it's very interesting. You get to living with each other and rubbing elbows with each other and – and you get on up the line, and you get variously tolerant and intolerant of each other's aberrations, and that sort of thing. What's quite interesting though, the change is gradual if – and sometimes quite spectacular – but you become somewhat conditioned to see-

ing change and you don't pay much attention to it in a unit at this particular time, and you don't notice the effect auditing does have. (I'll give an aside here – even the stinking auditing that you've been doing lately. See?) That's – unparenthesis. Anyhow – we'll have to cut that out of the tape! [laughter]

But it's this – you want to take a look at the training records, the theoretical section, records. When we went on to CCHs, we'd do nothing but CCHs at that particular time, we weren't even involved in the thing – of course, this is one of these *broad* horizon processes. You can do CCHs, standing on your head – something's going to happen. Have somebody patting walls – something's going to happen. See? No Model Session about it. We weren't using anything hardly. And I think it was a couple of weeks before I even showed you how to do two-way comm, you know, and CCHs got better after that.

But the funny part of it is, did you know that the first week you were doing CCHs here, you know that your passes went up something like about *300 percent!* You don't notice some of these things about auditing, but that's quite interesting. *Fantastic!*

Well, of course, this argues against this and shows you that there is a flaw in doing things this way because naturally if the fellow's having an awful hard time passing his theory and his practical, obviously he needs some auditing. That's obvious, isn't it? That's obvious. And the whole system from time to time of training, systems we've had in the past, have fallen to pieces because people did realize the Marxist system of training was best. He getteth auditing according to his need and giveth auditing according to his ability, you know, it's the Marxist system of taxation.

"To everyone according to his need, from everyone according to his ability to pay." And if I can just get those nuts over in America and England to put this into effect in their taxation systems, we won't have to worry about them anymore! And they're getting closer and closer to not worrying about them anymore. That's directly out of *Das Kapital*, by the way and the system of taxation adapted in the last thirty or forty years, by Western nations. Well, look, it just doesn't work. He getteth auditing according to his need. He giveth auditing according to his ability to audit. So we take all the good auditors, you see, in a training unit and we work them to death, you see, auditing all the bad auditors. And the bad auditors don't do any auditing at all, you see. And the good auditors get no auditing at all, and then because the good auditors are auditing awful cases, you see, with limited skills – they're still in the training stage, you see – they compound the number of loses they get. So they get sort of *hopeless*, you know.

We say to this fellow, "All right, now, you've learned all about skiing. We've – you've read a book here, you've passed an examination on this book about skiing. That's good. Now we've passed this examination on skiing now, and you've gotten through your practical, you've shown that you can put both skis on without falling on your face. Very good. Now there's the top of Mont Blanc. Now ski up there and ski back." *Gyaaah!* Of course, the guy says, "You know, I feel like I've had a lose." He has, too, because if all of your best auditors are auditing all of your worst students, of course they never have a chance to get a little win. They're actually being asked – it's being asked of limited, and faint little skills that you get early on, you see, to climb the whole hill, on a student who is – who's particularly rough.

So that Marxist principle does not function or work or apply in Scientology training. It can't.

Now, if the auditor has been on the books too long – it isn't the D of P, the D of T's signature on the bottom that requires that he get auditing, it's whether or not he has been for a long time on his checksheet, without ever getting over into the Auditing Section. And if he's been an awful long time on his checksheet without getting into the Auditing Section, you solve it this way. You turn him over, in a Central Organization, to the HGC. That's the way you do it in an Academy. You say, "Well son, you better go over and get 25 hours from the D of P; they have a student rate over there and that's it. Because you've been this many years here, here it is, 1972 and you've. ..." That's the way you heal this, you don't heal it according to this other ...

And the second that you do use that Marxist principle of apportionment of auditing, *ha-ha-ha*, you've had it. Because your good auditors will just be audited into a hole and the bad ones are receiving all the training, and you're just doing the same as the London County Council did.

All right. So, what do you do on a course like this? How do you – how do you straighten this out on a course like this? Well, actually there's some little basic processes, some earlier Grade processes, and what you do after a person has been on is downgrade the person's class – they never seem to be able to get onto an Auditing Section. They've been going too long without auditing. You downgrade their auditing class for an Auditing Section. You let them do something like a straight Havingness Process without rudiments or something, after – after the Auditing Section Supervisor has found what the Havingness Process is or something, you know.

In other words, you throw a kindergarten unit in there so they don't go forever without auditing. HPA/HCA, some old D of T will look with *horror* at this – read over this, a new sheet out here, the May 21st. It isn't complete either because there may also be a Class 1C in the Academy containing the upper-grade repetitive processes, which have been halfway done here in – under 1B. That's weighting 1B too heavily, so there may be another – another grade, be put in there.

But, somebody here at Saint Hill, and he'd been going forever on his theory and he wasn't passing his practical and he isn't getting in the Auditing Section, you see, he isn't getting in there at all, and that's piling up. And you look at the date – comparable dates and so forth, you can drop him down to a lower grade of auditing and of course you always have four, five, six students of that character and you can make a small auditing group on some repetitive action which will pick them up a bit and they can go through. But it will have to be this one that can shoot the broad horizon. Don't let them – let me call to your attention, don't let them do it in Model Session. You can let them have a meter on their lap, so it can hold an ashtray or something. But don't let them – don't let them fool with meter reads or something like that. Do something minor like, "the tone arm keeps moving, you keep on saying this," you get the idea. That's about as close as you can get to it. I don't mean to make nothing out of that grade because remember, we went on for years with not even repetitive processes. And

we know a lot about it now; we know at least you stop auditing when the tone arm stops moving we didn't used to know that, you know. And we've gotten smart through the years.

Anyway, that gives you a rundown on training. I think it looks rather simple to you, doesn't it? The only change that it makes as far as you're concerned is you just get – you get the grade you're studying for, on one sheet. And you will get credited everything you have passed no matter what sheet it occurs on, so don't worry about that too much. But you can expect in the very, very near future – I don't know if we'll be able to get this rolling Monday, but we will try – you can expect to see, out here on the bulletin board, your cancelled session list and so look there before you go someplace else. Don't sit there for two hours waiting for the pc to show up. He saw the cancelled session list, you see? [laughs] No, you wouldn't do that.

Anyway, that's – now the springboard of all this is, is look, we've got – we've got terrifically precise actions. It'll do tremendous things, there is no doubt about it whatsoever, but for a new articulation of it, my study of it in recent weeks has demonstrated more and more clearly to me that we cannot miss, you know. I mean, that's a nice colloquialism. We say, "Well, we just can't miss with Scientology. That's so true you know. We can't miss with Scientology, we've got to put it right through the bull's-eye." And that the more auditing we permit, which is offbeat auditing, why the longer it takes to get the cases moving.

So the techniques which you are actually using do not consume large numbers of hours. They are fast. If you handle them expertly and well, you can get very rapid results with them.

So, it's sort of on the line – as long as we don't have a grind-out – well, when we turn this fellow loose at a certain level, well, let's make sure he knows how to do it. And then he will get the gain which is inherent in that level rather rapidly, and we won't get pc damage that is going forward.

Also it winds up that you will have less – less restricted auditing space and it gives you, probably, more attention in the Auditing Section because there'll possibly be fewer auditing.

But the thing to do is, if you see your – if you see your name posted as on the cancelled session list, it means you, as the auditor, are supposed to review whatever's listed after your name, and in Theory straight away and as soon as you've done that why, in Practical, and then you go back getting a session, being given a session again.

That way we're not letting the pcs absorb all of the shock involved, with somebody asking them – as we come down the line we get to the withhold question in the beginning ruds, and they say, "Well now, let's see. Have – uh – since – uh – since I last saw you – uh – since I last saw you, have you missed a withhold on me? No, no." And I think – when we see that I think it's time we send somebody back to Model Session, rather than let the pc absorb all the shock of it.

You see our Instructors are absolutely shockproof. They can receive an unlimited amount of shock. They can get up to the hundred-billion-megaton shock, you see. So if

they're – if they're there, you see, to take all the bang, and, of course, when they can't receive it they just fall back on me, and I can so that's dead easy. Because back of me there's nothing!

So you haven't – you haven't then had all the training taken out on you. Your Theory Section is the first part of it, the communication. Your Practical Section is the demonstration that you can put it into action. And then the third part of it, you can demonstrate your absolute and complete ability to get results with it. And that sums up the purpose of the training we're doing. And I think you'll find that is much more digestible, and if anything, I probably should apologize to you for taking this long to figure it all out. But then, of course, you see, I didn't have all the mistakes you're making in order to correct, so I didn't know the right answer until just now, so I thank you for your contribution! [laughter]

Take a break.

MISSED WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on 22 May 1962

Thank you.

Lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. May the – what did you say it was?

Audience: Twenty-second.

Twenty-second. I get so mixed up on this planet's time. I don't know this planet's time at all. AD 12, English weather. [laughter]

This is a lecture on the subject of missed withholds.

Now, there's a long and involved bulletin on the subject which I haven't got in my hand, but some of you may have. And this has to do with several bulletins, amongst them HCO Bulletin of May the 24th, also HCO Bulletin of May the 21st, and HCO Bulletin of May the 22nd – last two are relatively unimportant.

Now, you are going round and round about this proposition of TRs and how you ask for this and that and exactly how you do this. And this bulletin of May the 24th talks about Q and A and there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about Q and A because there wasn't a real hot communication on what Q and A was. See, there has been a lot of talk about Q and A, but a real hot thing ...

Now it sounds like, when you read this bulletin, that I knew what Q and A was all the time. You see? And I'm talking to you as – it doesn't sound this way, but you could take it that – I was talking to you as, "You dullard, why didn't you know this?"

Well, the truth of the matter is, there is at least a third of this data – probably the most important third – was unknown. And I just recently discovered this thing. And the term Q and A fits in gorgeously if you interpret it as: questioning the pc's answer. So it really ought to be Q an A, no "d" on the "and." Question an answer.

Well, if you apply that principle "question an answer" throughout here, you get all three types. You get double questioning. Well, that's the pc says something and he gives you a reply to your question and then you question his answer. See? Well, of course, that is no acknowledgment and that is just a setup for an ARC break.

And Q and A also would be changing because the pc changes. In other words, you run a process on the pc and then the pc answers up this process – nicely and neatly – by changing, you see? And right in the middle of the change, because he's changed, you change.

In other words, you give the pc what he's giving you, you see? But you again are questioning the fact that he's changing. His response to the process is being questioned.

And then the next thing is, following the pc's instructions comes under this. Now, you've got a total reversal of the whole thing, and because the pc – obviously knows far more about his case than we do, or something of the sort, don't you see – why, therefore, it's always best, you see, to do what he says.

In other words, that Q and A hardly is the questioning of the pc. That is a Q and A of me. See? That's questioning my answers to his case. That's kind of stringing a longbow – an amusing way to put it. We've got the answers. If you know them and you can apply them, why, you'll get there. And if you keep finding holes in the line, why, we'll find some more that we didn't even know existed, but basically, an auditor must stay in control of the auditing session. There is *no* doubt about this.

Well, the way an auditor stays in control of the auditing session is to stay at cause over the session and put the pc at cause over his case. And if we don't stay at cause over the session, the pc cannot stay at cause over his case. He goes to effect. Because you see, we're raising the pc's causativeness by making the pc confront. And if we don't make the pc confront, the pc will just obey his bank and his bank says "don't confront."

Now, a full cycle of action must exist with an auditing command – a full cycle of action. And you can't have a muddy cycle of action.

Well, this puts a tremendous responsibility on the auditor to ask the right auditing question. You say, "What should I be running on you today?" You have asked a wrong question. You can't [can] ask wrong auditing questions. You can say, "Have you had a motivator lately?" [laughter] And that is a wrong auditing question.

So there are two conditions which can exist here: is a wrong auditing question and a failure to let a cycle complete itself. You can do these two things, both of them quite deadly.

Wrong auditing question: "Have I missed a withhold on you?" Now, we didn't know this was wrong a short time ago, but it is quite wrong because the pc can answer it with a motivator response. You've managed to dig that up for me. Pcs were never ambitious enough to do that for me. They just took the easy route and did what I want, but – most have found by experience that it was easier to do that.

But answering with a motivator has happened in many cases. So you mustn't ask a middle rudiments or a rudiment-type question which permits the pc to give a motivator response, because the pc is then throwing the end rudiments out.

Now, you mustn't throw your end rudiments out. This is the wrong auditing question. This is also part of the wrong auditing question. You mustn't permit the pc to throw his end rudiments out. You've got to keep his end rudiments in.

And if you look over the end rudiments, you will see there are several that can go out and if any of those end rudiments go out, the pc will go out of session. So if you ask an auditing question which permits the pc to let his end rudiments go out, you've cut your throat.

Now, let's get the middle rudiments in by throwing the end rudiments out, and then we've got a nice dog's breakfast.

Let's say, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?"

"Yes. My pc – I've been sitting here thinking how mean my pc has been to me in the last few sessions."

Oh man, you've had it because, unless – you're in for a Q and A. Now if you keep the end rudiment from going out – this is the problem you've posed yourself – to keep the end rudiment from going out, you've got to Q-and-A. You can't permit the cycle to be finished. He just got through damaging his own pc.

Now these two things have to be held in balance, don't you see? This is a real crazy one. By asking a wrong auditing question you will inevitably throw yourself into a Q and A, because you've got to question the pc's answer.

You say, "Has anybody been mean to you lately?"

And the pc says, "Oh, yes. Yes, yes. Herbie's been mean to me and Reg has been mean to me. All my fellow students have been mean to me." I'm not talking about any particular student. [laughs]

All right. You've just thrown the end rudiments wildly out. Now, suppose you correct this. Supposing you ask some equivocal thing like, "Have I missed a withhold on you?"

"Yes. I was sitting here realizing that Mike has a deep, sadistic tendency."

Ooh, you've had it here. Now what have you done, you see? You asked a question which was equivocal. The pc gives you an answer which throws the end rudiments out. Now the only way you can correct this is with a Q and A. You can't buy this answer. This is the auditor's dilemma that I am giving you here. You can't buy this answer because you've thrown the end rudiment out.

You would question the answer in any event, even if you said promptly, "In this session have you damaged anyone?"

The pc would still realize that his answer had been questioned. That's – see, the auditor's dilemma. You ask a wrong question, you will Q-and-A every time.

So you've got to ask the type of question – I'm not giving you now words – I'll give you the principle back of such wording. You must ask a type of question which makes a Q and A very unlikely. I will not use the word "impossible." [laughter]

Now, you can judge whether or not the wording of a middle rudiment or a Prepcheck question or anything else – you could judge whether or not a question you're asking the pc is right just on that formula alone. Is it one which will lead to a possibility of having to question the pc's answer? And if it is, then it is to greater or lesser degree a wrong question, because he's going to give you a response which you then must question.

You're going to have to question his answer, and then he's going to feel like he's not acknowledged, and then he's going to feel like he can't talk to you, and then he's going to go out of session. And there goes all of your beginning ruds and all the end ruds.

Now, that's where you should direct your consideration of what you are doing with the pc. You must not Q-and-A. To prevent Q and A, you must ask the right auditing question. What is a right auditing question? One that will produce an answer you do not have to challenge.

That is the perfect auditing question: a question that will produce an answer from the pc that does not have to be challenged or qualified in any way by the auditor. You mustn't question an answer.

Now, here's a perfect Q and A – in case somebody came in late and doesn't have a copy of the bulletin – here's a perfect Q and A:

We run into Joe. We say to Joe, "How are you, Joe?"

And Joe says, "Awful."

And we say, "What's wrong?"

Well that's very socially acceptable. You'll hear it up and down the highroads and byways in every language, including the Chinese and Scandinavian. Everybody does it. It's social machinery. It would be unsympathetic of us not to do it.

We ask a question. We say, "Well, have you had a good day, Bill?"

We meet Bill, you know? And Bill says, "No." Inevitably, we have to amplify the thing, see? So we say, "Well, what happened?"

That's a Q and A: That questions the pc's answer.

Correct. This is correct:

"How are you?"

"Awful."

"Good." [laughter]

When you get an answer like that, it is much more polite to say, "Thank you."

Do you know, the funny part of it is even in social concourse, the fellow will feel better if you handled it that way. He told you how he felt, so give him the cheery ack, man – the cheery ack.

All right. Now let's take the auditing question. Now here's where auditors tie themselves, not just into knots, but double carrick bends, bowlines on a bight and other unlikely cask hitches, and so forth.

We're doing rudiments. We say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes."

"Well, what is it?"

Flunk, flunk, flunk, flunk! He answered our question. So therefore there's something a little bit phony with the question. See, that question is not the perfect auditing question. Because it isn't perfect, it leads us into a Q and A.

Now the best question, of course, would [be] one which would require him to tell us. So you would have to add to it, "and if so, tell me what it is." [laughter, laughs]

You don't always run into this problem, but the proper non Q-and-A response is "Do you have a present time problem?"

Pc says, "Yes."

You say, "Thank you. I will check it on the meter."

So, therefore, the slightly offbeat question leads us into an inevitability of a Q and A because we would be prompted to say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes."

And the auditor would be prompted to say, "Yeah, well, what is it?"

Hey! Wait a minute. The guy did answer your auditing question. Your answer – I mean, question – is "Do you have a present time problem?"

You cut his comm, it'll throw him out of session; you've thrown the remaining rudiments out, don't you see?

The trick of keeping rudiments in is not throwing the others out while you're getting one in. And in view of the fact that there are more you are not working than the one you are working, [laughter] the probability of your doing this is great if you don't know this rule about the perfect auditing question and what a Q and A is.

You can throw these things out wildly if you don't. Now, auditing is of course, is what you get away with and you don't run into this *in extremis*. Most times it goes off just fine.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the fellow says, "Yes. I had a fight last night with my auditor."

Your proper response to that is, "Good," or "Thank you." The Q-and-A response would be "What about?"

And that just throws the comm straight out the window, you see, because it's an incomplete cycle; you have not bought the pc's communication; the pc will go out of session and rudiments start shedding out of the session like a white dog when you're wearing a blue suit.

There you are. You've had it, don't you see?

Now, auditors do these others such as changing because the pc changes. An auditor who does this constantly, after it's been called to his attention, just should be shot. I mean there is no other cure for it. I see them keep it up, you know? Actually, it tokens tremendous impatience. That is all.

This auditor is so anxious to do something for this pc that he's got to do it all in the next ten seconds. And therefore, he won't even run the full bracket. See, he'll do something like this. Actually, he's trying to help the pc like mad, usually. "Think of a problem you could confront. Think of a problem you could confront. Think – how are you getting along on that process? Think of a problem you could confront. Think of a prob--- how are you getting

along? Do you have problems now? You Clear yet?" [laughter] "Oh, well, we'll have to do something else. Let's see. Invent a problem. Invent a problem. That's best. How you doing? You Clear yet? Well, maybe we shouldn't be running Problems at all. Uh – let's – let's get down to something more fundamental. You used to talk about your mother an awful lot – uh – let's see. Now – uh, what has your mother done to you? Thank you. What has your mother done to you? Thank you. What has your mother done to you? Thank you. What has your mother done to you? Thank you. We don't seem to be getting anyplace here. What has your mother done to you? Ah, well, let's skip that."

Do you know auditors actually have done this? I'm not just joking on something that has never existed. You see it less commonly that way. More commonly, they will change from session to session. They won't flatten what they did in the last session because it's much better what they thought of today, you see?

So that type of thing – the auditor just simply needs training, but basically needs some confidence.

This auditor will also go off into extraordinary solutions very easily because he doesn't have any confidence in the ordinary doing anything because he's never done it.

And as far as following the pc's instructions again, you get a pc who is blasty, who is upset, who is misemotional, and so forth, and a lot of auditors just back out of it. And then they will do what the pc wants them to do. And it just about kills the pc. That's the usual source of that.

We're not worrying about that right now, however, we're worrying about this most basic and fundamental Q and A for which we do have an immediate and direct cure.

The first cure is always ask the right auditing question. The right auditing question is one which prohibits a Q and A.

There is no perfect right auditing question. You actually can get along with relatively sloppy ones like, "Do you have a present time problem?" Nobody has ever run into this so seriously on the present time problems.

"Yes," the pc says.

But it's a bad auditing question because it can be replied to so that you have to say, "Well, what is it? Heh-heh." Of course, that's a Q and A. The pc answered it, and now you pretend that the pc hasn't answered it. But the pc did answer it. Well, the pc gets the idea that he hasn't answered it, so there, if he hasn't answered it – you don't think he's answered it – then he knows what position he's in. He knows he's not in-session because the auditor didn't hear him. So therefore he must be withholding, so therefore he must be a missed withhold.

And if he's a missed withhold, then the thing for him to be is mad at the auditor. Very logical. But you'll find out that that is one hundred percent just like that. The exact mental response of one hundred percent of your pcs, no matter whether they look nice about it or look happy about it or anything else, that is the response of every pc who sits in front of you.

If you want to drive ... Take the mildest, best, goodest, most educated pc you ever had anything to do with; pc's never really been in-session; he just – sort of socially answers, re-

sponses, you see, and tries to be nice about the whole thing; and you never really get a bite on his case; and he's always sitting there in a very quiet, charming, nice – never makes any changes. You ever see this pc? Pc exists.

Take this perfect pc who never has any changes and just start this racket on this pc.

"Do you have a present time problem? Have you ever had a present time problem in your whole life? Yes, I know, but yes," you say, "Yes, I know, but have you ever had a problem in your whole life?"

The pc answers something. You say, "Well but – now look, look, look, look, listen now. In your whole life have you ever had a problem?" See?

And the pc says, "Well, yes, I – I – I had appendicitis and – and uh – and – so – so forth."

And you say, "Uh – now look, I'm talking to you. Do you have – you, see? Have – have *you*, you – right there, you know? Have you ever had a problem in your whole life? I – I want – I want you to tell me now."

And the pc, "If – I – yeah, my back's out and they gave me something."

"When are you going to tell me? Now just own up to it. A problem?" And listen, you keep up some kind of a racket like that – you could make it more flagrant than that – and do you know, you think a pc is peculiar who screams. You think this is a certain type of pc. Well, I assure you that that is not a type of pc – that's a type of auditor. Because you can drive that good pc, that perfectly educated pc, you can drive them absolutely into a screaming funk that you have just never heard the like of. You would just never dream that a human being can be that upset. And you can do it to every pc you audit.

And when this is done too much to a pc; when it's done at the wrong moments; when processes are also changed on the pc too often and when the pc is also giving auditing directions which have been accepted, and let's composite the whole thing, you see? We get somebody – all you have to do is look like you haven't received the question and thereafter the guy will start screaming – just look like you haven't heard him. You know? Be looking at the window when he speaks. You were going to come in right afterwards and say, "Yeah. All right. Thank you." you were going to do that, but you just paused for just a split second, and he saw that you were looking at the window and he'll start screaming.

"God damn you. You ought to go back to the Academy and, Jesus Christ, whoever the hell told you you were an auditor? For Christ's sake!" That's it.

In other words, you the auditor, can create that state of mind. You can create that situation much more easily than baking a birthday cake.

Now, I'm not talking now – because I myself a few times have been driven into "Christ almighty!" you know? I think poor Philip one day – I only did once – he missed fifteen or twenty. And the next thing you know, he – going like this because I had said a couple of very mean things – which of course I didn't mean – but the guy had just ... I'm not always a good pc or a bad pc, but just all of a sudden the no acknowledgment, the no acknowledgment, the no acceptance of the answer, something like that, and you sit there in amazement.

You sit back here – I've got a good reality on it and you say, "What the hell?" You know? You're saying, "For Christ's sakes, why don't you get your mind on it?" You know? And you sit back and look at yourself, "Did I say that? Huh? Was that me? Who was that? Did I hear some noise in here?" Because you're in the irresponsibility, of course, of being a pc, and you just react.

I did it to a pc, almost with malice, one time, but actually not on purpose. And that was when I learned exactly what the mechanism of it was. I had to look at exactly what had been going on. And I analyzed it and then I turned around and I did it again and brought the same response.

Now, I've taken other pcs and I can start up the same response. And then I analyze any situation where that is occurring and I find the same response. *That is it*, man.

Of course, the pc will go into apathy, go into a complete funk.

Now, there is an extreme action of questioning the pc's answer. That is the extreme response on the part of the pc to not receiving the pc's answer, because of course the pc thinks he's withholding.

And that's the whole mechanism – his replies have been missed. So therefore, he is a missed withhold. And he gets upset! Just as you'll find missed withholds works on everybody, so this mechanism will upset any pc.

But now look, look. Now listen to me very carefully. Do we have to produce the extreme state of screaming, of apathy, of making the pc ill, to have it in effect? I mean is there anything short of the extreme state? Oh, yes, yes. There is a twilight zone of in-session and out of session caused by the almost not-responded-to answer, the occasionally not-acknowledged reply by the pc. This sort of thing causes a borderline of not being out of session totally and not being in-session, but just being in a condition where all the rest of the rudiments keep going out all the time.

Everything is sort of flying out, and you're sort of keeping the pc in session, you know, just – just by gripping the table edge with your fingernails, you know? It's just barely keeping the pc in-session.

What's the answer to it? Don't Q-and-A. The pc says something – acknowledge it. Well, how can you keep from Q-and-Aing? Always ask the right auditing question. Of course, that is impossible to bat one thousand on the right auditing question, so therefore, make up your mind whether you're occasionally going to accept some nonsense from the pc, or drive the pc into an ARC break. And, actually, if you ask the wrong auditing question, you are honor bound to buy the nonsense.

But what if the nonsense throws out the end rudiments? Then you've worsened the case. Then you have to get the end rudiments in. Now, we've got some kind of a chain reaction going.

You ask the wrong auditing question; you cannot directly acknowledge the question because it isn't the kind of answer that you want or is a damaging answer to the pc, so this throws out the end rudiments. Therefore, you have to get the end rudiments in in order to get

this other rudiment in, and so forth. And then you ask this same question again, but of course, the pc gives you the wrong response which throws it – look at the chain reaction here. And that pc will not be in-session.

That is the only thing you can say about that – pc won't be in-session.

The pc will be half, three-quarters out of session all the time, all the time, all the time. Tone arm action is out and so forth. And then you have to become an absolute expert at putting middle rudiments in. Oh, you even develop systems sometimes to keep your middle rudiments in and you get very arduous. And it all stems back to the wrong auditing question in the first place, which forces you into a Q and A. You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" He says, "Yes."

You say, "Well, what about?"

What's this? You know? So you've already driven it a little bit up the wall, see? The exact right response is, "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes."

"Thank you. I will check it on the meter."

Now, for Christ's sakes, if you will pardon my French, don't ask him this again. See, if this is where we are going to get with this particular question, we had better ask a question which is far more intelligent, because there is an old, old datum that comes forward from 1950. And that is you can ask an auditing question once or twice without restimulating the pc.

You can always ask any process once or twice – even three times. But when you get up to three times, you're on the border of – now, you've got to flatten it from there on, see? Do you see what I mean?

So you can always ask a question, take the answer – it laid an egg. Well, let's sort out what would be the proper question here, now, and ask that question, get the answer to that and acknowledge it. But we'll do the pc far less damage if we do it that way. Far, far less damage if we do it that way than if we shift in midflight and Q-and-A.

"Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes."

"Well, what is it about?" Oh, God, we've had it now. We've done a Q and A. Pc will go just that far out of session. Inevitably, although he looks – he still looks the same – you don't see it, it doesn't get written on his forehead in letters of fire – he has still done it. An invariable rule because it busts up the comm formula and does a lot of other things.

All right. So how do we approach this problem? We ask a question and if it obviously is the wrong question to ask and doesn't produce the answer, we back out of the same door we went in, gracefully, by completing the cycle of action always. You're always safer to complete the cycle of action.

Now, there's several other things you could do. You could do an interim: "I am not asking you questions. I am trying to find out what the responses are on this meter," like you have to do in Prepchecking You say, "All right now. You don't have to answer any of these,

but I'm going to ask you several little What questions about this thing and see what the best reaction we get now."

"Now, well, what about stealing vehicles? What about killing girlfriends? What about – whatever it is – yeah, well, what about stealing vehicles? Thank you. I got the What question now. All right. Now let's go back to this incident which you just had there. Good."

And we just prepcheck it. You see, there's a fumble period. I suppose you couldn't dignify it any more than call it a fumble period.

You ask a middle rudiment. Here's an example.

"In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" Cheerily, cheerily, cheerily. See, very happy – perfectly legitimate. You get away with it eighty-nine percent of the time. Oh, more than that – you'll probably get away with it ninety-five and a half percent of the time, you see? And it's those other few percent there and you run into that one head-on, see?

"Yes, I've been sitting here thinking what a rotten auditor you are. And how mean all the Instructors are to me."

And now, of course, you say, "Thank you. I will check that on the meter. In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" *Clank! Whew!* Now you see, right there you've had it, see? You know you're walking through the valley of death. You're walking down the street at sunset – let me put it that way – with Black Bart in town.

This is a deadly activity in which you are involved. So you say, "All right. Thank you very much. Now have I missed a withhold on you in this session?"

"Yes. I think you're giving me a bunch of no auditing. You know, I've had twenty auditors since I've been here, and you're the rottenest of the lot." [laughter]

Damage, half-truths, untruths. See, we're just compounding this felony, see, madly. So you say, "Good. Thank you. Have I missed a withhold – in this session have I missed a withhold on you?" How far can it go?

Well, you can not only take in all the end rudiments, you can also take in all the beginning rudiments. You can get them all out. See, that's the auditor's dilemma. Well, you're asking the wrong auditing question. So it is much safer to do it this way.

Oh, yeah, inevitably you will use something like: "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" for the excellent reason it lets him tell you the "thinks" and the other things. And you don't want to prepcheck this guy and go back and find all the things he has *done* to you because he hasn't done anything really in the session.

He did something this morning that you missed in the beginning rudiments, and so forth and et cetera, *ad nauseam*. Yeah, all those things are true. But you'll ask something like this, you see? And most of the time you get away with it. So you say, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?"

"No." *Clank!*

"Thank you. I will check that on the meter. In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" *Clank!* And what are we going to do? Well, you just enter a fishing or fumble period.

That is what you do. I've been trying to work out this data to a something-or-other and I have a package question which serves as a middle rudiments. "In this session..." I won't give you this package question. You'll start writing it down. But it'd be something like this: "In this session have you withheld, invalidated or suppressed any datum about listing, or anything about listing?" Do you understand?

I'm talking about just giving you an example of a package question. And you can name each one of these things as you go by, and you'll get the *fall*, you see? And you watch for the one that falls. That's very smooth. Otherwise, you're left in a fish and fumble period.

But, I don't care how perfect you make auditing, you'll still have fish and fumble periods. You say, "Well, just – just a minute. Let me check this over on the meter. Withhold, invalidation, suppression, untruth, half-truth, impression, impress, damage, command and a wrong command – haven't answered a command – meter. Meter. In this session, have I failed to find out something you were doing about a meter?" *Clang!*

And he says, "Eh – well, yes. Ha-ha – thanks. Ha-ha, ha-ha. Yeah, haha – I'm sitting here fiddling the cans so that you – so you'd get the goal 'to have more women' because I always get such a bang out of running heh-ha – that kind of a stuff, you know?" [laughter]

And you say, "Well, thank you. Thank you very much. I'll check that on the meter. Good. In this session have you tried to influence the meter?" whatever it is. "That's clean."

In other words, there's the fish and fumble period. You actually sort of run a little assessment so you could have a package question in the middle rudiments which would run a nice assessment for you. But if it were too long, you'd get lost.

Now if you're going to have such a package question, remember you're going to have to repeat it, so it had better be fairly standardized.

I'm telling you in this lecture how you figure these things out rather than giving you a bunch of pat data, you understand?

Now, there will always be a fish and fumble period in Prepchecking as far as I can figure it out. Otherwise, for the sake of smoothness and gallantry, you're throwing away efficiency. You're just discarding the possibility of getting the right What question.

You sit there and look at Mr. Meter and you say, "All right, let me test out a few questions here. Now what about throwing baseball bats at cops? What about throwing things at cops? What about doing things to cops? That's it. That's it. What about doing things to cops?"

"Now, you were just telling me about throwing a baseball bat at a cop. All right. When was that?" See, that's a fish and fumble period.

Well frankly, doing a list and nulling it is a fish and fumble period, isn't it? Well, there is always these areas in auditing when you're trying to find something out. And the mark of a good auditor is that he goes ahead and finds these things out without throwing the rudiments wildly out.

See, now you could go at this in such a way as to throw them wildly out. I'll give you an idea: "Well, this listing isn't going very well here, because I don't think you've given it very many right items for this particular list. They don't seem to really be the kind of item that

I would expect on this list. So this is sort of – of crude here, and although we've listed 1285 items on this particular list and we only have two items on these other three lists, I – I think – I think what I'd better do is figure out some better wording for the goal we found. And see whether or not we can't get this thing more adequately worded, because this thing doesn't show a sign of blowing and we have twelve hundred and fifty items, you see, all on this one list, you see, and it shows no signs of anything happening. So I think we ought to go about it that way. And if that's all right with you, why, we'll go back to the Goals Assessment. Now, What have I done to you in this session that you are upset about? Good. Good. What was that? Yeah. Oh, I didn't do that, you know, at the beginning of the session."

Well, I think by the time you had done all that, you would have the pc ready for his – to be measured for his straightjacket. Particularly, is that type of auditing would have gradually led up with 825 withholds to the cubic withhold. That'd be very corny, wouldn't it. But the funny part of it is you can do some mighty wild, offbeat things in an auditing session if you do them very smoothly, particularly if they are in the guise of letting you find out where you're going, without giving the pc a bunch of missed withholds or making the pc withhold madly.

And the only thing you've got to avoid is committing yourself to a cycle of action you can't complete. And if you commit yourself to a cycle of action you can't complete, of course, you've had it. I'll give you the crudest, oldest example: "What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? What's the matter with you?"

See, that has committed you to a cycle you dare not complete. I'll give you another old-time process: "Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. We'll get you over being unconscious all the time. Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. What's the matter with you?"

In other words, that's committing yourself to a line of action you can't complete. Well, recognize that a question which lets the pc answer as a motivator in the middle rudiment is something you actually can't satisfactorily complete. It's all going to be astray. Something like this:

You're going to say, "In this session have I missed a withhold, on you?"

"Yes."

See, you sit there like an idiot, man.

Now, the wrong way to weight the thing is to throw it over onto a Q and A. That is always wrong, no matter what you do – it is always wrong. Let that be your guiding principle.

So you say, "Good. Thank you. I will check this on the meter. In this session have I missed a withhold on you? That's dirty as a dishrag. Thank you very much."

"Now, in this session have you been up to something I didn't latch onto?"

He says, "Yes." [laughter]

"All right. Good. Thank you. I will check the meter on that. In this session have you been up to something I didn't latch onto? That's dirty. Thank you." Let's see now.

All right. "Ah, what have you been up to that I didn't find out about?" [laughter] "Ooooooh! All right. Good. I will check that on the meter. What have you been up to that I didn't find out about? Thank you. That's clean."

See, the mistake you make is always beginning a cycle which you feel would be very unsatisfactory to complete. But the big mistake – the big mistake would be failing to complete a cycle you started.

Don't kid yourself. You're going to find yourself in an old bunch of Western tales by old Charlie Russell, the Western painter. He had an old plainsman named Bab, and Bab was talking about the time he was being chased by the Sioux Indians and he got into a canyon. And there was 10,000 Sioux came boiling in through the front of the canyon, you know filling it up to wall to wall. He kept backing up further and further into the canyon. He finally looks around over his shoulder and it's a box canyon; it's totally cleaned off. And old Bab sits back and relaxes and doesn't go on with the story until somebody prompts him and says, "Well, Bab, what the hell happened?"

"Oh," he said, "they killed me." That's where you're going to find yourself someday – back up that box canyon. There's no way out of it.

Well let me tell you. The way you never get out of it is with a Q and A. You just never get out of it with a Q and A. Ask the right auditing question, is the way to prevent Q and A.

And it's all right for you to sit there and tell me, "All right Ron, go on, invent the exact, perfect wording that always keeps us from never getting into a Q-and-A situation." I don't know. I don't speak Chinese. I couldn't invent it in Chinese, so why do you demand I invent it in English.

Now, the joke of the thing is that I can give you a good approximation; I can give you a good code situation; I can give you something that is probably completely embracive about the thing.

Well let me tell you. Someday or another, you're going to run into somebody who is doing something weird, because pcs can invent them faster than you can cure them up, man. And you had better know the principles back of the auditing command – "the perfect auditing command," (quote) (unquote) – as well as the command itself, because you'll find yourself in a situation where the perfect auditing command doesn't pull the withhold.

And you say, where am I at? Well, you're at a position where you have to develop an auditing command which does get the pc to give you whatever the pc is doing, and which gives you at once the only real mistake that you can make – which is to fail to complete the cycle of action and to do a Q and A. If you Q-and-A at that point, why, you've lost that much of the pc in the session.

Now, you don't always notice that a pc has gone out of session because they sometimes drift out of session little by little, tiny by tiny by tiny. And the total aggregate of it is, is

the guy is miles out of session, but he's gone on such a gradient scale, hardly anybody noticed.

It's like the prisoner that escaped from the jail. Just everyday they were supposed to be sitting on their bunks at the last inspection. And every night when the guard came by – this was an actual escape, by the way, from Alcatraz of all places – the prisoner was an inch closer to the door. And he gradually built it up so that the guard got so used to that, that he had a prisoner actually standing at the door at the time when the last inspection was made, do you see?

And finally, the prisoner was able to stand at the door and keep the automatic lock from going shut, opened the door and walked out and swam to San Francisco. I think they elected him mayor. Anyway ... [laughter]

A pc can drift out of session; you should know what he's drifting on. He's drifting on his feeling he cannot communicate to the auditor. That is what he's drifting out of session on. And the way to throw somebody wildly and almost permanently out of session is just lower the bars on him to prove to him conclusively and forever and aye, from there on out, that he will never be able to communicate to the auditor or he will never be able to tell any of his withholds.

You start punishing somebody for getting off their withholds and you produce this immediate and direct result. The fellow feels then he can never be audited. Why? That is – you see, you're dealing with the actual machinery of a mind. You're dealing with the actual responses of the mind. We're not playing with kid's stuff here, you see? We're not playing with psychology or psychiatry or other dirty words, you see? We're actually functioning right straight on the middle buttons of the mind. And that is communication, withholds, missing withholds, that sort of thing. And the person will stay in there and pitch, and do almost anything under the sun, moon and stars, for an auditor that he can communicate to. He'll almost take anything off of an auditor he can communicate to.

You see me run a session someday that looks awful rough to you and you wonder, "How in the name of God is that pc still in-session?" If you thought emotion, misemotion, argument, things of this character, if you thought these threw people out of session and if you thought that being kind and sweet and good as an auditor keeps somebody in-session, you should watch a good, knockdown-drag-out session, by somebody who knows better than to miss a withhold. And that is a pretty fantastic session.

I've done this, you see? I've asked an auditing question. The pc doesn't speak Chinese, the pc speaks English. I've asked an auditing question and I demand that that auditing question be answered – and go on and on demanding it be answered.

See, the pc's trying to answer some other question, and just never permit the cycle to shift in any other direction than to a perfect completion of the answer of that auditing question.

Cheer the pc up. Say, "Yes, yes, you can talk to me about any of those things. That's fine. I'm glad to hear about that. Fine." And so forth. "But I asked you if you'd ever seen a rat. And you keep talking to me about hats."

The pc will even come up scale on something like that. He'll say, "What the hell do you know? This guy listens to me. You know, he listens. That's true. I did talk to him about hats. He asked me if I'd ever seen a rat and I said – I said girls in their teens wear thick hats. I did – I said that, and he heard it. But I heard him and therefore I ought to tell him whether or not I've seen a rat. And I can tell him that because he'll listen. Proves it because he knows that I didn't answer the question."

"Yeah, I've seen a rat!"

There, that pc would be in-session, come out the other end smiling. My God, you would have thought for half an hour there was nothing but a confounded dogfight going on in the room. That was because the perfect communication cycle was always insisted upon, that the answer to the auditing question was given. But you have to be very, very smart, and hear your own questions because the pc very often answers your auditing question.

And when you don't hear that exact answer and don't realize it's an exact answer and you refute it, well, you've had it.

But by permitting him to answer something else beside the question asked, you also throw the rudiments out. And that's not a Q and A. "I'll repeat the auditing question. What have you done, done, done, done? Not what have you thought about doing. I asked you something you've done."

"Oh, oh, oh, oh yeah. You did, didn't you?" Guy listens. Good auditor.

Funny part of it is that the cycle, the completed cycle of action, must take place. The cycle of communication must occur. It must go all the way through, but only on the subject which the auditor has introduced, otherwise, it's a complete miscontrol and it isn't a response to what was asked.

So if you think you can sit there and be kind, and you say, "Well, have you ever seen any rats?"

And the pc says, "Yes, I've seen – a lot of girls wear thick hats." And you say, "Well, good." Because Ron always said that you mustn't Q-and-A and you have to accept the pc's response.

Don't be surprised if at the end of a half an hour of doing this kind of thing your pc is not in-session, because the withhold in this case you have created and the withhold is the right answer to your auditing question. Here is – this thing falls on both sides of the fence.

So therefore, there is a thing called control, there is a thing called the right answer, and so forth. So you must ask a question – this is the rest of it – you must ask a question that can be answered and then complete that cycle of action of getting that question that you asked answered. And don't buy any other answers.

And if you do that smoothly, man, pcs will just do almost anything for you, including go Clear. But you see where the tightrope walk is, is how do you keep the pc in-session while not permitting the pc to give you the wrong answer to the auditing question. Well, you have to be smart enough to know when he has given you the right answer; and when he has given you the right answer that you buy it and you don't challenge him.

And I'll say this at least once. You're going to find yourself sitting there gaping. The pc is absolutely right. He has answered the auditing question and you have developed the whole thing into a dogfight.

And you said, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc said, "Yes."

You know, that kind of a situation, but it'll be in some other guise.

You'll be prepchecking somebody and you'll say, "Well, did you ever really know your mother?" Why you asked that, God knows, you see?

And the pc says, "Well, I – actually, actually, I don't know."

Well the question is, did the pc answer the cycle? Is it part of the cycle? Is that a right answer? And you go up in smoke and then you finally look back at your question and you realize that he's given you the only possible answer he could give you under the circumstances. And that is the answer to the auditing question and you're the one who has thrown him out of session.

There is two ways, now, he can go out of session: One, is you "complete the cycle of action," (quote) (unquote), or the cycle of communication on a wrong answer, because the right answer is now a missed withhold. Or you failed to complete the cycle of action on a right answer and, of course, now the right answer is a missed withhold. Now, that is the tight-rope walk which you walk, and you should know exactly what you're doing with an auditing question.

Now, when you see a session running off the rails, when you see a session doing peculiar and odd and strange things and the pc doesn't look right with your auditing, don't look at the pc as a peculiar ape. Don't develop that. And neither develop a good communistic self-criticism. Don't develop that either.

Just look at the questions which you're asking in a session and ask it to yourself if they are answerable by this pc and if you are accepting the right answers that the pc gives you here. Just look at the whole thing on a cycle of action on a communication line. See, a cycle of communication. Is it complete? Have you asked a question? Has the pc answered the question? Have you then responded in such a way as the pc knew you answered the question? And have you straightened out what you were trying to straighten out? Well, if you've done all those things and so forth right, and the pc is getting worse, then I'll let you in on something – something very, very tremendous. It must be his environment that is caving him in.

Now, the way – the way it goes – the way it goes... What you've got to reconcile yourself to is your pc drifts out of session, something is going wrong. Yes, you're doing something that is failing to complete that communication cycle. You're doing something that appears to – a Q and A – doing something like this.

Could be in your earliest sessions the pc – that you've inherited a pc, of course, that has been mucked up with this kind of thing. And you have to straighten out the pc's communication cycle and that sort of thing. But if you have to go on straightening out a pc's communication cycle, if you have to go on patching the pc up, if you have to go on crowding him in-

session, session after session, and if you have to go on sweating blood over this pc, look at your own wording and your auditing and this lecture and you will have the answer. You'll be able to analyze it.

It's a very ordinary thing to analyze. I mean it's a very easy thing to analyze. The funny part of it is, it'll be as crazy when you finally see what you are doing as this business of "Since the last time I audited you, have I missed a withhold on you?" And it isn't quite a question, don't you see?

So that has been followed by this, that and the other thing and lifted out, and then one day, all of a sudden, you get the right question. And the right question is "Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding?"

And the pc says, "*Brrrrrrrrrrrrrrzzzzzzzzzz*," and so on and so on.

And you say, "My God, my God, my God."

Well, remember something, there is every period between session has been missed. You've walked into a lousy auditing situation then, you see? My God. Ghastly things staring you in the face. It's always going to be coming back up and should be prepchecked. So you have to prepcheck some rudiments. You see that?

Mark my words, it'll be something like that. It'll be something the auditor is doing that the pc cannot respond on and the auditor isn't finishing the cycle with or can't finish the cycle with.

And if you get that down pat, you'll be able to analyze your own auditing, you'll be able to analyze auditing in general, you'll be able to tell why pcs are improving or not improving.

Only thing TRs do is get you to improve your skill in handling these things so you're not taken by sudden surprise and so forth. So that these responses are very usual and natural. But I always think it's best to know the principles underlying these natural responses, and there are some very solid ones.

Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you. Thank you for staying over.

TV DEMO: CHECK ON "WHAT" QUESTIONS AND HAVINGNESS PROBE

An auditing demonstration given on 23 May 1962

We had an auditor given a list of five or six end rudiment-type Zero Questions to clean and every one of them was wildly alive at the end of the so-called session. Of course, the auditor is off auditing until he knows something about this.

We had this trouble last September very bad. And that trouble consisted of people not thinking it was important to clean an E-Meter or people skimping over it or people just not able to read an E-Meter. And we had all this trouble in September, and there are a whole bunch of lectures on that subject as of about that period – having to lay it in with branding irons.

Now, we're going to lay it in with branding irons this time. We're going to start the thing this way: We're going to get rudiments checked by the auditors who are auditing, at the end of pcs' sessions; and then I'm going to ask the Auditing Supervisor to get one or two of those preclears after that auditing period and check *their* rudiments; and if their rudiments are found out, we put that auditor off auditing. I think that's only fair. I don't think you have a sufficient – that is, some of you, certainly – don't have a sufficient respect for the fact that you have to be able to read an E-Meter, that the E-Meter reads the pc and that it has to be cleaned up on a question.

And frankly, I'm very happy to find out about this. I'm more than delighted, because I've been looking at some of the gray faces that are creeping up and down the hall and let me tell you, I knew there was something awry here. And I've been nattering about it and talking with Mary Sue about it, and your Instructors, for some weeks now. And, finally, we find out what it is: it's one more plague of not being able to read the E-Meter. Now, that's quite what it is. It's just a gross auditing error.

The grossest auditing error there is, is no auditing. And next to that in rank is the inability to read the E-Meter. There are auditors which actually will believe the preclear but not the meter; they think the meter is registering something else.

Now, we've got to reverse that thing. You never believe the pc; you only believe the meter. We've got to get these things clean, and we'll get some auditing results going.

Now, these results have been very poor in the last few weeks and I have been blowing my brains out trying to figure out why. And now I find out why: you're not reading E-Meters.

So there's a push on. And the demonstration tonight is – well, first and foremost – just so an Instructor in each room can call out the meter reads for you. And I want you to notice that there is some coordination between the question I ask and the pc and the meter. I know it's very hard to connect these, but there actually *is* a coordination. And you don't leave that pc, you understand, with that acting, and that's it. That's it. That is auditing. I mean, if I could lay it with a branding iron I would. But that is what you are doing. That is your gross auditing error. This is why, when you list, you are not blowing people to Clear. This is the whole story. The pcs are not in-session. The listing does no good because the rudiments are out. I mean, the whole chain of evil proceeds from that particular point.

Now, actually, the first thing I'm going to do here is simply check some old What questions. Now, the story of this particular pc is that some Prepchecking was set up and then I noticed the pc wasn't looking so good. So I had another auditor check all the What questions in order to make sure they were flat. Now, it was reported to me that all these What questions that the pc had been asked were flat. And now, I haven't gone over this, but in a nasty, evil, suspicious mood – you know, all Rons have two faces; one is good and the other is horrible; you realize that – in that nasty, suspicious mood, we are simply going to check this. This is not going to take very long.

And then, after that, I'm going to give you a demonstration of fish and fumble. That's not even a technical term, but I'm just going to show you how you fish and fumble around – what you actually can do with an E-Meter. I'm not even going to give you a very stylized demonstration of a session; it's just what you can do with an E-Meter.

E-Meters work! Every once in a while people don't think they work. And when that happens, pcs look grim and gray, and nobody goes Clear. It happened last September. It's happened again here now.

So, okay. Now, I'm in no militant mood, particularly, about this. I simply want to drive it home with cannonballs. Okay?

All right. Here we go. Have you got the right folder here?

PC: *It's me.*

LRH: Yes, yes, yes. This is the right folder. All right. All right. Sit down. Now, don't faint and don't drop through the floor, Smokey, because ... Push it forward.

PC: *How did you guess?*

LRH: Pick up the cans. Now don't worry about it, because there's nothing very bad going to happen, it's not going to

take very long, and I'm not going to reveal *everything*.

PC: [laughs] *Well, it'd be all right.*

LRH: Yes, it would be, wouldn't it?

PC: *Yeah. He said the combination of the stairs and uh ... Gosh! Are you sure you want me?*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *You know?*

LRH: You didn't believe it.

PC: *No!*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *I thought you wanted Wing. You know, sometimes you get our names mixed up.*

LRH: Yeah, I know I do. That's because he's the fire-eater, you know? I mean, he's the guy that goes to fires.

PC: *Yeah. Eat 'em up.*

LRH: Anyhow, honey, I'm not going to do this in Model Session. All I'm going to do here is simply check these What questions. And they are not very revelatory, but I want to see a few things are ...

PC: *Well, they're funny. There's one on there that's really a ball.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Wait till you see it.*

LRH: Now, your ... Well, I'll tell you the history of this.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: I looked at you many weeks ago and I said, "She isn't doing so good." you see?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: So I said, "Who's been prepchecking her?" and so forth. And then I had an auditor recheck all these What questions ...

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: ... just to make sure they were flat, you see? And then I took a look at you after he'd done so, and he said they were all flat.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: See, he said they were all flat. Yeah. I don't believe it.

PC: *Well, I didn't.*

LRH: See, I just think he wasn't reading the E-Meter.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Now, that's beside the point. But let's get back here. Here's your old CCH sessions – rattlety-bang of paper.

PC: *Yeah. They're fun.*

LRH: Yeah. You had a lot of CCHs. Now ...

PC: *Wonder if that reads a heartbeat.*

LRH: We're just – I'm just examining your folder here, honey.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: There we are. And I think here is the... here is this horrible one that you probably ... so forth.

PC: *That one.*

LRH: Not very bad.

PC: *It's not so horrible. It's just funny.*

LRH: All right, honey.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Now, all I'm going to do is just check these questions. Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *You mean I'm on there?*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *I'm on there?*

LRH: You're on there?

PC: *Yeah, I am on the meter over there?*

LRH: Oh, yeah. Your meter is functioning fine. Perfect.

PC: *That's good.*

LRH: Yeah. Working fine.

PC: *Terrible? Does it show my heartbeat? It's beating fast.*

LRH: Well, I'm not even going to try to put you at ease particularly.

PC: *No. I'm fine.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Doing all right by my window.*

LRH: The question is, "What about undressing every time you went to the bathroom?" All right. Let me check that. What about undressing every time you went to the bathroom? All right. What about catching catfish?

PC: *You're reading my mind.*

LRH: No, I'm just trying to see what the needle pattern is here. What about catching catfish? What about catching catfish? What about ... I'm banging on something here, honey; I won't be able to check these things out. Tell me what it is.

PC: *Well, I just told you. My heart was beating fast.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Oh.*

LRH: I didn't get that, huh? Was that it?

PC: *Well, I thought you did.*

LRH: All right. Now, let me ask this test question again. What about catch-

ing catfish? You're getting a little bippity-bop here on the heart all right.

PC: *Mm-hm. Well, is it – is it my eyes, too?*

LRH: But it's also my voice. No, no, no, it's not your eyes. What about your eyes? Go ahead, swing your eyeballs from the left to the right. Swing ...

PC: *Really?*

LRH: ...your eyeballs from the left to the right. All right. Swing them from the left to the right. Getting no significant read here. But there is something reading on this meter.

PC: *Oh.*

LRH: There is something ...

PC: *It must be me.*

LRH: ... reading on here. There must be some kind of a – I don't think it's you. Let's ...

PC: *I think it was checked up all right.*

LRH: Let me check this.

PC: *Um, um-um.*

LRH: Squeeze your cans.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Squeeze your cans. No, it's just your havingness is out the bottom.

PC: *Yeah, that's true. I know.*

LRH: All right. What's your Havingness Process?

PC: *Oh saints, I don't know. The last one that was used was "touching things."*

LRH: Huh? Touching things.

PC: *Touch ... Yeah. Hm-hm.*

LRH: Anybody ever run reach on you?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Hm? Well, let's see if it works. All right. Squeeze the cans. Thank you. All right. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *Oh, I can reach that chair.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *Oh, I could reach that couch.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *I could reach that picture.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The curtain.*

LRH: All right. Squeeze the cans. All right. That's doing exactly nothing

PC: *Uh-uh.*

LRH: All right. Okay?

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Put your cans down.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Touch the table. Good. Touch the chair. Good. Touch the table. Good. Touch the chair. Good. Touch the table. Good. Touch the chair. All right. Pick up the cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right. Just hold them loosely.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: That's all right.

PC: *They do kind of ... Oh, I guess I'm big.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *There, now.*

LRH: Squeeze the cans. All right. Apparently – may be doing something.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Put the cans down. All right. Touch the table. Good. Touch the chair. Good. Touch the table. Good. Touch the chair. Good. Touch the table. Good. Touch the chair. Good. All right. Pick up the cans. All right. Squeeze them. All right. Hold them down in your lap ...

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: ... just like you were before.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Now, squeeze the cans. Okay. That's not your Havingness Process either.

PC: *Well, really, one hasn't been found on me.*

LRH: You have never had a Havingness Process found?

PC: *No. Sometimes "Point out something" works fairly fine. Sometimes "Look around here and find something you could have."*

LRH: Well, what's the variation?

PC: *Sometimes they work and sometimes they don't.*

LRH: Have you ever invalidated a Havingness Process?

PC: *Uh-uh. Oh, I like them.*

LRH: Hm? All right.

PC: *Oh, there was one I didn't like.*

LRH: What one?

PC: *Uh – "Something you could confront."*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *"Something you would rather not confront. Something you could confront."*

LRH: All right. Good. Thank you.

PC: *I invalidated that one.*

LRH: All right. Thank you very much. Squeeze the cans. All right. Thank you. All right. Here's the first command. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *That camera.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you'd rather not confront.

PC: *That thing up there in the corner.*

LRH: Okay. Good. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *The fireplace.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you'd rather not confront.

PC: *Uh – the binoculars.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *That uh – sign on the door.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you'd rather not confront.

PC: *Those rings.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Squeeze the cans. Okay. Now, you've got a trick squeeze here.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Now, you just put them down in your lap ...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: ... the back of your hands in your lap.

PC: *Nm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Now squeeze them.

PC: *Okay?*

LRH: Okay. Yeah. But you know, all I want is an even pressure down and up.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: You know? Just let them go. Do it again. Mm-hm.

PC: *This okay? Hm?*

LRH: Now, just hold them naturally.

PC: *Hm-hm. My hands are kind of hot.*

LRH: That's all right. Doesn't matter.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Now, squeeze the cans. All right. Let them go. All right, that's fine. All right. What do you think about this process?

PC: *Well, it's all right.*

LRH: Well, are you just saying that? What do you think about this process?

PC: *Well, I really could confront any of them, you see, that I see.*

LRH: Oh, I see. The whole thing is a bad answer, is that right?

PC: *Yeah. It is.*

LRH: I get it. All right. In other words, you could confront any of it?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. And yet you're having to answer, so there's some missed auditing commands in that Havingness Process. Is that correct?

PC: *It's possible, yeah.*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *Because, really ...*

LRH: Possible?

PC: *...I could. Yes!*

LRH: Well, is ...

PC: *All right, it is.*

LRH: ... is it?

PC: *Yes!*

LRH: All right. Go on.

PC: *Because I could confront the things that I say I'd rather not. It's ...*

LRH: So you just had to make up answers for the "rather not"?

PC: *Hm-hm. Hm-hm.*

LRH: Well, that's very interesting. Very interesting

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: When was that?

PC: *Wow, it must have been in January.*

LRH: Quite a while ago?

PC: *Yeah. Quite a while ago. When I first got here. About ...*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *... the second or third week, I think.*

LRH: Good. All right.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Now, let's proceed with just the one side of it.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *That wall.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *You.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *Mirror.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *That chair.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *That camera.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *Curtain.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *The ashtray.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *That thing.*

LRH: All right. Now, squeeze the cans. All right. Now, something very funny happens here ...

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: ...is the needle only comes halfway back. So, do you continue to grip the cans afterwards?

PC: *Well, now this is ... My hands kind of stick, you know? They're long and uh – the hands are a little bit wet ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... and so they cling.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *See?*

LRH: I see.

PC: *And...*

LRH: I get it.

PC: *And they stay.*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *You see, they don't uh – uh – be like they were before.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *They really don't.*

LRH: All right. Put them in your lap. Now, just lay them just lay them down in your lap.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. Squeeze them. Thank you. All right. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *Uh – that thing, whatever it is.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *Uh – the whole line of shelves there.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could confront.

PC: *Uh – the top of that uh – curtain.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. Squeeze the cans. All right. That is reducing the amount of squeeze.

PC: *Hm. Really?*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *I feel better.*

LRH: Yeah, I know you probably do.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: But that's basically because you got an invalidation off, huh? Isn't it? Or is it?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: What is it?

PC: *Probably.*

LRH: Yeah. Do you feel better about that?

PC: *Yeah. Because I hadn't said that to anyone.*

LRH: All right. Good. Now let's try this other one.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: The one I started with originally.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The couch.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *That door.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The venetian blinds.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The telephone.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *Uh – folder.*

LRH: Okay. Squeeze the cans. All right. Now, have I missed a withhold on you?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Ah, what did you just think of though?

PC: *I Just thought, my God, could he have? [laughs]*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *But I think I've poured out all my ...*

LRH: Think you got all that taped, huh?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. All right. Now, this needle has become quite quiet compared to what it was. But it seems to me just a little sticky.

PC: *Oh. My goodness.*

LRH: But it's become quite quiet.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Now, have you become upset about anything?

PC: *Well, I'm always upset.*

LRH: Well, have you become upset about anything in the last minute or two?

PC: *Oh, no. Don't think so.*

LRH: What do you mean, you're always upset? Go on, finish what you were telling me.

PC: *Well – well, you see, this is on TV. And I – I feel really upset about it. But I feel better about it now. But, wow!*

LRH: It upset you?

PC: *Yes!*

LRH: All right. All right. Has anything bitten yet? Anything bitten you?

PC: *You mean here?*

LRH: The TV camera suddenly blown a fuse?

PC: *Not a thing. That's – that's what's amazing.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Well, go on now. You want to say anything more about that? How about it?

PC: *No. It – uh – it just doesn't seem like it was.*

LRH: Doesn't seem so bad.

PC: *Uh – I seem – uh-uh.*

LRH: What did you think might happen?

PC: *Well, you know, it looks different from – when you're here than it does down there.*

LRH: Doesn't it!

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Oh, I see. Maybe you're running out some of the stuff that was ...

PC: *Uh – it's possible.*

LRH: ... left.

PC: *Oh, like I would – oh, like I was afraid that you were going to have me up here last week.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *I breathed a sigh of relief I didn't even think of it this week.*

LRH: All right. You had a surprise.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Put your cans there in your lap.

PC: *In...*

LRH: Yeah. Just – don't – just hold them with your ...

PC: *All right.*

LRH: ... backs of your hands down. All right. Now, squeeze the cans. All right. We apparently are ... Do it again. Squeeze the cans. There's something real fluky here – what's happening I don't quite know what's going on, because this is not a proper can squeeze.

PC: *Uh-uh.*

LRH: It doesn't release. It simply falls and that's it.

PC: *Well, my hands do stick to the cans.*

LRH: Well now, are you giving a can squeeze because more skin touches the can? Bring your hands up here on the table. Let's see ...

PC: *Yes, I guess.*

LRH: ... what this is all about. Now, is that can fitted snugly down there?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Now, I don't want more palm against the can. I just want ...

PC: *Oh, it's nice and fitting.*

LRH: Why don't you just squeeze it between there and there. Now, we're going – I'm going to squeeze it for you.

PC: *Oh, there.*

LRH: Oh, there!

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Yes, there's something going on here. All right. There's no can squeeze there at all. You're just pushing more ... Yes. You were just pushing more – I suppose that was invisible on the meter, but ... Go on, squeeze it between there and there like I showed you. Well, how do you like ...

PC: *I didn't feel the can squeeze.*

LRH: Yeah, so that's it. But you're – what you were doing before was wrapping more hand around the can.

PC: *Hm. Could be.*

LRH: Yeah. Well, then, it wasn't releasing.

PC: *No. It just stayed.*

LRH: That's all right. But that's because the only fall we were getting on you was because more skin is touching the can. Not because of ...

PC: *I'm a terrible – uh – I'm a terrible havingness case.*

LRH: Hm? Yes. This havingness thing is fascinating here.

PC: *Mm! Fascinates me, too.*

LRH: Well, what goes on here?

PC: *Low havingness perhaps.*

LRH: Yes! This I will agree with.

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: But what's that?

PC: *Well, now ...*

LRH: What's your idea of this? Go ahead and tell me. Go on.

PC: *Well, you know, I don't have any idea of it at all. I just know that I did have a – a – a havingness thing. You see?*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *Mm-hm. And I still do.*

LRH: Hm! How do you account for this?

PC: *I haven't the faintest idea. You know, people are like that.*

LRH: You know that ... All right. All right, honey. Okay. Well, this is an activity I didn't expect to get into here. Squeeze the cans like that again.

PC: *That's what I was afraid of, too, you see?*

LRH: Yeah, but that's all right.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Squeeze the cans again. No, I mean it's a darn good thing I started checking up on this.

PC: *Why?*

LRH: Because if you'd ever had an auditor, he would have straightened it up.

PC: *Well, I've had a lot of auditors.*

LRH: I don't think so.

PC: *I've had six.*

LRH: Nobody has straightened up your Havingness Process.

PC: *Well, maybe I don't look like a havingness case. I mean, you know, I might not.*

LRH: I'm not invalidating your auditor. I wouldn't do that in a normal session. But you're not in a Model Session.

PC: *No.*

LRH: I was just slapping some people's ears. Put your cans down.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *My ears just got red.*

LRH: Come on, I wasn't slapping your ears; I was slapping their ears. Now, look-a-here. Touch your ears.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Touch the top of your head.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Touch your chest.

PC: *Ha!*

LRH: Good. Touch your stomach.

PC: *Yep.*

LRH: All right. Touch your shoulders. Good. Touch your stomach. Good. Touch the top of your head.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Good. Touch the end of your nose.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Good. Touch your stomach. Good. Touch your shoulders. All right. Thank you. Pick up the cans. All right. Squeeze them.

PC: *Better?*

LRH: Do it again. That's all right. All right. Mm-hm!

PC: *Maybe I'm not very strong.*

LRH: Oh, that's all right. I'm not going to worry about this.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: All right. Once more we're going to try out this reach thing.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: But we're going to try it out in negative.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you aren't reaching.

PC: *That door.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. Look around here and find something you aren't reaching.

PC: *I'm not reaching the window.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you aren't reaching.

PC: *Uh – that light switch.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you aren't reaching.

PC: *The ceiling.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you aren't reaching.

PC: *Oh, that weigher.*

LRH: All right. Now, how do you feel on this – for a minute?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Does that make you feel strange?

PC: *Uh – no. I just started feeling here and it's sort of echoish.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Good. Squeeze the cans. Oh, I think it's a tiny bit increased.

PC: *Oh.*

LRH: Has it annoyed you?

PC: *My space is kind of small.*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *My space is kind of small.*

LRH: All right. But has it annoyed you that these Havingness Processes were all grab-out-at-something, grab-out-at-something, or something like that?

PC: *Uh – possibly.*

LRH: Well, has it or hasn't it? Don't try to be obliging, just tell me.

PC: *Well, it was uh ... Well, sometimes things would be too far away, yes. Hm-hm.*

LRH: And you sort of felt like you couldn't reach it. Well, answer this question: Have you ever failed to answer a Havingness command?

PC: *I don't think so.*

LRH: All right. I will check that. Have you ever failed to answer a Havingness command? I'm not getting a direct response on that.

PC: *Oh, I don't think I have failed to. I might have had difficulty answering them.*

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

PC: *The last uh – time I ran uh – Notice – Notice! That was a good one....*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Uh – the auditor had me notice things that were small and close, you see? And that helped, to me.*

LRH: I see. All right. All right. Well, we got this ...

PC: *He started on a gradient scale, you know?*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It worked.*

LRH: Now, just for fun ...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: ... let's run a few more of these negative commands.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *I like them.*

LRH: Squeeze the cans. All right. Thank you. Look around here and find something you aren't reaching.

PC: *That nail.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you aren't reaching.

PC: *That rug.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you aren't reaching.

PC: *That chair.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you aren't reaching.

PC: *The top of that uh – shelf.*

LRH: Good. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right. That's reducing the can swing ...

PC: *Oh. Well ...*

LRH: ... as you could expect it to. What?

PC: *I uh – almost said I wasn't reaching you but I found out I was, so I didn't.*

LRH: All right. Okay. You suppressed ...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, let's now check out this Notice, hm?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Notice that ash-tray.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Okay. Notice that wood.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Good. Notice that telephone.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Good. Notice that ceiling.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Good. Notice that flower.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Good. Notice that necklace.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Good. Notice that E-Meter.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Good. Notice that lamp.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Good. Notice that button.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Good. Notice that pencil.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Good. Notice that pencil.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Good. Thank you. Squeeze the cans. Well, it's possibly coming up just a little bit more.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Squeeze them again. All right. All right. I don't like the reaction of that ...

PC: *I'm ruining it.*

LRH: ... process particularly. Hm?

PC: *I'm ruining the demonstration.*

LRH: Are you worried about that?
I'm not ...

PC: *A little bit, yeah.*

LRH: ... worried about that. What are you worried about it for? Well, come on, what are you worried about it for?

PC: *Well, I just – I did.*

LRH: All right. Don't worry about that. No, I'm quite interested here. I'm quite interested here. I'm looking for a bug on the subject of havingness.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: I'm looking for a bug of some kind or another ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... on the subject of havingness. Here's the way you check into one of those things, for your own information.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Have you ever failed to answer a Havingness command? I got a reaction that time.

PC: *Did you?*

LRH: You ever fail to answer a Havingness command? I got a reaction that time.

PC: *Hm. Um – I did once, but I answered it later, because I told him.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Thank you. Let me check that on the meter.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Have you ever failed to answer a Havingness command? All right. You got a rather heavily swinging needle here. I'll have to check it again. Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Have you ever failed to answer a Havingness command? All right. That's clean.

PC: *Yeah. I usually try. I – I – I like that, you see? I like the havingness Processes.*

LRH: An right.

PC: *And uh ... I don't think I've failed to answer.*

LRH: Okay. Now, have you ever failed to find a Havingness Process on a pc?

PC: *I don't think so.*

LRH: Ouhh, man, we've got a nice fall here.

PC: *It scares me though to think about it.*

LRH: Yes. We've got a nice fall here.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: I'll ask that again. Have you ever failed to find a Havingness Process on a pc? There's something here.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: That was ...

PC: *Let's see now.*

LRH: Well, what was that?

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: What's that? What are you thinking about right there? What's that?

PC: *Oh – oh, by-y-y-y golly, I got sidetracked there.*

LRH: What were you thinking about? You say you got sidetracked, but what did you think about at that point?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Come on. That's it.

PC: *I'm sure I must have.*

LRH: Must have what?

PC: *Failed ... Oh...*

LRH: Yeah, go on. Have you ...

PC: *And...*

LRH: ... ever failed to find a Havingness Process on a pc? There's something in this.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. What is it?

PC: *Well, I'm sure I did. You found it.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. I will check it.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Have you ever failed to find a Havingness Process on a pc?

PC: *Yeah, I must have.*

LRH: That's latent now.

PC: *Yeah. Well, I'm sure I did.*

LRH: You're sure you did.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Thank you. All right. Let me ask this question: What Havingness Process did you fail to find on a pc?

PC: *Goodness' sakes. Oh, it was a "Point out."*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *It was "Point out something," I think . .*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right.

PC: *... on someone.*

LRH: Thank you. Let me check that.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: What Havingness Process did you fail to find on a pc? Well, I got ...

PC: *It must have been "Point out something."*

LRH: I get a wobbly needle on that. What Havingness Process did you fail to find on a pc? I've got a reaction on that still.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Let me ask you this question ...

PC: *I uh – it was the thirty-six ones, I think.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *You know, the thirty-six Presessions.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *Yeah. That was what it was. Hm?*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right. Let me check that again. What Havingness Process did you fail to find on a pc? That's still live.

PC: *Still.*

LRH: What are you thinking about when you hit that?

PC: *Well, it – it was one where you have a can between. "Point out something."*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *That was the one.*

LRH: All right. Let me ask you this question.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: What pc did you fail to find a Havingness Process on?

PC: *I think it was my son. I don't know.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Seems like it must have been.*

LRH: There's a steep fall here.

PC: *Well, it must have been him. You know, undoubtedly.*

LRH: Why? Why undoubtedly? You don't remember this ...

PC: *Because that's the one I was thinking of.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. I'll check that.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: What pc did you fail to find a Havingness Process on? All right, that's still dirty.

PC: *Still dirty.*

LRH: Not dirty, by the way, just falling.

PC: *Oh.*

LRH: It still reacts, however.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Let me ask you the question again. Now what pc did you fail to find a Havingness Process on?

PC: *I guess that was Carl. Probably.*

LRH: Who?

PC: *Carl.*

LRH: Carl.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Let me check that. What pc did you fail to find a Havingness Process on? All right. That's clean.

PC: *No kidding. It was Carl. Hm!*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *That's true, too.*

LRH: It's true?

PC: *Yeah. That's the one.*

LRH: Hm? All right. Very good. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right. Now, let me ask something here out of my – just out of curiosity here.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: You were sort of waiting for the meter to tell you whether that was right or wrong. What was this all about? Didn't you really remember that yourself?

PC: *Not until I told it to you.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *Not Carl.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I knew there was someone, and the thirty-six Presessions and then this thing between the cans.*

LRH: All right. You do remember – you do remember doing this?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Yeah. All right.

PC: *Definitely.*

LRH: Good. All right. Let me check this once more to make sure we get out from underneath the thing.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. What pc did you fail to find a Havingness Process on? I get nothing on that now.

PC: *Mm, it was Carl.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now let's see what luck we have here.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Squeeze the cans. All right. Thank you. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *That hanger.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *Uh – the couch.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *Uh – that uh – connecting thing.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *I could reach that camera.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The camera holder.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Okay. Squeeze the cans.

PC: *Did I do it right?*

LRH: Put those backs of your hands on the table here.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Now put the backs of your hands – now, put your hands up to where I can get them here because I don't want to cover up the dial.

PC: *All right. There's my fingers.*

LRH: All right. Now just hold them relaxedly.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Man, there's certainly very little drop here, let me tell you, man. All right. Now, I'll tell you something

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: I'll tell you something. Is there something that you consistently want that you can't have?

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: Well, what is it?

PC: *Uh – a lot of motion.*

LRH: Hm? A lot of ...

PC: *Motion.*

LRH: A lot of motion.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: And you don't think you can have this?

PC: *Uh-uh.*

LRH: Well, all right. All right. Okay. I get a little reaction on this.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Is there anything else you consistently want that you can't have?

PC: *No, I don't think so.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Well, I'd like to be a – a real excellent auditor.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That I would like. But, you know, that – that I can come to in my own slow way.*

LRH: All right. Now, let me ask you this question again just to check it on the meter. Okay?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Is there anything you consistently want that you can't have? No, that's quiet now.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: It's sensitivity.

PC: *Just those two things.*

LRH: All right. I'll check it again. Is there anything you consistently want that you can't have? No, that's clean.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Okay, honey. Now, we're not going to fool with this anymore ...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: ... as a Havingness Process. But I'm going to recommend that we just do a standard job now of trying to find a Havingness Process on you. Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Because I've taken a little bit of charge off this thing. And I've now got – whether we've got havingness or not – I still got – I've got now a rather quiet needle.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: This thing was going slam-ity-slam before.

PC: *I'm not surprised.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Let me check these What questions now.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. What about undressing every time you went to the bathroom? All right. We're just doing a check on this. It's just – this thing is – there's something about this. What about it?

PC: *Well, I just think it's silly.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *You know, what an effect!*

LRH: Thank you. Let me check that again.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: What about undressing every time you went to the bathroom? All right. Thank you. That's still a little bit warm.

PC: *Is it?*

LRH: Mm-hm. All right, honey.

PC: *For goodness' sakes.*

LRH: Now, here's the next one. What about you acting rowdy? All right. That's an active question. Do you care to say anything there particularly?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Thank you, honey. Well, what about withdrawing from people? Let me check that again.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: What about withdrawing from people? All right. That's ...

PC: *That one's all right.*

LRH: Apparently nothing on it very much.

PC: *Yeah. I think I undid that one real good.*

LRH: By the way, what overt was found that caused that to be asked as a What question?

PC: *Santa Maria!*

LRH: What overt was found? This is the question: What about withdrawing from people? I want to know what overt was found that led to that question being asked.

PC: *I haven't the faintest idea at this point.*

LRH: What might it have – I get a reaction here.

PC: *Yeah, because I'm supposed to know. I mean, I ...*

LRH: Well, do you remember any overt?

PC: *No, I don't remember.*

LRH: Did you ever have an overt on this?

PC: *Oh, yeah, I must have.*

LRH: You *must* have, but did you?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: Did you ever have an overt on this?

PC: *Mm, yeah. But I can't remember it.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Thank you. All right. All right. Nothing wrong with this.

PC: *Yeah, I – I had a lot of them, really.*

LRH: You went over a lot of them with the auditor?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Mm. What was the type of overt?

PC: *God...*

LRH: Go on, what was the type of overt?

PC: *Oh, withdrawing my support and stuff like that.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Withdrawing my support and uh ... Gosh, really, I don't really remember.*

LRH: Well, is that so? All right.

PC: *Yes, sir.*

LRH: Thank you.

PC: *Yes, sir.*

LRH: Thank you.

PC: *You're welcome.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But it seemed terrible at the time, I'm sure.*

LRH: Mm-hm. All right. Okay, honey. All right, we've got "What about picking up a body?"

PC: *That's what I said at the time.*

LRH: All right. Very good. I'll check that on the meter again. What about picking up a body? Okay.

PC: *I didn't like that one.*

LRH: What about putting a body in storage?

PC: *Pretty terrible, huh?*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Pretty terrible, huh?*

LRH: Oh, pretty grim. Well, what about it?

PC: *Yeah! Just think it used to be a good way to put them in, you know?*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Save them.*

LRH: Thank you.

PC: *No problem with me right now.*

LRH: All right. All right, here's one I find. I'm not going to go over all these.

PC: *I think Mary Sue had a list of the whole bunch on the front of it.*

LRH: On the front of something here, huh?

PC: *On the very first page.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Right on the very first page there. Yes!*

LRH: All right. I'll check a couple of more of these. What about invalidating a teacher? Anything you'd care to say?

PC: *Mm. Well, I only did it a couple of times.*

LRH: All right. Good. Now I'll ask that again. What about invalidating a teacher?

I'm not going to check any more: They're all hot, every one of them.

PC: *Good heavens.*

LRH: All right, honey. We'll arrange to get something flattened on here. Okay?

PC: *Except me.*

LRH: What about except you?

PC: *We'll not flatten me.*
[laughs]

LRH: Horrible remark.

PC: *I know.*

LRH: All right, honey. You don't want to be flattened, huh?

PC: *Uh-uh.*

LRH: That's a bad one, huh?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. All right. Now, the only thing I'm going to put down here is "1. Find this pc's Hav Process and use it." And "2. Flatten all What questions on list." And "3. Withdraw both former auditors from auditing." There we are.

PC: *But I had six of them.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *I had six of them!*

LRH: Good. It's just the last two. Just the last two. Okay?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Because when I tell somebody to get something done, then I expect it to get done.

PC: *Yes, sir.*

LRH: I found a gross auditing error here in auditing a pc without a Havingness Process. Now, I try not to invalidate your auditors: I'm not interested in invalidating them or not. All I'm interested in is, one day I walk out in the hall and I see a girl I like, called Smokey, and she is look-

ing like she has just been dragged in by the cat, Sambo.

PC: *Didn't, though?*

LRH: Yes. And so I says, "Well now, we'll check into this." So I said, "Well, the person has had a lot of What questions run, and we'll get these checked over." They were announced to me as being clear and clean and null: they're all hotter than a pistol.

PC: Mm.

LRH: Great? Furthermore, they're not very intelligent What questions. But that's all right; that's beside the point.

PC: *I had fun with some of them.*

LRH: Sure, I know you did. But those things can be cleaned.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: So I made up my mind that the cycle of action which I began ...

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: ... on straightening you up would be finished. I found two gross auditing errors here: one of them is auditing a pc without a Hav Process, and the other one is not flattening the questions. That was all I was looking for.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I think I just fool people, you know?*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *I think I do fool people. You know, I don't usually – you know, it takes a lot to run me down.*

LRH: All right, honey. As far as fooling people is concerned, you can't fool a meter.

PC: *Oh, I don't try to.*

LRH: I know you don't.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: No, it's just technical.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: What are you trying to do, take responsibility for this? Perfectly all right with me if you do.

PC: *Oh, of course!*

LRH: All right. Go ahead and take responsibility for it.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: That's all right.

PC: *That's better.*

LRH: All right. Now, have I missed a withhold on you? Thank you. That's clear.

PC: *I know.*

LRH: What were you thinking about?

PC: *Naturally it's clear!*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *Naturally it's clear.*

LRH: All right. Now, is there anything you care to ask or say before I end this?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Not a thing.*

LRH: Anything you care to ask or say before I end it?

PC: *Well, just say "thank you," of course.*

LRH: All right, honey. Now, I got a little dirty – instant dirty needle there.

PC: *Well – uh – well, that's my secret.*

LRH: What's your secret?

PC: *You see, I have hot flushes sometimes.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *Age, you know.*

LRH: Yeah. Yeah.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *So it – it gets a little dirty needle at times ...*

LRH: All right, honey.

PC: *... on that one thing.*

LRH: Okay. Let me ask this again. Is there anything you care to ask or say before I end this checkover?

PC: *No. Don't think so.*

LRH: All right. Think of anything else? Little something there?

PC: *Uh – well, I appreciate your finding uh – that the havingness is out, because I do think I need it.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Hm, all right. All right. Good enough.

All right. I'm going to check this one question on the meter here.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Is there anything you care to ask or say before I end this checkover? Thank you. That is clear.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right, honey. Thank you very much.

PC: *All right. Thank you.*

LRH: Put down the cans. You can go to – back downstairs and give the Instructor this.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Thank you.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Okay.

TV DEMO: FISH & FUMBLE CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES

An auditing demonstration given on 23 May 1962

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

PC: *Okay.*

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

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

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Hm.*

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

PC: *Hm.*

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

PC: *Great.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah. Not really.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Start of session.

PC: *Okay.*

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

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

LRH: All right.

PC: *The last few nights. And to*

...

LRH: Good.

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

LRH: Okay. All right. Any other goals?

PC: *That ought to do it.*

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

PC: *I'd like to – well, I have a goal: it's – it's – it's an imp – almost im-*

possible goal, but maybe it's possible, you know?

LRH: Yeah?

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

LRH: All right. Anything else?

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

LRH: All right.

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

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

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

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

PC: *Well, I – I – I – I got an overt against Robin, I guess.*

LRH: Okay.

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

LRH: Yeah.

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

LRH: Hm.

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

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: Okay.

PC: *It was.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Well, it's uh – I uh ...*

LRH: That's it.

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

LRH: Yeah.

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

LRH: Hm-mm.

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

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: *I have to check in ...*

LRH: Hm.

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

LRH: Hm.

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

LRH: Hm.

PC: *... but I – I – I don't think so.*

LRH: Mm-mm.

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

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: That's it.

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

LRH: All right. Okay.

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

LRH: Yeah.

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

LRH: Okay.

PC: *... but not about that party.*

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

PC: *Yep.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

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

PC: [laughs] *Well...*

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

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

LRH: Uh-huh.

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

LRH: Well, that, you know ...

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

LRH: Yeah?

PC: *... You know?*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Something – messing with little girls ...*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Ha-ha, ha-ha!

PC: *Uhh.*

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

PC: *No.*

LRH: Something about messing with little girls.

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *No.*

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

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

LRH: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

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

LRH: That's right.

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

LRH: There it is again.

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

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Is that it, or ...*

LRH: Yeah.

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

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

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

LRH: Something here about messing with little girls in the nose of a rocket ship?

PC: *I – that's what the – I looked at that, and there was something connected there or someplace; I don't know why.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *But, you see, it ...*

LRH: Yeah.

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

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

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

LRH: That's it.

PC: *... those two twins.*

LRH: Uh-huh.

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

LRH: Uh-uh.

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

LRH: That's it.

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

LRH: And we were going down that chain.

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

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

PC: *Hm.*

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

PC: *Is it?*

LRH: I get a tinier, smaller read.

PC: *Yeah.*

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

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

LRH: Yeah.

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

LRH: Well, that doesn't matter.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: What was that? The ...

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

LRH: Hm.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... in – in the yard of this ...*

LRH: Right.

PC: *... place with ...*

LRH: Right.

PC: *... a stream going by or*

something like that.

LRH: Right.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Let me check another little What here.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: What about punishing little girls? Clean.

PC: *Hm.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: There – what's that?

PC: *Switching little girls.*

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

PC: *Eating little girls?*

LRH: Beating little girls?

PC: *Beating or eating?*

LRH: Eating?

PC: *Eating little girls.*

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

PC: *Hm.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: See, and I was ...

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

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

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

LRH: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

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

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: Hm-mm.

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

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

PC: *I – I – I.*

LRH: ... a burner ...

PC: *Yeah, to burn off the whole planet.*

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

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

LRH: Yeah.

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

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

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

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

PC: *Yeah. Huh!*

LRH: We did.

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

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

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

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

PC: *Hm.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. What auditor was that?

PC: *Think it was Stan.*

LRH: Who?

PC: *Stan Stromfeld.*

LRH: Yeah?

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

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

PC: *No?*

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

PC: *I'll be darned.*

LRH: Somebody earlier than that?

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

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

PC: *... who it was. Raping – past lives and ...*

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

PC: *Denise?*

LRH: Yeah. There it is. Microscopically smaller.

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

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

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

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

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

PC: *Hm.*

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

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

LRH: All right. Was it Jack Campbell?

PC: *Maybe it was.*

LRH: All right. Was that auditor Jack Campbell?

PC: *Yeah, I guess it was.*

LRH: There's something here about it now.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: I'm gettin ...

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

LRH: Yeah.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

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

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

LRH: All right. You remember this now?

PC: *Yeah, yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Undoubtedly! [laughs] No doubt.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah, I think he did.*

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

PC: *Yeah. [laughs]*

LRH: All right. Now ...

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

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

PC: *All right. Ooh.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *There must be something there? Line charge? Or something. [chuckles]*

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

PC: *All right.*

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

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

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

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

PC: *The action of withholding from him?*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Uh...*

LRH: I get a tick.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: Hm.

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

LRH: Hm.

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

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: Well, tell me this now. Good. Tell me this now: Was that – the question we're on is doing something to him. Now, what specifically did you do to

him there?

PC: *I kind of conned him into – I conned him into giving me the course for nothing. You know?*

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

PC: *Yeah. After – yeah ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... after a fashion.*

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

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

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah. That's a good What question. Very good.*

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

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

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

PC: *Summer of 1958.*

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

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

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

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

LRH: All right.

PC: *... to pay for it.*

LRH: Very good. And who didn't find out about that?

PC: *Well, Jack didn't. I – I – I – the fact I could have gotten the money someplace to pay for it, I think.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *You know.*

LRH: Very, very good. Okay. When was that? Very specifically.

PC: *July of – gee, the Moscow Art Theatre was in town.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I think it was the end of June. I think it was the end of June. End of June in 1958.*

LRH: All right. Good. And what else is there about this?

PC: *Well, I – I – I – I went on and took the course, and conned him again into giving me the HPA Course without paying for it over there.*

LRH: All right. Okay. And what didn't appear there?

PC: *Fifty thousand francs for the HPA Course.*

LRH: Oh-ho-ho, I see.

PC: *Still hasn't appeared.*

LRH: All right. And who didn't find out about that?

PC: *Well, the – the people who I owed money to didn't find out that I was spending more money or, you know ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... putting myself into more debt ...*

LRH: I see.

PC: *... in a sense.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Kind of a little bit of an overt against them. Very funny.*

LRH: What?

PC: *Just getting more debts without paying them off.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *You know, something like that.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Now, let's test this What question.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: What about conning Jack Campbell? Have to test it again: What about conning Jack Campbell? That seems to have a tiny little bit of reaction on it. Let me ask you this. Is there any earlier moment there? Is there anything earlier, before that Comm Course? What's that?

PC: *Yeah, had coffee or something with Jack and Gernie...*

LRH: Yeah?

PC: *... and – I – Jack paid for the coffee or the drink or something – earlier, when I first met him. And I kind of conned him there a little bit. You know, he paid for the drink.*

LRH: All right. Well, when was that?

PC: *Was after a – hm. It – it was – well, it must have been after a – it must have been that spring, along in March or something like that.*

LRH: Get a tick-tick.

PC: *Yeah. In March ...*

LRH: Yeah. All right. Good enough.

PC: *... that year. Yeah.*

LRH: All right. What else is there to that?

PC: *I just – that was the first time I saw him. That night.*

LRH: That's the first time you ever saw him?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Yeah. Bang.

PC: *Yeah. Gernie invited me for a drink after an American Embassy Little Theatre group ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... production.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I'm not sure if it was hers or somebody else's. And – with her and Jack, and I saw this character first appear.*

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

PC: *Hm. Well, I don't know. A couple of hundred francs from my pocket, I guess, to pay for the drinks, could have appeared.*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *I think I was broke, or something, and I had to con him. You know, I couldn't pay the drink. I don't think I had any money on me, or something like this. It was funny.*

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

PC: *Well Jack and – Jack and Gernie didn't.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Let me test this What question again: What about conning Jack

Campbell? Still got an action. Did you meet him any earlier than that?

PC: *Not that I know of.*

LRH: Ah-ah-ah.

PC: *Yeah?*

LRH: You meet Jack Campbell earlier than that?

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

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

PC: *No.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

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

LRH: Yes, Jack Campbell earlier.

PC: *I knew Gernie before I knew Jack.*

LRH: Uh-huh.

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

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And...*

LRH: What are you plowing around with there? You got a double tick.

PC: *Yeah. It was meeting Gernie*

...

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... after that production ...*

LRH: Right.

PC: *... in – in – in the foyer of the ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... American Students and Artists Center ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... and – this – there's some unknown there. I can't remember about this – that ... Something ... I – I wondered where Jack was, or something like this. I'd never met him, you see?*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *But I wondered where Jack was ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... or something. You know? I mean, there's – there's something like that.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *This – about all I got.*

LRH: All right. Just experimentally, was there a desire to withhold yourself from meeting Jack? No. All right. Let me check this What question again: What about conning Jack Campbell? Still reacts.

PC: *I intended on meeting Gernie ...*

LRH: Good.

PC: *... I intended to get – get her interested in my theater project.*

LRH: Ah!

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

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: All right.

PC: *... she had connections ...*

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

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

LRH: All right.

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

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... to con Gernie?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Yeah, yeah.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *First meeting with Jack? Yeah.*

LRH: No. With Gernie.

PC: *Gernie.*

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

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

LRH: Oh, I see.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: Hm.

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

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

PC: *No, I – I – I can't think of any.*

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

PC: *Hm.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

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

PC: *Hm.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... when he bought the drinks?

PC: *The meeting with Gernie? Between that time?*

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

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

LRH: Uh-huh.

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

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

PC: *Must have been.*

LRH: The double action is on there.

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

LRH: What goes on here?

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

LRH: All right. Good. Good.

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

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *Wonder what happened in there.*

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

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

LRH: Hm?

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

LRH: Interesting.

PC: *It's interesting.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Uh...*

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

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

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... and when you met Jack. I was asking you ...

PC: *Yeah, there must have been several of them.*

LRH: ... when was that period?

PC: *Yeah. I can't remember when I first met Gernie.*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *Do you follow?*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Well, when might it have been?

PC: *I – it seems to me it was after Waiting for Godot. I – I – after I did that production. And that was in – sp – well, spring of 57. Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Is that all there is to that meeting now?

PC: *Yeah. You mean that meeting with Gernie?*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *Yeah. Far as – yeah.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *Far as I know.*

LRH: All right. What didn't appear there?

PC: *Well, Jack didn't.*

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

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

LRH: Oh, you didn't know he existed at all?

PC: *No.*

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

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

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

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

LRH: Well?

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

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

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

LRH: I see.

PC: *Kind of like this.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *In a sense.*

LRH: All right. Good enough.

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Hm.*

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

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

LRH: There it is.

PC: *There's a year ...*

LRH: There it is.

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

LRH: All right.

PC: *... about that.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *You know.*

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

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

LRH: Yeah? You do something to
her?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: What?

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

LRH: All right.

PC: *Fought with her ...*

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

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

LRH: Hm-km.

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

LRH: You what?

PC: *I kind of repulsed her.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Repulsed her and ...*

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

PC: *That time. Yeah.*

LRH: Well, when was that?

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

LRH: Well, when was it?

PC: *Nineteen – Jesus – Sixty.
Spring of 60.*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *March of 60.*

LRH: Is that all there is to it?

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

LRH: Ah. You were working with
her.

PC: *Yeah, working together.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *Long time.*

LRH: Good. All right. And what
didn't appear there?

PC: *In that particular instance there of repulsing her? Well, some friendliness on my part didn't appear.*

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

PC: *Well, Gernie didn't, really.*

LRH: Okay. Thank you.

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

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

LRH: Yeah, I don't care.

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

LRH: Hm.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *You know? Very ...*

LRH: All right. We're on the double-tick line.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Go on.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: Ah.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

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

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: Did she ever find out about this?

PC: *She never found out about that, no.*

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

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

LRH: Hm.

PC: *... together.*

LRH: Hm.

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

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *Before that – you know.*

LRH: You had an opinion through that period?

PC: *Yeah. Yeah.*

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

PC: *No.*

LRH: Did Jack ever find out about this?

PC: *No.*

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

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

LRH: All right.

PC: *... asked me.*

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

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

LRH: I see.

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

LRH: I see.

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

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

PC: *Yes.*

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

PC: *Right.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

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

PC: *Seems to be something else.*

LRH: It's what something else?

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

LRH: Something else ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... than this capability thing.

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *I didn't like her!*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *I didn't like her.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

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

LRH: Your considerations at the time.

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

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Instant reaction.

PC: *Hm.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

LRH: Hm-m.

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

LRH: All right. Okay.

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

LRH: Good. Good.

PC: *Uh...*

LRH: Any others?

PC: *Can't think of any right now.*

LRH: All right. What?

PC: *No, it's a motivator.*

LRH: Well, that's all right. What's the motivator? Perfectly all right with me.

PC: *Yeah. Well, there's – there was – there was some confusion with him about when I was on the course – when he came on the ACC over here. That's ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... when he was a student on an ACC. He and Vincent came over here. And – well, no, there – th-th-th-th-there's an overt in there. Yeah.*

LRH: Yeah, that's what I was going to just ask for, but you saved me the trouble.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. What's the overt?

PC: *There's an overt in there. He left Mario and myself to teach the course there. Mm?*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And we were supposed to work together in teaching the course.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *But Mario went on a concert tour, didn't come back.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *See? And he was supposed to come back in a week, didn't come back.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *... at all, you know. But I went ahead and taught the course, myself.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: Hm.

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

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *Something like that.*

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

PC: *Hm.*

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

PC: *All right.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: It's much quieter.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Everything is smoothing out. There is something else here. Is that

the first meeting you had with Jack Campbell?

PC: *Yeah!*

LRH: Was it?

PC: *Yeah!*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Far as I know.*

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

PC: *Hm-m.*

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

PC: *Yeah. Yeah.*

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

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

LRH: I get no reaction on it.

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *No.*

LRH: Did you ever steal anything off of him?

PC: *No.*

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

PC: *No. No.*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *No. Huh.*

LRH: What do you mean?

PC: *Oh, yeah!*

LRH: What?

PC: *Yeah, I just remembered an overt I got against him ...*

LRH: Yeah, all right.

PC: *... on that.*

LRH: What is it?

PC: *While I was there, teaching – you know, teaching the course, holding things down, his – I'd use his office, you know, I mean, his office there.*

LRH: Yeah, yeah.

PC: *And he said, well, I wasn't supposed to go in the bottom left-hand drawer of his desk.*

LRH: Right.

PC: *I'm not supposed to touch that bottom left-hand drawer.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *And so I went in the bottom – so I did go in the bottom left-hand drawer ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... and rummaged around there a bit, and found some dirty pictures down there.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *And never told him about that. Never told him about it.*

LRH: Okay. Did he audit you after that?

PC: *Yeah. Oh, yeah.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Thank you.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Good enough. Now let me check this question again. What about conning Jack Campbell? Well, this is getting to look much cleaner.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. What about conning Jack Campbell? I am not now getting an instant read ...

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: ... but it's a little bit before, and it's a little bit after.

PC: *Yeah. Well, there's a lot of – must be a lot of – several other things I have done to him, you know?*

LRH: Well, think of any offhand?

PC: *Hm, hm, hm.*

LRH: What's that?

PC: *Oh, well, I – yeah. I conned him there.*

LRH: What?

PC: *I took the test, my final exam paper ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... from the HPA, home, and did it at home ...*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *... in a sense. That's sort of a con. Well, yeah, because I – I – I went home and I – actually, when I took this paper home, I thought it was a joke about learning the Axioms. I – I – you know, learning, memorizing all those Axioms. That was silly.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And when I – I came – I brought it back. I copied them out of the book, you know.*

LRH: Hm.

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

LRH: Hm-m.

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

LRH: Hm.

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

LRH: Oh, I get you.

PC: *And I – I hadn't.*

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: Hm-hm, yeah.

PC: *And I conned him there.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: We got it taped now.

PC: *Hm.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

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

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: That's clean.

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

LRH: Yeah. That cleaned it. All right.

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

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

PC: *Yeah. Yeah.*

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

PC: *Nope.*

LRH: All right. Are you sure of that?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

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

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

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: It started disappearing when we cleaned up Gernie.

PC: *Hm. Hm.*

LRH: And I haven't seen it.

PC: *Hm?*

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

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: ... there's a wide motion, there's a wider motion.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: It's about so long, but it isn't the tick I had in the first place.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: I've got a tick here of some kind or another.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: It's not a tick. I've got a – a stop and a sweep.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: But I was looking for a dirty little tick-tick.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And it seems to have dived for cover at the moment.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: There – no, there it is again.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Why? What are you thinking of, as you think of that?

PC: *I don't know. That's the funny thing, you see? I kind of look at something. I kind of look at an area of the bank.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *You know, or something, or a piece of a ridge there, or something like that.*

LRH: Well, that's all right.

PC: *You know ? And I get it there ...*

LRH: It's all right. It's all right. Okay.

PC: *I can bring it back by sweeping, you know? Scanning across.*

LRH: Well, try it – to bring it back.

PC: *To bring it back? It's – I don't know.*

LRH: Yeah. A little bit. Little bit.

PC: *Yeah, there's a little button there, it's – push – I don't know.*

LRH: All right. There it is.

PC: *Creeps up on me. I was just trying there ...*

LRH: All right. But do you think we've attained anything there, on that?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah, yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Okay. Now, let's see what we've got here. Okay?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Have you told me any half-truth? What's the half-truth? That's it.

PC: *Oh, about writing those things for Robin, maybe. That's what I thought of ...*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *... right there.*

LRH: Thank you. I'll check it on the meter. Have you told me any half-truth? Got it. Check, bang. It reacts.

PC: *Hm-hm. Half-truths. Gee, I don't know.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *I don't know what it was.*

LRH: Think of anything at all? What's that?

PC: *Oh, well, there must be some other things with Jack, I think.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *You know.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I was ...*

LRH: You weren't satisfied that the What question was clean?

PC: *Yeah, I was satisfied.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *There was probably other things on the chain there along some – you know, little ones ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... like that, but not enough to ...*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Thank you. I'll check the auditing question. Have you told me any half-truth? Clean. Untruth? What's the untruth?

PC: *Untruth.*

LRH: That's it. Untruth.

PC: *About Gernie? I don't know.*

LRH: Think of an untruth?

PC: *Well, she didn't actually – I don't think she really ever really insinuated that she was interested in me, sexually.*

LRH: Ah.

PC: *You know? I – it – I think it was mainly my own ideas or something. You know, I mean, I kind of switched things around or something.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Have you told me any untruth? Got a reaction.

PC: *Hm. Huh, I don't know what it is. Untruth.*

LRH: There's something.

PC: *I don't know what it is.*

LRH: Something there.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. I'll ask the question again.

PC: *Yeah. Yeah.*

LRH: Your answer is you don't know what it is?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Thank you.

PC: *I- I got an idea.*

LRH: What is it?

PC: *Something about beginning rudiments.*

LRH: Did you think one of them was still hot?

PC: *Maybe I had kind of a suspicion or something. I wasn't sure.*

LRH: Oh, yeah?

PC: *Well, it could of – yeah, well, kind of a – of a missed withhold or something, you know?*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *I was – I was – when you said – when you asked about a present time problem, I had a tiny present time problem that I haven't been able to get to sleep too well ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... over the last week or so.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *And I thought that it might show up. And then it didn't show up. And I thought it might show up, and uh – but it didn't show up.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And so I thought maybe that was something wrong there.*

LRH: All right. Is there an untruth? Was any of that an untruth?

PC: *No, no, there wasn't an untruth on that.*

LRH: Well, was it an untruth? Did you tell me that it ... ?

PC: *An untruth, huh?*

LRH: Thinking of something there.

PC: *Well, yeah. If I said I had a present time problem and it didn't react on the meter, then it would be an untruth.*

LRH: Is that right?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Is that what occurred?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: You're not sure?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Is that your answer?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Very good. I will check that. All right. Have you told me an untruth? I get a reaction. Let me check it again ...

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: ... because you got a pretty dirty needle.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Have you told me an untruth?

PC: *Gee, I don't know what it is.*

LRH: This is very equivocal.

PC: *Yeah?*

LRH: Do you have a guilty conscience about telling untruths or something of the sort here? This is not getting the same reaction ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... constantly at all.

PC: *I – I – I have a guilty conscience. It's just, you know, a general one-has-a-guilty-conscience guilty conscience, you know?*

LRH: Well, does that upset you that I asked you if you've told an untruth?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Is that what this is falling on?

PC: *Yeah, maybe.*

LRH: Well, is it or isn't it?

PC: *Yeah, I didn't expect it to fall.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Okay.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Let me check it again. Have you told me an untruth? Now, I still get a reaction on this. That's it.

PC: *Oh. About my friend with the letter?*

LRH: All right.

PC: *My friend?*

LRH: Well, what's the untruth there? That's it.

PC: *Well, I'm not – I'm not absolutely positive I wrote it to the right address. Huh? Have to go back, I have to check my – my address book ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

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

PC: *Well, I said that ...*

LRH: What was the untruth?

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: That's it.

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

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *You know.*

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *Right.*

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

PC: *Oh.*

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

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

LRH: All right. Good.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Let me check it again.

PC: *Yeah.*

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

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

LRH: All right.

PC: *... like that.*

LRH: Okay. Thank you.

PC: *Yeah.*

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

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

LRH: Oh!

PC: *You know?*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *Looking for the double tick that I had.*

LRH: Very good. All right. I'll check that. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? I get a little tick on it still.

PC: *Well, I implied that I could influence, I suppose, to a certain extent, if I could "push the button." I said I could "push the button" there and get a double tick.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

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

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Sort of push the button.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That wasn't true, you know.*

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

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

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *You see?*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

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

LRH: All right.

PC: *You know.*

LRH: Good. All right.

PC: *Hm.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

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

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

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

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: Hm.

PC: *Then it came back.*

LRH: Hm.

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

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? That is clean. All right. Have you failed to answer any ques-

tion or command I have given you in this session? Thank you. That's clean. Have you withheld anything from me? It's a trifle latent ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... but what is it?

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

LRH: What was that?

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

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *Or something like that.*

LRH: All right, what question was it?

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

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *...you see, those two.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

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

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

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

PC: *When was that? I...*

LRH: Just a moment ago.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: All right. Let me check this

...

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

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

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah. There's a lot of things I – I don't tell you or talk about, or something like that. You know, sometimes I ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *...I've withheld – I've withheld communicating to you how pleased I am to be on the course, and how – how – how ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: ... and how many gains I have got and how tremendous I think it is. That's all.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know?

LRH: Very good.

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

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

PC: Uh-huh.

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

PC: Uh...

LRH: There it is. There it is.

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

LRH: Yeah.

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

LRH: Yeah.

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

LRH: Yeah.

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

LRH: Uh-huh.

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

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: All right. Thank you.

PC: Yeah.

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

PC: Hm.

LRH: There.

PC: Hm.

LRH: There. What are you thinking about?

PC: Well, I ...

LRH: There.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: Hm-hm.

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

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Is that it?

PC: Yeah.

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Hardly detectable. A slowed rise.

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

LRH: All right.

PC: *And...*

LRH: Does that answer the question?

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

LRH: Oh.

PC: *And...*

LRH: I see.

PC: *Because it ...*

LRH: I get you.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Well, go ahead, if you want.

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

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: All right.

PC: *You see?*

LRH: All right.

PC: *So I don't ...*

LRH: Very good.

PC: *... but if I did tell you, it would be kind of a "damage"; then it would be an overt act, then it – you know, it would – the rudiments would go out. And then, you know, I'm a little confused on what's a withhold. It's something I did.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And I can't think of anything I did that I, you know, withheld from you.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *You know.*

LRH: Let me check the question again.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Have you withheld anything from me? Still get a reaction.

PC: *Still get a reaction.*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Right there.*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Well, I – I – I ...*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Well, it's kind of an overt act now. I changed the franchise thing a – a little bit while I had the post.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *And it didn't really become an overt act until Robin got excited about it when he took over.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *And then – then I – something happened.*

LRH: Hm-m.

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

LRH: Hm-m.

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

LRH: Hm-m.

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

LRH: All right. Okay.

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

LRH: All right.

PC: *Huh.*

LRH: Thank you.

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah. Oh, is it?*

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

PC: *Yeah.*

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

PC: *Yeah, well, same thing.*

LRH: Does it mean anything?

PC: *Yeah, yeah.*

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

PC: *I think so.*

LRH: Okay. All right.

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

LRH: Stay in PT while studying? All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *And – what was my other goal?*

LRH: Sleep.

PC: *Sleep?*

LRH: Sleep at night?

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

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

PC: *No, I know. I just know.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I'll just go to sleep easily.*

LRH: You're not trying to make me look good?

PC: *No, no.*

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: All right. Okay. Okay.

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

LRH: All right.

PC: *So...*

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

PC: *Cleaned up on Scientology.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Remembered a few things, that...*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *... didn't remember otherwise.*

LRH: Anything else?

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

...

LRH: All right.

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

LRH: Good. All right. Thank you.

PC: *I got on television again.*
[laughs]

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *It's a game.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Is there anything you care to say or ask before I end this session?

PC: *No, but thank you.*

LRH: All right. You're sure?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Let me check that. Anything you care to say or ask before I end this session? Thank you. All right. You're all right, then, huh?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Is it all right with you if I end this session now?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right, here it is. End of session. Has the session ended for you?

PC: *Yeah. Yeah, it has.*

LRH: Has it?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Very good. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC: *You're no longer auditing me.*

LRH: Thank you.

E-METER DATA: INSTANT READS, PART I

A lecture given on 24 May 1962

Thank you.

Well, I'm glad to be in your midst. Actually, I enjoy lecturing to you. I do.

And, last night enjoyed giving a session. I thought that was the most, you know? You saw me lay a couple of eggs with this pc here earlier, you know, and remember, the earlier sessions were not particularly productive of any vast gain; pc didn't go downhill or anything. And last night, why, you see, I just got the idea that I'd better show you how to do some fishing and fumbling, and you might not have noticed what it did. It might have been all something or other.

All I did was let the meter wave until it ticked, and I just steered the pc onto a double tick. I just set out to clean up a dirty needle and actually, in that hour, made a stage of cleaning it up, and we got some of the stuff cleaned off it. And what do you know, it was right on his goal line. (You don't mind my mentioning it.) It was right on his goal line and everything was fine. And you notice, I didn't go out of this lifetime. I didn't even go back into his childhood, nothing. I held him securely anchored in the last three years. Remember? See that? Well, that's steering the pc. That's just fish and fumble. You can clear up some of the most remarkable things, particularly if you're aided and assisted by the fact that the pc has a meter pattern to start with.

But there was something very tricky last night that you might have missed – and that was just this and nothing more: was the handling of the stuck picture. Pc has a stuck picture; pc complains about stuck picture. You find session in which picture was first found; get the missed withhold off of that session. See? Don't you go running that engram, because it's a stuck picture so obviously it won't run.

Well, enough of that. I'm going to talk about the meter.

Now, what's the date? Twenty-fifth?

Audience: Twenty-fourth.

Fourth?

Audience: Twenty-fourth.

Well, what are you doing in the 24th? I was in the 25th. Well, I'll come back to the 24th. All right. It's the first lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 24th May 62.

We have a lecture about the E-Meter. Once there was a cat, and he went sniffing along corridors in the open cracks below auditing room doors. Heh, heh, heh. And after being baffled for a very long time, he became a very wise cat. And out of all this we have – we have a single plea: use the E-Meter. I know that seems like a lot to ask but if you use it, it'll treat you right; and if you misuse it, wrong.

Once again we have a complete breakdown in progress that occurred here in September of 1961 whereby everybody fashionably was reading the E-Meter cross-eyed with the rudiments wildly out and everybody was plowing into the ground. And we have come again into that particular period.

Now, recently I have talked to you scoldishly and I've said, "Why don't you make your pcs look good?" Remember? Well, I'll tell you, your pcs don't look good because you're not reading an E-Meter. That's all. It's a gross auditing error – simple, factual, 'orrible to contemplate, but true. It isn't the way you are holding your little finger in a session. It isn't the fact that your thumb is insufficiently calloused on the tone arm. It isn't any one of a thousand things. It isn't because you don't have a command of Model Session. It isn't because of something weird or wonderful in the pc. It's just that you're not reading an E-Meter. That's all.

Now, that sounds horrible, but I don't think this applies to all of you. It couldn't. But it must apply in some degree to all of you because I don't see anybody listening to this lecture three feet off his chair. Today all you have to do is just exactly what you have to do. You don't have to do anything fancy. And that is a very, very rough thing to get through to you. We actually are there, as far as technology is concerned – been there for some time, but been improving, improving, improving, little bits, little bits, little bits. But, do you know, I don't know a thing today that you could audit on somebody that wouldn't produce a remarkable gain. See? I don't know anything we're using that wouldn't produce a remarkable gain on the pc.

And I caught you out this way: I audit a pc with exactly what you're using, he shines. You audit a pc, and I get an Instructor to check it and your rudiments are all out. How could your rudiments be out? It isn't that you're not asking the exact, proper question. Oh, you're asking the right question. But the needle goes over, hits the pin, bends; blue smoke comes out of the meter connection, the sensitivity knob becomes incandescent, and you say, "That's clear," and go on to the next question. And that's all that's happening. Honest. Honest. I plead with you.

Now, I know you think you aren't doing it. But Fred was telling me in the break up there, he says, "You know," he said, "I had to practice quite a while in practical, and I've suddenly realized I was just *not seeing* instant reads. And all of a sudden I started to see them."

There is some kind of an oddball phenomenon that goes this way: Your eyesight shuts off. That's the only way I can explain it. Now, what shuts off your ruddy eyesight? What shuts it off? So I had to ask myself this embarrassing question: Did we know what made an auditor turn off when he turned the meter on? Do we *know* that? And up till last night, we didn't.

So I had to figure out what happened. Well, of course, I had the data, but I had to assemble it. And so I can give you this cheerful information. You can stop looking as though I have just beaten you, because I haven't just beaten you. You see, if I hadn't confidence in you,

why, I wouldn't even try. But a few weeks ago I took a look at you all, and I realized that the gray sunken cheek, the thick and muddy eye, the dragging of oneself up the stairs, was not being caused by your late hours or lack of food or anything else, but must somehow or another be caused by the auditing. And I started on a campaign at that time to locate what was wrong.

Now, actually I wasn't trying to look *for* anything I was just looking to see what was there. This is always a good idea. When you are looking for something, don't make up your mind, like the psychologist, that you know the something you are looking for before you look. It's very remarkable. You can look across a whole beach of white pebbles for a white pebble, don't you see, and never find one. If you've already specified that in order to find a white pebble, it has to be black, you see, or something odd like this. No, the thing to do is just to go down to the beach and look, and not even look for a white pebble. Just – just look and see what's there.

That's always very good in research. By the Ford Foundation – I think it's 100 million dollars a month. I think that's the value of the research as done by the Ford Foundation – about 100 million dollars. Oh well, that's an exaggeration; it's actually 100 million dollars worth a minute, because of course they get no place. If the Ford Foundation's research along these various lines was to be chalked up in value, why, it couldn't be, you see, because they haven't gotten anyplace.

Actually, the Ford Foundation was founded at exactly the same day – did you know this? – of the first Hubbard Dianetic Research Foundation for exactly the same purposes: to discover the basics of human life and the mind. It's fascinating. And there they are. And it's cost them, since that time, several billion dollars. And they recently, a few years ago, just after they investigated a HASI in Phoenix, Arizona – they sent a representative down, and he gave a report of some kind or another – they wrote a letter to an inquirer that they had ceased to investigate in that particular field. Now, out of that we didn't know quite what to imply, but we've whipped 'em.

But the idea is that fantastic sums can be spent in research by taking records and compiling records and comparing records to records, and the next thing, when you get through you've got some records. They make nice bonfires; you can toast weenies over them.

But to date, this type of research which does all the lookingness on a via through symbols ... You know? We're going to mathematically compute it all. See, we've got a white tree in front of us, so we're going to mathematically compute as to whether or not a white tree can exist. And then we figure out that it can't, and we walk away. See? And that's very commonly the fate of research.

Who was it? Hegel or Hume, or... Hegel, I think it was. It was some such bird. Somebody or other had up and looked through a telescope and had found the eighth or ninth planet or – eighth planet, that's it – and somebody like Hegel, I think it was, said, "Couldn't exist because the perfect number was seven!" And for several years nobody would admit that it existed. All they had to do was train a telescope on it, but it couldn't exist because the perfect number was seven. Therefore, there couldn't be more than seven planets in this system. That's what's known as looking at the figures, you see, not looking at anything else.

So all of this kind of thing, I start narrowing it down. Now, the first observation was you didn't glow, see? I'm always looking, and this one I found. See, you didn't glow. That was obviously a fact. There was nobody glowing. To prove it: you're in the basement, aren't you, here? We're still using coal. See? That's enough, see. Proves itself, doesn't it? So... He wants some mathematical computation to go along with it, I'll just throw that one in, you see?

So from that I made a couple of assignments. Not necessarily sneakily. I really did just make these assignments. You see? And the assignments I made was one, I gave an auditor a list of questions – Prepcheck questions to be cleaned on a pc – and I gave another auditor a list of questions that had already been asked, to check over whether or not they were live. The best way to repair a case, you see, on a Prepcheck is to pick up all the questions left alive and clean them. That's the best thing to do. Ho-ho-ho, ho-ho-ho.

I also got some rudiments checked by your auditing Supervisor, and I was coordinating tone arm against out-rudiments. And one of the earlier discoveries on this: When the rudiment is out, the tone arm, she don't move. Important fact. That's a new fact. If the rudiments are out, no tone arm action. That applies to anything.

All right. I went ahead, then, and you saw the results last night of one of these people I checked out. This is not necessarily derogatory to the auditors who did this. There's no point in you going out and blowing your brains out, because we'll just have to pick you up in the next life and clear you again, see? Nobody is being condemnatory on this particular line. But it is indicative of something, and the thing it's indicative of is somebody wasn't reading the meter, because I'm absolutely sure – absolutely sure – that the auditor checked those questions but they didn't read right – something. Something, see?

Now, a further discovery of this: I find out that the auditor believed the meter did not react, and that there was some belief present that TR 1 must be out – that the auditor isn't delivering the question hard enough, you see, to the pc, or hasn't enough control over the pc to make the meter register. See, that could enter in, you see? And a lot of other things. You can explain this a dozen ways.

I actually don't buy any of that. I think the meter reacted and it wasn't observed. That was just as simple as that. Let's take the gross auditing error just as a gross auditing error, not a lot of mathematical figure-figure over alongside of the thing. Let's not try to figure out why, particularly, on that basis. Let's not say the meter didn't operate and the pc didn't operate because look, this has been several widely scattered pcs, which picked up immediately afterwards – one of them by an Instructor he could cheerfully strangle (the pc could: that Instructor couldn't possibly have anything with that pc but an ARC break) – and every single one of them reacted.

But we can't attribute it to some other mechanism except just this: He was a-lookin' at the meter, and the meter wobbled – the needle went *bap!* – and the auditor didn't do a thing about it. The auditor didn't see it. That's the only available explanation. Because other people hostile to the pc, in the pc's estimation, found the meter operating for them.

Do you think it's easy to sit up in front of that TV camera? It isn't, man. Not for a pc. Not easy at all. Takes quite a bit as an auditor to hold him in. And you saw those questions falling off the pin; but those questions had just been checked over, and some statement was

made that they were mostly clear. Now, afterwards we found out, although they'd been stated mostly clear at first, the auditor said that not all of them were. However, there was one there that the auditor had said was clear that was *not* clear on my test, see? Well, that wipes it out. The things were reacting, in other words. In other words, something was happening with the meter and it was not observed. Well let's not try ...

And listen to me! You see me crossing this bridge right now. You're going to cross this bridge. See? There's hardly a one here that isn't going to cross this bridge sooner or later. You're going to stand there speechless, whether in the HGC or an Academy, or with somebody who's helping you out as an auditor or something of the sort. I don't care where it's going to be, you're going to cross this same barrier, and you're going to say, "Mrs. Glutz is not doing better. Did you notice the blood dripping out of both her eyes when she left the session today?"

And the auditor will say – whether student or staff auditor or whoever it'll be, see – will say, "Well yes, but she's just a very difficult pc. She's very difficult." And if you don't know what to do at that point, you yourself will go figure it all out mathematically.

The thing to do is to get ahold of the pc and take a look at the pc. That's your first thing And the pc isn't better. See? That's good enough with modern processes. The pc isn't better. The pc does not look better. Therefore, somebody isn't reading the meter. *Bing, bing* – something. You wait! You'll be on this hot seat. And you'll get Mrs. Glutz and you'll put her down in the chair and you will hand her the cans, and you will say, "Well, now, let's see, now. Now, let me see. You just had a session. Now, in that session did you tell any half-truth? Untruth?" Tone arm action. [laughter] "Did you try to impress the auditor?" "Did you try to damage anyone?" There's no sense in going on checking it because the needle – the tone arm is now at 7. [laughter, laughs] And you'll turn around to this auditor and you will say, "Hey, Mike. Hey, hey, hey, bud. What the hell? What goes on?"

Hell say, "Well, they were all in when she left the session."

And you, you idiot, may fall for it. And you're liable to say, "But then what might it have been? Might it be that his TR 1 is bad? Or actually that the pc is so ARC broke that doesn't read on the meter for that auditor? Or is it the fact that they were clear at that moment for him but not for me? Or do they have mutual withholds between themselves which are then coming out because I am checking...?" I mean, you know, you can just figure yourself crazy.

Now, this is the one you want to figure: The meter wobbled and the auditor was looking out the window. Don't figure it any other way, because if you do figure it any other way, you will miss its cure. Thing to cure is not necessarily the auditor's eyesight.

How can an auditor get in that condition? By invalidating the meter, of course. An auditor can go stone-blind on a meter.

Now, how does this come about? The auditor is audited by an auditor who is stone-blind. Just exactly how do we get this chain reaction, see? He's sitting there early in his career, minding his own business, and his auditor says to him, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And he thinks, "Oh, my God, if I don't pay the rent by two o'clock, I'm going be thrown out," you see? And he can just feel this thing seethe, you know? The auditor across from him says, "Thank you. That's clear."

And he says, "You know, that said that didn't register." You understand, he couldn't see the dial so he doesn't know whether it doesn't register or not. He makes the assumption that it didn't register. "Didn't register, see? Feels like a present time problem to me. I guess the meter is... Well, all right. And I'll just ..." He just kind of suppresses it and goes through the session gritting his teeth.

Next session: (During – the night before, see, he was on a drinking bout with this guy's girlfriend, see, or something like that – whatever it was, it doesn't matter.) "Since the last session, have you done anything" (or something like this), "that you're withholding?" See?

"Oh boy," he says. "Man, when he gets this... I don't know whether I can get this withhold off or not. *Ohooooo*. I can just imagine him going out and buying a sound truck and driving up and down the streets, you see, with this particular withhold; because that's what they always do with hot withholds, you see? Well therefore, at no time will I..." you know. "But if I sit here real quietly and don't breathe at this moment as he asks the question, be all right."

And the auditor looks at him and says, "That's clear."

And the guy says, "*Whooh!* boy. That was lucky." [laughter] "Man. *Whooh!* Got away with that."

And this happens often enough to a point where a guy gets the idea that meters don't read. See, all it requires is for one auditor, auditing another auditor, to make one error – be looking elsewhere when the meter bangs. Just requires one of these, and you start this chain going. You think the meter didn't read. And this is very invalidative to the meter. You think meters don't read. That's where that comes in.

Well, of course, that happens while you're in-session and you're kind of non compos mentis at the time or too interested in withholding what you're withholding or something like that, you see, to pay – to go into this thing deeply, and so you close that one out. That's a total suppression. You forget it – and it lays the most beautiful chain in you ever heard of.

You know it should have read and it didn't read. Therefore, the meter is no good. But your assumption is the incorrect assumption, so it lasts in space, which is "meter didn't read." That is a lie. The meter read. And as any lie, it'll hang up. And it builds a whole chain up with somebody who is audited this way – builds an enormous chain.

The way you clear that chain is you just prepcheck the question "Has any auditor ever failed to find a meter read on you that you thought should have reacted?" That gets the unknowns out of it because that's the most likely area of unknown, even though it's kind of motivatorish. It's actually neither an overt nor motivator; it's just hanging in space. But it's quite unknown because it happened in the middle of the session while the pc was very interested in other things, see? So it's a quick one.

One of the ways the ancient medicine man operated ... I actually, at one time or another, have studied in this particular field. I remember about 1630 I was very disgusted; I did some study in North America on the subject of becoming an Indian medicine man. One of the fine ways to go about it is to learn how to scream. And if you can let off a good scream, see, that's got saw-toothed edges, that is twice as loud as any psycho's scream, see? – just a good, total-volume scream. You can stand close to somebody, scream suddenly, utter a command phrase, and then continue your scream. And it'll go in as a total implant. That is a crude and savage way of implanting, but very effective. This is your old medicine man. Make a terrific amount of noise, no noise for a second and utter a command phrase like "You are a pig," see, and then interrupt the scream at that point and then start it again at exactly the same pitch that you stopped it, and go on and finish the scream.

The person who heard this scream is unaware of its ever having been interrupted, and after the session will look at you attentively and say, "Oink." [laughter] Really will. I mean, this is quite, quite effective – quite effective.

There would be many ways to go about it. You could take a pistol and put somebody in sudden terror and shoot past his face, and then stop shooting for a moment and say something to him, and then shoot the other three shots, you see? He'd never have any idea that you ever said anything. It goes into an unknownness and makes a compulsion.

This is probably how the ancient magician enchanted things. Possibly princes *have* turned into deer in the forest. If you took a period in the magic universe when thetans were still capable of mocking up their own bodies, and you pulled some shocking stunt on the person and sandwiched into that "You are now a deer," why, he'd cease to mock up the prince and start mocking up a deer, don't you see? And he would be an enchanted deer. That would be how enchantments were accomplished. I mean, the mechanism of enchantment is no cruder than that.

So when you lay something in like a hellish invalidation of the meter, the person is so involved in their own think-think and worried, you see, about something or other – they're already very submerged and very withholdy – they get a further withhold on top of the darn thing, just as though they were being screamed at. You see, they're with – "Meter doesn't work," and then – "Meter doesn't work." But they don't know that. Except they can't read meters. See how you could do it to somebody?

But actually it wouldn't be just that motivator that made this thing come true. I'm afraid, for any prince to get enchanted, I'm afraid in the former life when he was a magician, he ran into a prince and committed an overt which was actually a motivator. And I think that's how it all got mixed up. He did the enchantment and somebody in front of him turned into a deer to hang the guy with his own enchantment. And then, of course, walked around the other side of the tree and became a prince again. See, you'd have to have an incident of that particular kind – the guy commits an overt that he thinks is an overt that is actually a motivator, but he doesn't know it is – in order to get some such goofiness started.

In other words, a pc is to some degree at an auditor's mercy. And when an auditor does something weird, makes some evaluative remark, the pc might be fogged up at that kind of an instant; and if it's too bad – *poohie!* It isn't that your auditing on a long range is going to do

anything, providing you eventually get rid of the person's GPM; because all of this hangs up on the GPM. When you eventually blow the GPM, it'll blow all the rest of it, don't you see?

So therefore, you have to audit in such a way as to not impede the pc from getting Clear. See? It isn't that you can actually hurt a pc, you understand? But the stuff is laying in against the aberrations and the GPM, see? And you got to audit a pc so that the GPM is *not* thoroughly restimulated, and so at the other end he goes Clear and the GPM blows to pieces. Got it? And then all the auditing and everything else comes off.

But in the meantime, if you do a rough job of auditing because the pc is in a rough state, why, of course, you get these implantations inadvertently – quite inadvertent. You have to be careful what you say to a pc who is in session, as you know very well.

Psychiatry, by the way – we find psychiatry hard to understand because the psychiatrist is always doing something on a goal line that we don't understand. We say we have a goal line. I ask all of you about this: What's your private opinion of why you audit a pc is a concern. But it's uniformly: to do something for the pc, help him out, something like that, you see? You all had that idea. Actually, psychiatry doesn't have that idea in treating a patient. They are not trying to make the patient better or cure insanity or anything like that. They have entirely different goal lines. So you find them incomprehensible.

By the way, in doing a 3GA, all the people who are incomprehensible are the people who would not want your goal. Those are the true incomprehensibles of this universe. You just can't understand them. And of course, you stop and think of a president of the United States who wants to be a piccolo player or something like that; you'd have a hard time understanding his foreign policy. You'd think he was being inefficient in running the nation, whereas he knows he's being efficient in running the nation. He is handing out enormous sums of money to disabled piccolo players, you see, or something like this. So he knows how to run a nation. He is president so he can go to concerts, see, and that helps out – comprehensible.

This would be the way – this would be the way most nations are run. Supposing, by the way, you got all the heads of state there are in the world that cause all this upset and misery and got them down the line and actually did a Goals Assessment on each one of them. I imagine it would be terribly revelatory. It would be a kick, man. You wouldn't believe it. God! The reasons they want to be president or king or commissar, generalissimo ...

Well, this goal line that the individual has is quite important. He's trying to get Clear and things that cross against it are all those things which we classify as auditing errors. You see, he's apparently being batted aback on the subject of his goal. Well actually, smooth auditing is designed not to bat his goal back. See? And that's the definition of what's right and wrong in an auditing session. Now, that doesn't mean specifically we have to know what his goal is or anything else. We just don't impede him on going forward. See? So the things that impede him we delete from the session. And we get some incomprehensible, like "Do you have a present time problem?" Yes, the individual does have a present time problem. Oh, my God!, you know. He's got this present – it's an antisocial present time problem, or something of the sort, and he really doesn't want to fess up to it, and he's right in the line of having to

make a horrible omission – admission – of some kind or another, and the auditor says, "That's clear."

Well, of course, he wanted to get rid of his present time problem, was his basic goal, and he didn't get a chance to get rid of it. So you've gone across his goal line, and you've laid one in, and that one that comes in is "The meter doesn't work." And he inevitably will make that conclusion at that moment. It's actually very upsetting if you go back and analyze the thing and go over it. You sit there very upset. You're saying to yourself, "My God! It's a good thing I got away with that withhold. Thank God I didn't have to get off that withhold." It's what you're thinking, kind of analytically, you know? "Whoa, oh boy! Would that have been embarrassing. This girl auditor and ... oh, gee. I'm so happy I didn't get off – have to get off the withhold, you know. She said it was clear. I don't think it was clear."

Hour and a half later – he's getting audited all this time, you see – "What the hell was the matter with the E-Meter?" you know? Well, he has to come to the conclusion it didn't work. See, the conclusion is – automatically, the response is "The E-Meter doesn't work." That's what's laid in. He knows it should react; it didn't react. So therefore what should react doesn't react, so therefore it doesn't react. And there's quite an upset about that.

I've seen this myself. I've had an ARC break – something like this – and the auditor wouldn't register, but I would, on the meter. In other words, I could ask myself the question, "Do I have a present time problem?" – the meter would go *plang!* you see? And the auditor would ask me, "Do you have a present time problem?" – it would sit there absolutely motionless. It was quite interesting. I've actually seen a meter myself, see? Now, with the auditor I said, "Well now, come on now, let's look at this. Let's look at this damn thing, you see? Here's a weird phenomenon." The auditor asks me the question – no reaction. I asked the question – reaction. Yeah, I was holding the cans. Fantastic!

So the meter can be ARC broke out of existence. But even so, the shock in not seeing the meter operate was quite something – a considerable shock involved in that operation. You know? She asked me a question: "Do you have a present time problem?" – doesn't seem to operate. I ask the question, "Do I have a present time problem?" – it operates. What the hell is going on here, see? I just couldn't believe it. You know, just stony-eyed disbelief. *Dahhhh*. I already have a good subjective reality on it – quite a shock. Patched up the ARC break, of course the meter operated for the auditor. Wasn't anything more to it than that.

You remember the time and date of this, because I studied this a little bit further and then found out that a meter could be inoperative in the process of an ARC break. But you'd have to ARC break the living daylights out of a pc before you got to this phenomena, and I don't believe we really reached this phenomena. That meter, by the way, I don't think was tuned to sensitivity 16. I think it was at a low sensitivity. I think it still would have read, one way or the other. But it was quite a shock to me.

Meter gets invalidated. At the same time the pc is ARC broke. Now, the next time this person is auditing, it sweeps, it reacts – perhaps minorly because his rudiments are already kind of queasy and the pc is halfway ARC broke. He gets a reaction; he doesn't believe it when he sees it. You could stack these up to a point where an auditor would simply be stone-

blind on the meter. He'd just never see a reaction, that's all. Or he'd try to explain the reaction, which is the same thing, you see?

You got one going right now which is very laughable. You know all about this, and yet I've had a despatch about it, and somebody else has had a despatch about it today. And that is: Do you take the reading during the sentence? Ah, this is just silly! If you ask yourself, what the hell? What is a reading which you get during the sentence? It's reading on the various words in the sentence, not on the sense of the sentence, so of course you ignore it. There's a prior read; you ignore it. There's a latent read; you ignore it. The only read you read is the instant read. *Bang!* If you don't get an instant read and you want to be sure, try it again. You saw one last night when I was auditing. You saw a prior read. Now, you didn't see me buy it. I said, "Well, we'll check it," and there it went that time – it fired. But we were getting some kind of a random read. Random needles are apt to read almost anyplace, but they won't ordinarily read two times running, accidentally. Do you see?

Now, you only buy an instant read. Just lay that in with iron, man – instant read. Actually, there is actually *no* time period at *all* between the receipt of your question and the response from the reactive mind. If there's any time period, it is consumed electronically. Might be an electronic lag. I've said a half, and a fifth, and a tenth, and I'm just trying to give you an idea of a small amount of time.

I was studying it the other day and I found out it was zero time. It's actually zero time plus the electronic lag. That electronic lag is pretty darn – pretty darn instantaneous unless your meter is damped. And to your eye, you really can't detect any lag. That's the only thing you pay any attention to.

There's only one other time when you use any other kind of read. You never use a prior read. You never use a late read, except this one. There is one exception and that is when you're helping the pc by steering. You're steering the pc's thinkingness. You saw me do it last night on a very broad scale: fish and fumble – very, very broad. I was practically sitting there waiting for the needle to hit on something so I could ask the pc what he was thinking about, you see? And then you've asked a question, you've got an instant read. You've asked him what it is; a moment later you see that instant read repeated, but this time as a needle pattern. You see, you see the same read so you say, "What was that?" see "What's that?" and so on. That's steering. See?

So it doesn't matter whether you steer it in a fish and fumble – just sit there and wait for the guy to react on something and say, "What were you looking at, at that moment," you see? "That. That. That." That's just steering. It doesn't matter whether you do it after you've got the instant read or without any instant read. You could use a meter in that fashion. It doesn't tell you anything. You just want to steer the pc's attention to something. And he, "Oh, well, that. That... oh, well, I keep seeing this stuck picture. That's what that is." It wouldn't matter what the "that" was or what his withhold was. It's just steering. It's the only time you ever use anything but an instant read.

Your instant read is never prior. It never happens before the end of the sentence. These must be single-clause sentences. It never happens except at the end of the sentence – the end of the word. Now, you can say, "Have you ever damaged anyone?" and get a "you," "have."

The person is all ARC broke on havingness, see. Have – clink. "You" – you know, "you" nearly reacts on all pcs? – clink. "Damaged," – clank! See? "Someone" – tick.

Oh, you could say to yourself, "Where the hell am I?" Well, just ignore all that earlier stuff, see? Just ignore the lot, see? And if you're not sure, say, "I'll repeat that. Have you ever damaged someone?" And *clang*, you'll get your instant read right on the *e* of "someone." It's right exactly – it's just as the tail of the *e* comes up, you'll get the instant read. [laughter] Particularly on a second repeat, because you kind of have worn a groove, see? You want to take a question apart – you'll get "have." "What about 'have'?" You'd be a real idiot to do this, see, but "What about 'have'?"

"Oh, I don't know."

"Well, what was that?"

"Oh, well, that was the Havingness session I had today. The auditor said it was my process because it kept tightening the needle."

"All right. 'You.' All right. What's that? That. That. That. That."

"Well, I don't know. It must be listing. We keep putting 'you' down on the list." [laughter]

"All right. Fine. Fine. 'Damaged.' Yeah, what's that? That. That."

"Well, I don't know what that is."

"That. That."

"Well, what am I supposed to be answering?"

"Just that. Uh – that!"

"But what am I supposed to be answering?"

"Well, just that! That's all."

Idiocy reigns, don't you see? That is your prior read. Just ignore the basketful, see? To hell with them. Same as latent. You wouldn't do anything with a latent read; well, don't do anything with a prior read.

When does a read become prior? Well, I would say anything up to a non-instantaneousness before you ended the sentence. And when – when does – when does a – when does a read become latent? Any non-instantaneousness after you have ended the sentence. I mean it's just as idiotic as that. I mean, there's – we're actually defining a cheese knife, or something like that. Crazy. I mean, it's so easy to read that you could keep missing it, you see? You don't have to compartment the question anymore to amount to a hill of beans. Ask it two or three times if you're not sure what it is. It all of a sudden will straighten out and read.

You see, you're actually talking to a thought of the reactive bank. Most of you make this fantastic mistake: you think the pc analytically can influence the meter, and he *cannot!* Absolutely *impossible!* He can do it on a via by thinking of something that he knows auditors always call on him. See, he remembers a session in which he had a missed withhold, but nobody has ever pulled, see? So he could actually go about this kind of a weird one. Every time

they ask him about something, he could think of that session, you see, and he'd get a reaction. But there must have been an unknown in the session. See, he could not-know enough about it, you see, so that he'd get a reaction by thinking of something that he knew he didn't know anything about. He could get a reaction. That's as close as he can get to it. And do you know, it always has a lag. You know, it will always give you a latent read? Because the guy has to sit there and think about the session, and the time it takes him to think analytically about the session gives you a latent read.

Now, an instant read can't ever go through the analytical mind and doesn't. It goes straight to the reactive mind, straight as a bullet. See, the reactive mind by definition is something that has never been timed, something that is still happening, something that is always now. And its "always nowness" deletes all time, and that is why you get an instant read. There's no time in the reactive mind, which is what is wrong with it. So of course it reads reactively *now*. And you think the pc knows the answer to what just flicked the needle. Now look, he can't move the needle analytically, so how the hell could he know it? See, there must be an unknown on anything that goes flick. I don't care whether it's a dirty needle or anything else.

Of course, you ask him if he has a present time problem and he's – he knows he's got a present time problem; he got reminded of it, you see, just at that moment. Terrific unknowns in this present time problem. It's the unknowns that fire. See? If something is not unknown to the pc, it won't fire, which is the other denominator of the reactive mind. It is a cauldron of unknowns which exist in "now" always.

So, you ask the pc something – it's because you only get a reactive response – the needle will not react. You sit there prepchecking somebody. You could get very impatient about it. But it sure makes the pc think, if he sees his auditor getting a little bit – crowding him. And he kind of *thuhuuuu*, and he thinks and grinds, and he looks and that sort of thing. The auditor could steer him around and say, "What's that?" Why does the auditor have to steer him? It's because he doesn't *know* what it is.

You'd ask – try this on a pc someday if you don't like him, if you've just been given a bad session by him yourself, or something like that; try this on him: "Say, have I missed a withhold on you in this session?" And the pc suddenly feels funny because, you see, he feels the surge just as you get, electronically, the surge on the meter, you see? So he feels this surge and he kind of knows "yes," you know?

You say, "Well, what was it?" you know. "What was it?" Don't help him out. Just sit there.

And he finally says, "Well, I can't find – I don't know what it is. Uh ..." and so forth.

You say, "You know what it is. Tell me." Don't help him out. Don't steer him. You can go on like this for hours.

But the pc is kind of looking around, you know, and you see a flick, you say, "That." He's looking at a table. He's looking at a picture of a table. Where the hell did that come from, you know?

"Ha-ha-haai ..."

"That," the auditor says.

"It's a picture of a table." Well, of course, it develops a little bit. He sees a little bit more of it.

"Oh, oh, oh, the missed withhold. Oh, oh, oh, yes! I was – that..." He recognizes what the table is. It's the table on which the E-Meter sits. He was thinking that the thing was awfully creaky, and he didn't say anything about it to the auditor; and it springs to view and all of a sudden you haven't got a reaction anymore. Why haven't you got a reaction? Because it's known.

So the more unknown underpinnings you have on something, the less reaction – I mean, the more reaction you've got, you understand? And the less unknown there is there, the less reaction. So magnitude of action... Beg your pardon, consistency of action – not really magnitude, but consistency of action – is determined by consistency of unknown and its immediacy in present time. So of course you can get a goal, and the goal will go bang, bang, bang, bang.

Well, you don't know what the hell the goal is sitting in; that's how that goal fires. We don't know the mass that surrounds it. How's it stay in place? What is all of it? What life did we lead? How come we got into that? You know, all kinds of questions like this. And yet the thing will still fire on the E-Meter. You say the goal – *bing*. Say the goal - *bing, bing, bing*. Say it every time, *bing, bing, bing*. You say, "What is the goal?" to the pc, and the pc can't tell what the goal is. Of course, that ought to wash out, shouldn't it? Uh-uh – *bing, bing, bing-bing*. That's why you have to audit them. See, it's a firing proposition.

All right. Now, this unknownness can get buried in. You can bury unknownness in the middle of an auditing session. You can sandwich it in just like the screaming witch doctor. They got one down in South Africa, yeah – or mostly Central Africa. They walk around... Not having seen it in South Africa; they kind of chased it out underneath the brush, I guess. But get a horsetail fly – a horsetail switch for flies, fill it full of fleas, shake it all over somebody; and while he's trying to brush them all off, say something to him. That's a version of that. That's implantation magic.

The Russians, being rather Asiatic, do this consistently and continually. Guy is en route to a questioning chamber and a woman dentist with forceps and so forth, steps out of a hidden door in the hall and examines his teeth and disappears through the same door. Shatters him! "Where the hell was she from? You know? What is going on?" Typical modern Russian tactic. Boy, these Russians, they go around this way, you know? This was what Pavlov taught them. I don't think he had to teach them very hard, for some of them.

I notice they made a terrific bid for popularity tonight. Fifteen-year-old boy swam across the river to get into West Berlin tonight, so they put – from the commie side – seven bullets in him. Mobs of people watching this. And they took him to the hospital with a bullet in his lungs and in a critical condition. Their bids for popularity are really marvelous to behold. They probably think it's the thing to do, you know?

But they do these surprising things. See? They do a sudden surprise in the middle of an action that makes an implant. Don't give them credit for being smart on this. It's probably a dramatization, because they don't do anything with it. You see?

You, knowing that, figuring out "And let's see, how could we use this politically?" "Oh well, easy. Uh, we'll have this guy – we'll play some Beethoven. And we'll have some soft perfume in the room and – lying on a soft couch – and we'll play some Beethoven, see? And under the table, out of sight, why, we will have the Moscow air-raid-warning siren – the biggest one. And just as he's all relaxed and listening to this thing, you see, we will press this button; stop pressing the button and say, 'You are a communist,' and start pressing the button again." The guy would walk out; he'd tell everybody he was a communist. We'd have done the trick, since a communist is more or less a robot anyhow.

I mean, you could apply these things intelligently. The Russians don't. You know, it takes them seventy days to brainwash, and they only get 22 percent. Isn't that interesting? You know, they only get 22 percent? I think this is marvelous, you know? Why do they try? Why do they try?

But this all comes under the heading of that sort of thing. Something that is invalidated secretly or privately – bang, like that – in a guy's mind. What is it? It's sort of interesting. You go over this. It'll make more sense when you get these things checked off, because it wouldn't take very long to check these things off.

You can go on and check it over, of course, on more of an overt proposition – just talking about getting rid of this meter blindness.

"As an auditor, have you ever deliberately ignored a significant meter response?"

When I first looked at that question, I thought, "My God." I-just had E-Meters all over in front of my face. I wrote the question down. All of a sudden this morning, I was sitting there looking at E-Meters. And I was willing to swear that I must have done it just every session. For just a moment, just having thought the thought "I must have done this every session, you know? I just must have ignored significant meter responses." So I just sat there, forced myself to remember exactly when they were. They amounted to exactly three.

One of them on you. I said I would take up the rudiments question in the middle of the Prepcheck session. In other words, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" So I said, "We won't bother with it now because we're gonna take it up ..."

Another guy – I checked out a criminal and I couldn't clear it and didn't believe the meter. And the guy ran away with the crown jewels afterwards – you know, some such comparable action. And an early one, why, I asked somebody a question, and I got a response – an immediate and direct response on the question – and couldn't and didn't follow it up, and never developed it. And boy, was that fraught with havoc.

And there are only three. Think of the thousands of hours I've audited – there were three. And they had stacked up enough to give me an automaticity of meters, meters, meters, meters, meters, meters, meters, meters, meters ... My God, I saw meters going this way and that way. [laughter] Get the idea? I mean, they had it stacked right in.

Of course, the obvious one: "Have you ever invalidated an E-Meter?" And then another obvious one: "As a preclear, have you ever successfully persuaded an auditor the meter was wrong?" That's more hazarding it, but I know there are a few who have. And then: "Have you ever attempted to invalidate a meter read in order to keep something secret?" And I know some pcs have done that. But you notice in each case it says, "or any version thereof, or any version thereof, or any version thereof," and so forth. So you'd have to fool around with it and get the thing clear.

Now, I think it could – I don't mean to invalidate or make you believe that you are going blind and can't see anymore, or something like that, but the alternative is, is you're just plain wicked. And you aren't that either. The mistakes which could be made – "Are you just not seeing the meter bang?" See? You think that it's swinging all the time anyway, and you don't quite see the change of pace. Your eye isn't educated to seeing the change of pace, that's all. That would be one.

Another thing: your pc – before you investigate this thing and before you investigate your pc, you've already got him so ARC broke that the meter won't read at all. See, your TR 1 just is not responding on the pc because of the ARC break.

And the other one would be some confusion about what is an instant read. What is one? Well, of course, you see one, you see one. Last night Suzie was calling off for you just any read that came along, naturally. She was giving you read practice, and some of you took it that she was calling them all reads and thought she should have only been calling the instant read. I'll stop that. Why, she can call just instant reads next time. You will see these things read. It's the educated eye.

This is the grossest auditing error there is. It is the hardest one to put across. Nobody is trying to make you guilty, particularly. Well, I have got some ways and means by which you can feel easier about it. And I don't say that all of you are doing it, and I don't say that all of you are doing it always. But there's enough of it being done so that those pcs which I have checked out, or had checked out, in the last few weeks have been found to not – they weren't clean on whatever was being asked. Not only weren't clean on the meter but weren't clean physiologically on the questions.

You see, there are other ways to watch – you ask a pc a question, and he goes *zuuhmm*, *nyah* and *stuh* and *huh-huh* and blushes and squirms and ... Honest, it's as good as an instant read. You get all those reactions of one kind or another. Of course you add it up.

Observation – observation. That's the whole thing – the ability to look. I have always been trying to teach you how to look. Here is a direction to look; here is an instrument with which to look. And if I ever will just teach you just to look and to see what you are looking at without any interference or interpretation or anything else, well, I probably would have made a greater philosophic splash than any philosopher we've had on this planet, don't you see?

So this is the toughest one to get anybody to do, is just to observe. That's the tough one, see? Don't feel too bad. Just work on it. Get practiced up. All of a sudden you'll be right in there pitching. Okay?

Remember, once upon a time somebody delivered me a thing, and they said it was an Electropsychometer. And I sat up most of the night trying to find out what it did. And it was actually a week or two before I found out that it read on the needle. So you're in good company.

Thank you.

E-METER DATA: INSTANT READS, PART II

A lecture given on 24 May 1962

Twenty-four May, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, AD 12.

All right. Now you seem to be considerably interested in what meters do, and you seem to be having an awful lot of trouble, one way or the other. I was going to talk to you about Goals Assessments in this particular lecture, but I won't; I will talk to you definitely about meters.

You know, you can get into more holes full of complication than anybody could easily dig you out of in a long while. You get complicated. And if you just would stop figuring and start looking!

I remember – went out one time – got a motorcycle off the boat, and I was straightening the motorcycle up and was trying to get the thing to function out in Camden, New Jersey. I was trying to get this motorcycle going so – lights wouldn't light, you know; and so we kept throwing the switch, and so forth. And it was just at that time this first cliché – the first time I had put out this cliché and so on. It was "Look, don't think." See? It was very funny.

And this little Francis-Barnett British motorcycle had a very complicated Lucas light system – its headlamp and everything else. And it was very complicated, very hard to get apart. All kinds of wires and condensers, and all sorts of things.

So I started taking it apart, and took the bulb out and took the wires apart and unhooked everything. We had parts that were lying around a good square yard. And then I happened to look down at the battery and the terminals weren't connected. We had all the job of putting it all together again. It would have taken about one minute to have put the terminals on the battery.

That was a marvelous example of "Look, don't think," because I'd sure done a lot of figuring right there on that motorcycle, you see, and the net result was dismantling the works.

You get doing this, and you get to figuring out what this is and the significance of that, and the complications of something else and so on. And I know what you're up against because there's a textbook called *Dutton's* which teaches navigation. And it is the textbook used by the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis; it's their key book on the subject. And it's – no doubt about it, it's a marvelous textbook. There is no doubt whatsoever that *Dutton's* is just absolutely wonderful as a textbook. Not a single datum of any kind on the subject of navigation that is not to be found in *Dutton's*. They modernize it, also, every year – marvelous!

You open it up, and sentence by sentence they machine-gun you with exact pertinent data with no amplification or further definition of any kind whatsoever. They don't bother to tell you it's a textbook on navigation of ships from here to there. They simply start in telling you, "This is the Earth and the sun and the planets and the alidade-amplitude angle dihedral in betwixt."

"A barograph is an instrument used to measure barometric pressure. It is read at two o'clock, four o'clock and eight o'clock." I don't know; what do you read? You read its directions? What do you read? You read the label on the – the manufacturer's label on the bottom of it? What do you do? Well, *Dutton's* never bothers to inform you about that. They're above all that, you see?

Unfortunately I collided – on a restudy of Earth navigation – I collided with *Dutton's* back in the middle thirties, hard, you see? There was everything there but an understanding. See? There was no understanding of what this was all about whatsoever, but there sure were hot data. Man, every datum in it was hot.

But there was never any side amplification, such as: You must always precisely locate the exact position of a battleship. See? See, it never says also that it is sometimes disastrous not to locate the position of a battleship. Your imagination is never invited. It is a dry feast of bare bones. It drove me stark, staring mad. I never learned how to navigate from it.

Finally got a book that – I think *Mixer's Primer of Navigation*, or something like this – and read this book. And it didn't treat it very seriously, and it was very happy about the whole thing, and I dug up a few data from that.

Actually, though, I thought it would be easier to go back and evolve the whole thing, so I did. Sometime in 44 an admiral was walking around on the bridge, and I was calculating something or other. And he says, "Well, I see," he says, "that you – how is this?" He'd just flown in, you know, from stateside. He wouldn't be there long because it wasn't very safe where we were. And uh – and he said, "I see," he said, "What – but – but how is this? You're using Commander Weems' new textbook on aerial navigation." And it puzzled him because it was just now in print in the States, and we couldn't possibly have connected that fast. No, I had accidentally evolved it as a simple method of navigation, and somebody else had evolved it. That was all. But it didn't come from *Dutton's*, but I imagine it's now part of *Dutton's*. And I imagine *nobody* can savvy it now. I mean, I imagine that's totally – totally lost.

But this is a method of losing information: is you just give a bunch of machine-gun data and expect everybody to hew the mark on that exact data, and it's never amplified, you see? So we have lots of examples of that particular character.

It is the *importance* of a datum that must be weighted. Weighted – you weight the importance of a datum. And you are so accustomed on this planet – you are terribly accustomed – to studying unweighted data.

Somebody opens up Krishnamurti, and he shows you three places in this book of Krishnamurti's whereby it's exactly parallel to exactly what we say in Scientology; so therefore Krishnamurti is Scientology. And poor old Peggy Conway – I showed her one day that these were totally unweighted data. They had no importance assigned to them whatsoever, but

were there with equal importance with about three or four thousand other datum. These other data were all there of equal importance, and they were – some of them were really wild data. See? So they were all equally important. In other words, there was no selection of importances.

And people keep forgetting this. They think all data are equal. And it's as big a mistake as to consider that all people are equal or anything else is all equal, because it's pretty hard to get an equality. Mathematically it's impossible to get an equality. You take an apple out here off a tree: and if you had another apple which is exactly the same size, shape, age, skin thickness, pattern of the skin, everything else, you'd say, "Well, that apple is equal to that apple." No, they're not equal. They're not occupying the same space. How could they be equal? All the characteristics of one apple would have to be equal to all the characteristics of the other apple and they're all – they're both occupying different positions in space so they can't possibly be equal.

Now, in order to study – I've heard this phrase "Learn how to study." I've had it thrown at me in very fine universities, very fine schools, and so on. Learn how to study, they say, and then they sit back. We should remember this: that there are several ways of laying out data. one is to lay it all out with equal weight with no amplification, no other explanation, nothing to assist understanding; we just machine-gun out a whole bunch of data – *brrrrr*, see? That's supposed to be real good. Your technical-scientific writer of today is educated to do this, and sometimes criticizes the writings of Dianetics and Scientology because it doesn't do only this.

All right. Now, there's another way of handling this stuff, and that is to throw it all out with tremendous obfuscations. You sort of interlard it with "Of course, you boob, you couldn't understand this anyway because it's all so complicated." And they do that in various ways. With footnotes: "Refer to Jervis Crack, page 39," you see? Of course, that book hasn't been available for the last century, so you've had it, you see. Well, what they're doing is doing a priesthood type of action. And most of the professors writing in modern university and so on, are guilty of that. They're trying to create a priesthood.

Now, the reason navigation sprung to mind, and the reason I talk about navigation, is they're exclusively devoted – not this *Dutton*, it's of another kind – but the navigator himself is devoted to the development of a priesthood. It is not for nothing that the early navigators of the South Pacific *were* a priesthood. And they were the reigning priesthood of Polynesia. Well, those birds, with a hole in a coconut shell and that sort of thing, navigated themselves all over the place. Quite interesting how they did it, but it was a priesthood.

And they surround this with a bunch of magic, and they surround it with a bunch of nonsense of one kind or another. Well, a chemistry professor is just as guilty. He gives you a whole bunch of nonsense.

But the reason a navigator springs to mind: if you were to go on a bridge of a naval vessel that had a navigator and to ask him how he was finding his position, he won't have you shot because that's illegal. Instead of that, he will either ignore you with a contemptuous sniff or utterly overwhelm you with a bunch of irrelevant bunk. That man is totally dedicated to the

protection of the cult. Navigation is what makes him important, and if every fool knew how to navigate he wouldn't be important anymore. And that would be that.

The textbook *Bowditch*, on this subject – I'm choosing an esoteric field (navigation), not that you're interested at all in navigation, but just because it's a – it's a – far enough afield that it won't confuse the issue.

Bowditch was a fellow up in the New England states who decided that celestial navigation should be decelestialized. So he did a bunch of tables and things of this character, and he went out on a China trip; and out of his little manual, which was about quarter of an inch thick, he taught even the cook to navigate by star-sights. It was marvelous. He taught everybody on the ship. He was teaching everybody up and down the New England coast how to navigate out of this little tiny book.

You should see that book today! Ha-ha-ha! It's also published by the United States Navy; and it is that thick, it's that high and it's that broad. It's the most marvelous thing for keeping a passageway door open you ever saw. [laughter]

But it has everything in it that has nothing to do with navigation, and it has tables developed which nobody has used for ages. And his original tables, I don't think, are even in it anymore. And yet it's called *Bowditch*. See, the whole thing has been obfuscated. Whole thing has been masked.

That is the way somebody swells up his importance. He makes himself very important. He's one of the twelve men in the world that can understand Einstein. Oh, I don't know, if there was anything there to understand, I think that more than twelve men could have understood Einstein. I took one of the twelve men in the world who could understand Einstein, and I went around to him to have him explain it to me, as the associate editor of the college paper, in a short article. (I was making friends in those days.) I wanted him to give me a short article for this college paper so that I could explain Einstein to the student body. He was very insulted. He was very upset, but is – I wrote an article.

But years afterwards, I was talking to a friend, and he was a pretty good scientist. He was good enough to be kicked out of the government; he was one of the sixty-four that were released for doing their duty. And he said, "Theory of relativity? Well, let's see? Mass equals mc^2 . Well, let's see if we can't do – I wonder if it couldn't be explained rather simply?"

And so we boiled it down and told it to a kid and he understood it perfectly. There wasn't much to this, except what? The vast importance of the person. See? Somebody is using this as a cloak of rare bird feathers, you see, so he can stand before the idol and tell everybody how important he is.

Well, these methods of communication of thought, methods of communication of data – now, we're in an interestingly peculiar field, because the data that is being communicated is in actual fact totally new data that everybody already has. That makes it very peculiar data indeed. Now, there's no language that embraces this because language comes after the fact – before the fact, rather – of the data. And so you get a few terms mixed up in it. It's nothing compared to medical terms or other fields. Nevertheless, it has the frailty of having new

terms. But you have to have new terms, otherwise everything you describe would be a whole package.

I could probably dream up an example and say, "Well, the combined impulses derived from force and duress in the past which have become forgotten but which are capable of impinging themselves upon the individual." Wouldn't you like to say that every time you said "reactive mind"? That would be pretty grim, wouldn't it?

So naturally, you get conversant with this, you start developing a bit of a shorthand. But the shorthand mustn't itself be terribly obscure, and most of our stuff is not obscure. We don't invent words where we don't need them; but we do invent words where we shouldn't be confused.

Now, we lack a complete dictionary. That we should have – there's no doubt about that – so that you could look up any phrase and understand it better. We've been in the throes of making up a dictionary for years. I had the notes on my desk recently, just a few days ago, to start recompiling the thing.

Trouble is, it's costly. That's the only thing that's wrong with a dictionary. You'd have to put two or three people on it for several months to really knock a dictionary together, because you'd have to listen to every tape on which every word had ever been defined at any time; and put all the definitions down for a single word immediately following it, and then that would be a worthwhile dictionary. It would also be quite a worthwhile textbook.

But it happens to be a labor. It's mostly labor: listening to tapes, taking down every definition; looking up all the textbooks, taking down every definition, you know; writing each word on a piece of paper, and then writing each definition that has ever been defined for it – because they've been defined several times.

Well, we – that is a barrier. There is no doubt about that. But what I try to do, the way I try to teach you this, is teach you one very simply and try to give you the weight of the datum – you know, how heavily this is weighted in comparison to other data, see?

I tell you "This one is important," see? And then because there are quite a few important datum, I very often make the mistake of not saying to you that there's a lot of data along this line that's not important. See? They don't amount to anything; they're merely interesting. Well, I tell you that – even that, too, occasionally – that it's an awful lot of bric-a-brac and phenomena.

Well, what happens is that I give you a datum that's important, and you very often pick up a piece of bric-a-brac that's right next door to it that is interesting. See? And you get the two things confused. You know, this other one's fascinating. There's no doubt about it. You start fooling around with things in the mind and there are fascinating things. The floor of the 'ead is strewn with them, man. I don't know how you can live in there.

There are many fascinating data; they are terribly, terribly interesting. Why, if I sat down and wrote everything I knew about needle phenomena or phenomena which could be disclosed by a meter, my God, it'd be something on the order of four or five million words! I know tremendous lots of oddities, fantastic things that you can do, all of which amount to a hill of beans. They're just of no importance at all. Amongst all of that, there are only a few

important data and they are boiled down into that savagely condensed book *E-Meter Essentials*.

Now that is an example, by the way, of a terrific boil-down. The instant read, however, is not described in that book. It is now described in the second edition, but in the original edition it's not described.

Now obviously, it should also be part of my responsibility to tell you what's *not* important. But look! But look, that's four or five million words, see, compared to a few hundred. That would be a job, man.

And you want to know about teaching you some of this stuff, what is utterly, staggeringly fantastic, you see, is trying to guess what you're going to do wrong next. And I tell you, man, that would keep somebody awake all night if he really worried. You know? I worry about it enough. But trying to guess which way the mistake is going to go – because, you see, it can go into any of those unimportant channel. See? And they're just infinite in number.

Now, right now you're riding the hobbyhorse of the interim read, the prior and interim read. Because the word *latent read* is forbidden, you see – I mean, the subject of latent reads we're not interested in – I've omitted saying that there's such a thing as a *prior read*, see? Well, it is also forbidden, see?

A prior read is as bad as a latent read. You only want an instant read.

But what is an instant read? It is that read which takes place immediately after the expressed thought. Now, if you sum that up as a definition, you will see that it precludes – that it is *thoughts* that impinge – not words – on the reactive mind. It's thought, not words. You may express them in words, but they impinge in thought. The reactive mind doesn't actually react to words. The words translate through symbolism into thought, you see? You got the symbols of the words, and then that melts down into thought. The reactive mind responds to the thought impulse. So you can have a lot of thought impulses in one thought.

"Have you seen any gorgeous, good looking, luscious, marvelous, sensational women lately?" How many reads would you get? Man, that's up to you and the gods.

Now, because you are thinking the thought, and if you read this as a straight thought through, the reactive bank at first – only at first – will impinge on every thought contained in the major thought. So you get a whole bunch of prior reads. And then it finally grooves in that *this* is what you're talking about, see?

The major thought is "Have you seen any women lately?" See? "Have you seen any gorgeous, beautiful, luscious, you know, women lately?" That's the big thought. And it'll register as "Have you seen any beautiful women lately?" as well as "you," and "seen," and "gorgeous," and... Get the idea?

Well, the funny part of it is, is you can groove in the major thought or the minor thought. "Have – you – seen ." See? You're going to get reactions by this time. That's a sort of a punctuated reading of something. You're going to get action, action, action, action and then action on the thought.

Well, you saw an example in the demonstration I gave you last night of a prior read. And I threw it away and asked the pc again because I couldn't tell if it was a read or not a read. I just threw it away; I didn't pay any attention to it. It was the one time in the session when that occurred – that something fell on the middle of the last word. Obviously invalid, but it showed that it might have been instant; it all depended. So I just checked it again. But that only happened – in a whole hour of session – only happened once. See how rare that was?

Now, you got the packaged thought. Now, if you repeat that thought, through to the pc, you have restimulated the thought *majeure*, see – not the thought *mineure*, the thought *majeure*. We could have a lot of fun if we were really – really fish-end tails, white tie, you know, type of subject treatment, you know, on the subject of Dianetics and Scientology, you know? You would be learning about the thought *majeure*, you see, and the thought *mineure*. Oh yeah, we could be fancy. Don't let me kid you.

Actually the trick of communicating the whole subject of the human mind with as few words – new words – as we use is quite a trick. That is actually one of the big things that we got, you know. We don't have to go four years to study Latin so that we can abuse *it*.

No, the thought "You seen any beautiful women lately?" is inherent in your statement. And so most of the time you simply read it and "you" almost always will get a reaction, by the way, and so on – whatever it is.

All of your interim spots may get a reaction, but you're only interested in the reaction which occurs with the last word – the end of the last word. It's not after you stop speaking, it's when the whole thought is completed.

Therefore, you'd never use more than one clause, but you can even get away with using several clauses and still get a reaction – lot of phrases and clauses and so forth.

But it may take you two, three or four reads to ring it in. That is one of the reasons you read a goal three times – because it might fall interrimly, might fall randomly. But you want to get the thought expressed. The thought has got to be expressed through to the pc. So you could never read it really successfully less than three times aloud to get the whole thought, that's all. The whole thought delivers through.

Most of the time, oddly enough, the whole thought does deliver through and react. But just that once in the hour's session, you see – well, we got some other interim reads – but only one interim read came so close to the end that a fellow could have made a mistake – indistinguishably close, halfway through the last word.

Well now, the point is this, is the pc's thinkingness isn't turning on the read. It's the pc's reactingness which is reading. So there's no understandingness of any kind consulted on an E-Meter read. It is all stimulus-response. There is no understanding of any kind. It's as though the reactive bank can listen and react. Oddly enough, it can.

It is the auditor to the reactive bank, not the auditor to the analytical mind to the reactive bank. That always gives you a latent read. You got an instantaneous proposition here. Doesn't matter how mysterious it is or isn't. It's just you've just got an instantaneous proposition. It's you – you read the thought, and it reacts in the reactive mind. And honest, the pc can

be doped off, nine-tenths unconscious, goofed off, everything else, and it will still read. I've seen a pc sitting there practically snoring and everything reading. I made several tests on this. I was flabbergasted! You could have said to him, "Women, women, women." You got react, react, see, just this nice *pang! pang! pang!* – three instant reads, nice strong ones. And you could have said, "What did I say?" And he'd say, "What? What's that? What? I don't know. What did you say?" He didn't know, either. See how crazy that is?

Until you actually explore that, it still looks to you as though you say something, the pc analytically hears you and then reacts to what you said, and it is not that cycle at all! That is not the cycle which takes place. I don't care to elucidate even what cycle takes place rather than invent knowledge, but that cycle does *not* take place. See, I can tell you which one *doesn't* take place.

You say it, and he reacts. What reacts? Reactive mind. And that's got to contain timelessness and not-knowingness in order to get a reaction. If you don't have timelessness and not-knowingness, you don't get a reaction on the meter. It's as simple as that. If he thinks of something in order to get a reaction, you always get a latent read; you don't get an instant read.

Oh, you want black magic? There it is. The reactive mind of most people is black enough. Look at the GPM sometime.

But of course, you have all of your latent reactive thinkingnesses of former identities are stacked up there like Genghis Khan's pyramid of skulls. There's plenty of them. And all of that combined thinkingness and reactingness, and so forth, has amounted to a GPM. So it'd be wonderful and marvelous that it didn't respond. But remember *it – it* I said. *It*, not the pc.

Actually, this is technically incorrect: "How did the pc respond on the meter?" The pc never responded on the meter! *It* did. *It* did. And when *it* responded, it did it instantaneously, exactly, peculiarly, at the end of the thought *majeure*.

I'll hang you with one just so you can feel upstage. [laughter] So if you're at some party sometime where there's nothing but professors, you could say, "Well, we mostly deal in the thought *majeure*." [laughter]

But there is this – there is this weirdity. Now frankly, you think sound travels at eleven thousand – eleven hundred feet per second, and so forth, and such. And undoubtedly there are lags developed in here because of sound, and so forth; but remember I don't know that. See, this is to some degree an invented piece of knowledge.

And we could calculate it out and say that the auditor's length of time to pour out to the end, plus the length of time of his voice impulse to the pc's ears, plus the length of time to the reactive bank, plus the time consumed in restimulating the electrical responses of the reactive mind, plus the lag of the E-Meter would be how long it took for the read to read instantly.

Now, I don't know, maybe we could sit on one mountain top and have an E-Meter lead from Mont Blanc over to Mount Punk, or something of the sort. And we yodeldeehoo, you see, across and ask some restimulative question and see how long it takes, and measure the electrical current and measure the amount of time in the air; and maybe we could do a lot of things like this and maybe we could learn a great deal. And I'm sure if some professor liked to

mountain climb, he would spend the rest of his life establishing that fact. We're more interested in the subject *majeure* rather than the subject *mineure*. Anyway – . [laughs]

So the main thing we're interested in is the thing reacts instantly, and it reacts instantly at the end of the thought. And of course, it will react to interim thoughts.

You say, "Have you, you swine, damaged any pigs lately in this session?" See? Well, now you're throwing yourself a curve if you add "in this session" because it's a clause after the thought. The modifying clause coming after the thought "fubbles" the whole thing up. So you should say, "In this session," and then you should drop the interjection "you swine," [laughter] and you say, "In this session, have you damaged any pigs?"

Now, this is the liability of reading a meter. Supposing the pc has an item called pigs. Now, you'll get into one of the world's most marvelous tangles, because it's reacting on the word "pigs," and you don't know whether it's acting on the thought *majeure* or the thought *mineure*. You don't know which is which. And that's the only time you can really get tangled up.

Say the pc's goal: "To catch catfish." And you're trying to test out the way to list it. Now, "Want to catch catfish," you know, "Who or what would not want to catch catfish?" "Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?" "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" will all react on an instant read just like the goal, won't they? Isn't that horrible? That's very confusing because then you can't tell which is the right phrasing to line up on, unless you read them two or three times to groove it home, at which time, oddly enough, the goal will no longer react as the goal but will only react as a thought *majeure*. And that's a little test that you ought to make just to convince yourself – show yourself, what it is.

Take some highly restimulative interimly worded sentence – I don't care what it is – that as a major thought adds up to a whole, that you know would be hot on the pc. He's got some old item that's still in, see? Some kind like this. Put that on the end. And then you will see after you have read it about three times that it only acts on the thought *majeure* and will not act on that item. But the item will act separately.

You can take the item out of the sentence. Even though it occurs to the end of the sentence, you can take it out – it's just marvelous, you know? And you can set it out there all by itself. And you say, "Pigs, pigs." First time it doesn't react; it's cautious, see? "Pigs." Now you say, "Pigs, pigs, pigs, pigs." After that, "Pigs, pigs, pigs, pigs, pigs."

You put it back in the thought *majeure*: "In this session, have you injured any pigs?" No read. This is mysterious, man. Of course it might read the first time as just an additional "pig," but then groove it in again – groove it in again. "In this session, have you injured any pigs?" No, it won't react. Mysterious!

Now, the mysteriousness of it is: is below the unknowingness there is a terrific power of retention in the reactive bank. It is another one of its characteristics. It has fantastic continuity, fantastic survival. Otherwise it wouldn't be here. And what is put into it then acquires this characteristic of fantastic survival. So you have time, not-knowingness and survival. So what you pour into it will continue to react.

The delicacy of its operation is another astounding thing. If the goal is "To injure pigs" – that's the actual goal – and the wording which you have on the list is "To injure a pig," at first, "To injure a pig," will react and will then cease to react, and will react and it'll splutter and monkey around, and you won't quite know what you're doing on the thing. And all of a sudden the pc – you can never change it for the pc – the pc is liable to say, "Oh, well, that's – tha-that's to injure pigs." *Pang!* It's a marvelous precision. This is an old study in Dianetics, is the fantastic precision with which this thing will do it. "To injure pigs," that's fine. It'll react from there on out. See? But "To injure a pig" – sporadic, not in.

Don't also think that total retention is total wisdom. It isn't. So you get this kind of a circumstance where if you're a tiny bit offbeat you won't get the reaction.

Now oddly enough, you can get a generalized thought which is close enough in to get the reaction, and that's where you get your What questions from. That's why you actually ought to fish for your What question. "What about wrecking cars? What about stealing and wrecking cars?" The pc unfortunately used the word "swiping cars," and you're trying to get on "stealing cars," and my God, you never get a What question.

Last night we had a word. If I'd used any other word than that exact What question, if I hadn't used the word *conned*, it wouldn't have reacted. The pc said it so that must be at the base of the chain of the overt. Your clue must be taken from the pc.

Now, you can play ducks and drakes with this thing You can throw it all over the place, and so forth, as long as a central pin stays there to hook in and identify. You got to have something that will identify. You got to have a thought that associates and so on.

Well, you're doing an interesting thing. You're taking the whole of an overt act, which was all in terms of action anyhow, and you're putting it in terms of English, which it might not even have occurred in, and that thought embraces the action which took place which was the overt. Oh, my God! Nobody would be able to build a machine that did it. That would be utterly incredible. And yet the reactive mind can do that much of a stretch.

But "What about stealing a lot of cars? What about stealing cars? What about stealing and wrecking cars?" *Bang!* On another instance the pc said, "Well, I swiped a scooter." And you say to him, "What about stealing children's toys?" You know? BBC, you know, type of response. Nothing happens. You have to sound out your What question.

Now, you can alter it this far: "What about swiping toys?" That will be dead on. That's okay.

But you altered the doingness, you see? And the thought of the doingness shifted. You have to keep that pretty well the same, don't you see? And you have to have some – at least some associated object to make this thing react, but it will react every time.

And the odd part of it is, why does it react after "toys?" Why does it go "toys," See? "Toys" – click. Why? It's the total thought. All I can tell you is it does. And if you have a question which reads "What (tick) about (dirty needle) stealing (tick) toys? (fall)," you ignore everything but the fall. You don't do another blessed thing with a prior read. You just skip the lot. If it doesn't fall at the instant you said "-s." See, "toys," "toys"-fall. If it falls at "t-" (fall), it's not an instant read.

Don't tell me why the reactive mind does this. I couldn't care less. Just take it from me that it does. Then it cleans up and everything squares up and the pc feels better and it falls apart. It's almost as if it's drawn itself a complete plan of "how you take me apart." Most fantastic thing. All you had to know about the whole thing from beginning to end was exactly . You had to be able to look and observe.

Interim reads are so common that if you tried to pay any attention to an interim read on "Have you tried to damage – In this session, have you tried to damage anyone?" Suppose you're asking such a question, and it fell on "damage," – you knucklehead! The worst you could do – you saw me do it one time on an earlier session. I wrote "damage" over in the margin. I knew it would be a hot Prepcheck question, but ignored it for that because it didn't fall on "anyon-e" – See? It's just a curve of the "e" and then the action. See? "In this session, have you tried to damage anyon-e?" – *ooo!* There it goes right on that "e," see? Not earlier, not later, but right on. Marvelous. Why it works this way, God knows.

You know, I think even people with the big-thetan theory would doubt it. It's too incredible. But that is the fact. And you'll find out this pans out every time. You find out if you clean off that instant read at the end of the thought major, you'll be all set. And if you start monkeying around with the interim reads of the thought minors, you are going to fall on your 'lead every time.

Now, you very often will get in severe trouble putting together goals. "To go out and pick potatoes and sometimes have a girl in the potato patch." Man! And it falls on "to go out," and it falls on "and pick potatoes" and "to have a girl," and it falls on "potato patch." And there's no instant read after "patch." After you've said it three times, there is no instant read after "patch." Well, I'd say it has something to do with the goal, probably, in some version or form or another, as will eventually arise. And I'd get all the invalidations and the missed withholds and suppressions off of listing.

That's another one I should take up with you. I'll take it up with you right now.

When I say "listing," I don't mean items. When I say "Take it off the subject of listing," I don't mean take it off the items of listing. When I say "listing," I just mean listing. You say, "Is there any missed withhold on listing" See? "Have you suppressed listing?" "Have you invalidated listing?" "Have you ever committed an overt with listing?" That's the way you phrase it, see? That's listing. Listing. It is a subject. You could even say "Goals listing."

And when we say – when I tell you "items" or "individual items," why, then, I mean a goal or an item or a straight line.

"Is there any item on this list which has been invalidated? Thank you. Is there any item on this list on which there is a missed withhold?" Too complicated a phraseology, you can't get across the thought *majeure* easily, so you say, "Is there any item on this list which has been invalidated?" Say it the second time. And you get your click. Marvelous to behold; you'll get your click, and you clean that click off.

But you – there is the subject of listing, and then there's the subject of goals, and there's the subject of items in general; all of these things are different things that you can do things with, you understand?

Now, in this rundown of the goal, if you don't get your instant read on the end of the goal by the third time you've read it, it ain't it. And you certainly better ignore it. But very possibly – not positively at all – but very possibly potatoes have something to do with this goal, or maybe it's girls have something to do with the goal. Of course, we can't guess.

Now, I've even gone so far, experimentally, as to try to pick out all of the various words that had reacted and put a goal together for the pc. Doesn't work. Evaluates for the pc and throws the whole thing into that. The pc will give it to you eventually. You get all the withholds off the subject of listing, all the withholds off the subject of auditing, all the withholds off the subject of items, goals, that sort of thing. Any overts that might have occurred in this direction – just explore around, get them all over. And all of a sudden you say, "Well, are there any more goals?"

"Oh, yap, yap, yap, yap, and yap, yap, yap and yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap – 'To lay girls in the open.'"

All right. You're nulling on down. There was your potato patch. See? Only this one will go "open" (*bang*), "open" (*bang*), "open" (*bang*). You see your read? Instant read, instant read, instant read every time.

It does not matter how many reads you get that are prior to the instant read. You ignore them. Please believe me. You just ignore them. It does not matter how many reads you get *after* the instant read. Ignore them. But you must put across your thought *majeure* to the pc. And if you got the thing all participially occluded, why, prepare to stand there for several reads before it'll finally embrace.

But oddly enough, no matter how complicated it is – I don't know, I think you could probably get – you could probably get a fall on *Uncle Tom's Cabin* where it says "The End"; you get your instant read, you know? But you would have had to have read it to the reactive mind fifty or sixty times, and I don't think anybody could stand that. [laughter]

So that stable datum – get used to that stable datum. Live with it and you won't have any trouble on the thing. And God almighty never ignore one. *Teowwwwwww!* Never ignore one.

On the subject of rudiments, middle rudiments, something like that: "A little while ago when I was talking to you about that goal, did you get an ARC break?" And it goes *zumth-zwy* – ARC break, goal – *zzzm-zzzumph*, you know? "A little while ago when I was talking to you about that goal, did you get an ARC break?" Now, you'll notice there's less randomness in it. "A little while ago when I was talking to you about that goal, did you get an ARC break?" – *Clank!* You put the thought *majeure* across, and it now is impinged, and it will react. But why did it take so long? That's because it's so complicated.

You would have gotten your instant read like this: "In this session, have you had an ARC break?" – *Clank!* See? Simple: fast. Complicated: takes you a while. A complicated thought *majeure* takes a lot of pounding before it is finally embraced and will give you an instant read.

Now you say, "In this session, have you told a half-truth? Untruth?" See? That package question possibly leads you astray, because there you are using a packaged bunch of instant reads. Actually, you're shorthanding: "In this session have you told a half-truth? In this

session have you told an untruth? In this session have you tried to impress me? In this session have you tried to damage anyone?" See? Oddly enough, you could package the whole thing together and use the interim reads. Oddly enough, only that one will go down; particularly after the third or fourth or fifth session with the pc, because the reactive bank is now grooved into that thought *majeure*. They're very obliging. A pc who is under control really responds.

This is all rather incredible. Why does the reactive mind react? Why does the E-Meter work? Well, I won't be so stupid as to try to force on you the same orders that the six hundred had at Balaklava, (which is some sort of musical instrument they didn't play well). There's this type of think about this. Now, I could say to you, the Instructors could say, everybody could say to you: "Now, look! When it gets an instant read, read it! Now, you don't have to understand it. Just when it gets an instant read, read it that way. That's it!" See?

And you say, "Yeah, but why does it read that way?", see, and so forth. You've got a perfect right to ask that question, see? Got a perfect right. *Why* does it only give an instant read? And why can you groove in a thought *majeure*? And why does it sometimes read on the thought *mineure*? See? Why? Why? Why? Why? Why? Like little Arthur says, see? You've got a perfect right to say that.

And I got a perfect right to tell you, "I don't know!" [laughter] It just does! This is a whole set of fortuitous accidents based on direct lookingness and on no figureness. There's very little think involved with this thing, you see?

The E-Meter itself, I think, was a Decca voltmeter which a guy held both sides of and it reacted, in its most primitive state. I think it was Richard Saunders at Elizabeth, New Jersey was monkeying around with this. He wanted to show doctors that there was a response, and he knew they would look at meters. So he pinched the living daylights out of a pc, you know – made him black and blue, you know – while they were holding on to this thing, and then told him to recall it and got the same response on the meter.

Well, fortunately today we're not dealing with that level of insensitivity on the subject of meters, because think of how you'd look at the end of session. [laughter] But this was picked up one way or the other or independently gone at by Mathison. I gave a lecture, described what kind of an instrument we really had to have. Mathison went home and he bread-boarded one up. It functioned remarkably well for its original state. It was very limited. Pcs went off the top of it and went off the bottom of it with the greatest of ease. I think they possibly still do on Mathisons.

But anyway, time went on and around Washington, why, I eventually thought it would be a good thing to have this one, and Don Breeding, and the rest of the boys got scratching their head over this thing, and old Joe Wallace and so on. And they kept hanging things together.

And then they'd do a perfect one, you know, and then they'd scrap it because they could do one that, you know, behaved electronically better, you know? And I'd take a pistol out of my desk and hold it on them and make them build the first plan.

And then they'd put fifty on the line or twenty-five on the line, or something like that, and come back and tell me that if they just eliminated the ruddy rod and put a couple of con-

densers there that would work much better. And I'd say, "No, you don't. You build the original one." See?

And they built some of these other ones, and they responded perfectly electronically, but they did not respond mentally. This meter responds mentally. Anybody alters that meter, it's practically over our dead body, because it's just empirically worked out. It's marvelous that it works at all.

But, do you know, people give you explanations for the working and for the circuit and for this and that about this thing. They're talking in their hats. They're talking through their hats. They can give you all of the stuff, and so forth, but that stuff all got assembled in there on the basis of just breadboarding something.

Now we've developed theories as to how this thing works. Now we've developed all kinds of things. There's a magnetic thing in here that swings that. We're dependent on James Watt, Edison, all the modern electronics guys, transistors, everybody else, on all of their know-how; but this hung together makes an E-Meter. Why? I don't know.

We've got a doctor's meter. Costs several times what one of these things cost. Reg got me one.

We played around with that thing. It doesn't work. We don't know what it does, but it does something else. The needle goes by so fast, you can't even see it go. We've learned exactly nothing from it, which I think is marvelous, except this one fact – you all knew that – that's doctors are frauds. But we have an example of this. They've tried to copy our E-Meter and they just haven't gone anywhere with it. They couldn't tell anything with this thing. It's marvelous! And we got it, and I'm glad to have it! It's not a wasted instrument. There is the peak of medical electronics.

Now, why does it work? Why does the reactive mind do this?

What you figuring for? For God's sakes, the thing is laid out on a red carpet. This is how it works, this is how it reacts and this is how you use it. Oddly enough, it's invariable – utterly invariable.

Now, one of these days you're going to get Clear, you're going to get very bright, you're going to figure out *exactly* why an E-Meter responds this way, *exactly* what wavelengths the thetan operates on in order to put a reactivity together, *exactly* how many condensers fit together amongst the ruddy rods. You understand? And how you can all do it on thought transference and set up an E-Meter on a table and read President Coolidge's reasons why he wouldn't run, you see? – read through time.

Yes, by all means get in that shape! Yes, by all means get that design. When you do, write me a letter. I'll publish it.

There's more phenomena around this subject – not just this meter – than you could easily count up on an ICBM [IBM] Comptometer, and there's an awful lot of particles in one of those.

Now, where do we got the figure? Where's the think?

Reg is an engineer, who is a sharp apple. You see him around here once in a while. He has a hard time with this, man. It violates all of his principles of electricity and the body and everything else. This thing is a ghost instrument. He concluded the other day that, well, there's nothing else to register there but thinkingness, or what did it? or how did it? or something.

It wasn't that he was baffled that this reacted against the mind, because that's rather common.

He's baffled about other things. He always thought it worked on the amount of sweat, and then he suddenly realized that you can't sweat and unsweat that fast. So there must be something else involved here, and a lot of things. But you walk up to most guys and they'll tell you it's sweat – measures sweat. All right. Good. Measures sweat. I don't know what that's got to do with it either. It doesn't measure sweat. It measures think.

But there's a lot of boys can put these meters together that don't measure think. Oddly enough, you can put the commonest type of Wheatstone bridge together and give it no damping, and the thing oddly enough will register even think. So there's nothing very mysterious about it.

The mind is hung together electronically, it's hung together with electricity. There's standing waves, standing masses in it which are timeless. These things are drifting along in present time, and it obeys all of your electrical laws and impulses.

But remember something. The human being is the author of this universe and he's also the author of all the electronics in this universe. Actually, there are flows and currents in the human mind that have not yet been discovered in electronics. See? That a junior subject can now study a senior subject is, of course, a weird joke. But it can, which is quite peculiar.

Now, you're not interested in why an E-Meter reads really – unless you want to do some research in that particular line – beyond this one thing. A thetan is an electric eel and it measures electric currents. That's about as close as I care to come to it myself. I never speculate on this. But you talk about oddball, offbeat data on the subject of the E-Meter. Why does the meter go tickity-tick, back and forth, with an exact pattern every time when a person wants to leave or go away or blow out of his head, or so forth? – the theta bop.

The study of the theta bop could be very long and very involved. I can tell you numerous ways to produce a theta bop. Lots of ways. "Did you ever think of leaving anybody?" You get a theta bop, you see? "Did you ever think of dying?" You get a theta bop. "Try not to be three feet back of your head." You get a theta bop. "Shoot him with a .45." You get a theta bop. I mean, it's an interesting thing. Well, we get the coordinative action then. And one of the ways that you could deduce or surmise that people could exteriorize and what exteriorization was and how people leave their bodies at the time of death, and that sort of thing, can be traced with a theta bop.

What do you want to trace it for? Why don't you just learn how to get out of your head and see how it is and get back in again. See? You don't have to figure these things out because you're on the main road anyhow. You don't have to go at it with a bunch of logics and substitutes, because it's there to look at. So you can go around picking up pebbles all over the road.

You can get them in your shoes. You can fall in the ditch. You can run into milestones and culverts and bridge abutments and the neighbor's fence. You can do all of these things. But let me call to your attention that there is a main highway, and you can go down it at 110 miles an hour.

And it's the instant read – prior reads don't count; latent reads don't count – just instant reads, that's all. And the instant read will abide by the major thought that you're putting across to the pc and, oddly enough, will occur exactly as though somebody over there had been informed when you were going to stop talking. Probably the OGPU or the NKVD. I don't know, they have an intelligence service involved.

You can be very mysterious about the whole thing, but the funny part of it is, it becomes terribly simple. And when you look at it in that way, when you clean up everything in this way, E-Metering becomes very odd.

Now, if you're so involved in prior reads and so involved in latent reads and so involved in why it reads, and if you also have a number of invalidations of the meter and also suspect that it doesn't work because it hasn't worked on you – you see, one day it didn't read when you knew it should have read – why, naturally you're going to have a hell of a time with a meter.

So break it down to that simplicity. Look at the only important read that is on the machine and you've got it.

The only other thing I can tell you about a read is when it goes more than one simple read, it is a dirty needle and is measuring somewhere on the track a missed withhold.

All the goals and items that you want have a single tick. The only reaction you will get on a proven goal item – single tick.

Double tick? Then the whole goal or item is a missed withhold. Soon as you get the missed withhold off, it'll no longer read. Missed withholds are always more than one tick. You never have goals and items finally proven out with any other pattern.

I have seen some prove out with a rock slam. I've seen some prove out with a rock slam. But latterly, I have realized that there wasn't much of a list every time that occurred. If there'd been a little bit more of a list, they would have proved out with a tick. It's all right as a goal, but I see these things months and months afterwards when they've settled down, and they all prove out with a tick. You understand? That's all you're really interested in with a meter.

Now, you talk about speeded rises, speeded falls, slowed rises, slowed falls – yeah, but those are all instant reads. Now you're talking about out rudiments. Now you're talking about reading the significance of the thought *majeure* but it's still an instant read. It is merely a change of needle pattern. So there's significances about what this read is and what that read is, and I've just rattled them off to you.

There are no more than that, you see? The dirty needle is always a missed withhold. That's a double-tick arrangement. Any change of needle pattern at the *instant* you're finished

is an instant read. And, that goals and items when they check out, if they're valid, turn out to be single ticks.

Frankly, you could get along with just the data which I've given you in this lecture. If you applied that and didn't go scrambling around the road for a bunch of new data, why, man, you'd have all the rudiments in, you'd be sailing and everything would be fine. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

I don't say stop thinking. Think all you want to. But don't stop looking

Thank you.

Q AND A PERIOD: GOALS ASSESSMENT, HAVINGNESS

A lecture given on 29 May 1962

Thank you.

All right this is what?

Audience: 29 May.

Twenty-nine May 1962, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Lecture 1. And this is a very good opportunity for you to ask some questions. And a very, very good opportunity for you to ask some questions.

Now every once in a while I give you an opportunity to wish you hadn't spoken. [laughter] Okay, what question do you have tonight?

Male voice: What are the stable datums for doing a Goals Assessment?

What's the stable datum for doing a Goals Assessment? Can you keep the rudiments in on the pc? You must be able to keep the rudiments in on the pc before you embark upon a Goals Assessment. In other words, don't start on a Goals Assessment and then find out that you should have been prepchecking. This is the mark of a knuckleheaded auditor. This is – this raises one to the "Royal Order of Coconut." [laughter]

There you are, "To catch catfish, to catch cat-" Dirty needle. Ha-ha. Well, "To catch catfish." Dirty, continuing and repetitive needle. "To shoot squirrels. To shoot sq- . Have I missed a withhold on you?"

"Oh, no. No. No, you haven't missed a withhold on me. I ... "

That is the wrong time, see. That's the wrong time and place.

Somebody wrote me the other day – somebody who got a course incomplete here, by the way – and halfway through it, a Goals Assessment, had been able to straighten out the pc by going into three or four hours of prepchecking. Ha-ha.

What was this auditor doing prepchecking when they were supposed to be doing a Goals Assessment, see? They should have prepchecked it, got it *all* straightened out, got everything *all* smooth so that the pc's rudiments would stay in beautifully and then *zoom-zoom-zoom-zoom-zoom-zoom*, you could do a fast Goals Assessment and so forth. Otherwise you spend three times the time it takes to do a Goals Assessment doing the prepchecking that you would have done in one *third* of the time if you'd only been prepchecking. Now do you get the idea?

So the whole criteria of when do you do a Goals Assessment or what kind of condition the pc's got to be in to do a Goals Assessment or any other such question, the whole criteria is

totally that one thing. Will the rudiments stay in? And if they stay in – *clank-thud-bang*, in concrete – by all means do a Goals Assessment. Answered?

Male voice: Right.

All right. Yes, John?

Male voice: My question, Ron, would you care to say something about the expectancies of Routine 3 GA?

Expectancy of...

Male voice: Routine 3 GA.

... Routine 3 GA. Now do you mean expectancy in what you ...

Male voice: In terms of Clearing.

... in terms of Clearing. How long it might take to Clear somebody with this?

Well you'd have to make an estimate of how long it would take to – how long – what's the expectancy of Routine 3 GA in terms of Clearing somebody and so forth. Well, if you add to it how long does it take to prepcheck somebody up to rudiments in, see – rudiments well in. That length of time, you see, that's kind of variable. I don't know what length of time that would be. It's anybody's guess. It depends on the auditor to a very marked degree.

Phil is in the next room so it's all right for me to tell you. But he suggested that I make you good and guilty tonight about this and so forth – because we did three and a half weeks of student-rate Prepchecking this afternoon. We were at it about an hour and a half, something – an hour and forty-five minutes. I won't – I won't shorten it anymore than it was. It was actually an hour and fifty-two minutes. And we cleaned up invalidations of goals, listing prior goals lists – any overts against, you know I mean, that kind of thing. Got it straightened up. And got it straightened up so the middle rudiments would stay in pretty good. And we did it all in about an hour and fifty-five minutes.

Now, this just depends – how long is it going to take you to do it? Well it'd vary a great deal. Depend on prior processing the individual had had.

Supposing – supposing you come into session every day and you say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

The pc says, "Well yes, I have a present time problem. My mother-in-law has left me and I'm – I'm being – being sued by my wife and by three children who are in college are all pregnant." Or something of the sort.

He's got present time problems galore and so forth. And so you spend three-quarters of the session trying to get rid of the present time problem. Well, you are in no condition to get rid of present time problems. This guy's got problems, problems, problems, problems, problems, problems, problems. How are you ever going to get anything done, see?

Well, how long does it take to clean that up? So that's an open question. You might elect to run Routine 1A or something like that. And run it flat. Right away. Well you've shot

about twenty-five hours maybe, bang. Get the idea? So it's that factor – that factor, very variable for the auditor, very variable for the pc.

But let's say we've got this fellow up to a point where it's an "Oh, my God" situation. This one that just came out into the – got his toes just on the edge of Clear at the moment the auditor went south in a hurry. Got there just, you know, just ready to walk in through the gate, you know and looked up and the auditor had blown the area. I don't know why it was, but... Now, that history in Prepchecking, CCHs, Routine 1A and so forth is a *long and bloody* history. [laughter] His auditor used to spend hour for hour, one hour in processing, one hour in her bedroom crying quietly to herself over the hopelessness of it all. Actually that wasn't the action of one auditor, but the action of about three auditors. So all of the tough points of the case had already been straightened out. Case would stay in-session beautifully.

How long did it take from there on? Well the first goal, I think, assessment – I have no real figures on this – but I know that it couldn't have taken longer than twelve and a half hours. I know it just couldn't have taken more than that. And the actual listing down to the first appearance of the free needle with the tone arm down on four lists on that particular goal couldn't have taken more than about twenty-five hours. So there you have what? There you have thirty-seven and a half hours to the first free needle.

But there's this horrible variable, you see, up to this point, see. The ground looked like Flanders in 1917, you see. Everything was all smoothed out. And then from then on, see, very rapid. Careful preparation up to that point and then, gruesome as it might have been, then easy going from there on.

Now, finding the next goal – this is an indeterminate thing – but actually shouldn't take any longer to find that goal than to find the first one. So let's say another twelve and a half hours. And it certainly wouldn't take any longer than twenty-five to list that one if it took that long to list the first one. So, a very safe margin – you've got about another thirty-seven and a half hours. And let's be dispassionate about it and say that it's probably seventy-five hours right about this point.

Then the next one, you couldn't possibly occupy this much time with it. I mean you couldn't occupy thirty-seven and a half hours on the third goal if you tried – if the auditor knew his business. And let's just throw the third and fourth goal and their listing into the next twenty-five hours – you'd have about a hundred. And I imagine that needle would be free, free, free, at just about that time. You'd have a hard time stirring the case up.

I'm just looking at one case, you know – just trying to give you some kind of a forecast on it – just a guesstimate. Ah, I'd say time to burn – time to burn madly on decent auditing at a hundred and twenty-five hours. Oh, I imagine that it would've just been time to burn.

So I'd say perhaps your expectancy on 3 GA should range – the length of time of Prepcheck and CCHs to make sure that the pc's rudiments would stay in – whatever else you had to do – take *that* length of time – which is very variable. And put on top of that maybe a hundred and twenty-five to a hundred and fifty hours or something like that and you've probably got some guesstimate of this situation. You understand this is a guesstimate, this is still an experimental procedure.

But at least this procedure does tend to lower the sensitivity knob, although I haven't had as many reports on that as I would like to. In other words loosen the needle – does tend to – and tends to bring the tone arm down to the Clear read of the pc and all tendencies are that this one is in there.

By the way, there's another process that is on the assembly line. There's another process that is waiting in case, see. It's 3 G4, as long as we're going into it. 3 GA doesn't plow things well case to case – case – you've still got this other one. This other one is all figured out, totally untested, just lying on the shelf, maybe never be used. A very simple process but you would find it harder to do than 3 GA and that's why it is lying on the shelf.

You find a goal and then you find a goal that would oppose it. And then you find – you do another assessment and you assess for goals that would oppose that goal and then you assess for goals that would not oppose that goal. And then – and then you assess for goals that would not want that goal. And now you've got four goals and they all tick alike. You've got to get four goals that all tick alike. There can't be a hair's breadth difference in their reaction and that'll be all the manifestations of the package. And then you list all those four goals and you theoretically would come out with your same package. At the other end you'd come out with your four items, which are actually two items. And that's just another approach to the situation and I've seen absolutely no reason whatsoever to cook that one up yet or do anything about it. I just worked out the possibilities of processes and that of course is sitting there.

But expectancy for that one – the only reason I'm bringing that up now, you see – it's taking people normally about three weeks, you see, to find a goal and now, you understand you haven't audited that goal. This case is in no better shape now, really. This case just feels a little brighter and with that case in that same condition, now, you are going to find an opposition goal. I don't know how long that's going to take. And then you're going to find a not-opposition goal and we don't know how long that is going to take. And we are going to find a goal of "something that wouldn't want to" and then we don't know how long it'd take to find that goal. But I imagine you are up there to about twelve twenty-five hour intensives and you haven't yet listed anything So I don't look very... I'm hoping you don't find any way to misrun 3 GA, you see. That's the main – that's the main thing That answer your question?

Male voice: Yes it does.

All right. Yes, Fred?

Male voice: Since we don't have a modifier now, how do you keep a Goals Problem Mass keyed in uh – if it – if it should uh – key out and you get a free needle?

Well, all right. That's a good question. Since we don't have a modifier how do you keep the GPM keyed in while you are listing and that sort of thing?

Actually the modifier is only the label of one of those items which you are listing on that listing.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

See at – you were – you were oh, you're still finding the same package. You see, if you found an opposition goal and an opposition terminal, your modifier and all the rest of these

things – they're – they're still just – they're – it's the same package as you were finding in 3D. And of course by listing each one of these lines, you of course keep as much of this thing pulled in as you are going to keep pulled in anyway, theoretically.

Now, the next thing that you might run into is the *second goal* – trying to keep things stirred up for the second goal. But the pc will be able to approach the GPM much more closely now because the first package has been whizzed up into space. And I don't think, I don't foresee any trouble with that at all, because you are listing a line which keeps it pulled in. Okay? Right. Okay.

Yes Jim.

Male voice: The stabilizing of the Clear resolution – apparently – was a notice on the board that this was happening I'm curious to know what the procedure is.

Oh, that would just be going on and that would be going on and that would be going on. That is just more goals and more four lists and more goals and more four lists, more goals and more four lists – until you can't get a meter to read if you hit the guy over the head with a club.

Stabilization is just more of it in 3 GA and just more of it and more of it and more of it because you're not likely to find this pc flying off into a key-out. See, because every time you find a goal, you are going to wrap your paws around every element that was part of the Goals Problem Mass. And you could probably look for longer listing, more goals to be found than in Routine 3, you see. Let's see, what was your question again now?

Male voice: The stabilizing of 3 GA Clear.

Yeah. Does that answer it?

Male voice: Definitely, but uh – another question.

Hm?

Male voice: There's another question.

What is it?

Male voice: That is not actually a stabilization that you've described. Rather it's a continuation of the 3 GA process from the new – the ...

Yeah.

Male voice: ... new preclear that you have now – you are simply running 3 GA again on him.

Well, stabilization would be – the error in the statement, you see – if there is one – comes from the fact that you said, "Clear – the stabilization of a Clear." All right, the stabilization of a Clear would be able to get rid of the masses that were liable to be keyed in or that are waiting. In other words, you would get out of the road those masses that could scoop up this Clear and get him all involved in the bank again.

Now, you see earlier Clears, we didn't have that much horizon cleared for the Clear. Get the idea? And he could pick these masses up. All right. He could get enturbulated, in

other words, again. The GPM could come in on him again. But by continuing 3 GA – doing 3 GA again and again and again, why you're just shooting holes into the GPM and you continue on out the other side of it and won't find any, theoretically, you won't find any GPM now to key in, see? Because the GPM only stays lined up on the most tenuous impossibility that anybody ever heard of. The only way that can be here and in present time is so – is so fantastically intricate that actually sometimes – sometimes you'll hit a couple of items on the way through on listing and see them go *pfffft* and wonder what was that? It's like releasing a – taking a string off of a balloon neck at a party, you know, there they went. Well, they can't any longer keep themselves pumped up. So as you carve into this mass more and more and more and get rid of more and more packages, you are actually stabilizing Clear. You're only getting out of the road things – to stabilize a Clear – you'd only get out of the road things that could cause the person to go unclear again. You follow that?

Male voice: I follow that.

Yeah, it's like how do you keep an automobile.... This is – this is this kind of an answer, see. How do you keep a racing car stably going around the track? Well you take all the boulders off the track. Now, you've left on automatic the fact that the racing car will keep running. In this case, the case of a racing car, it wouldn't be safe to rely on it. But in this particular case, it is safe to rely on it because you are not handling a machine. You are handling a livingness, a thetan, see.

But remember that as long as you're talking about the word Clear, just as it implies, you are talking about something which has had the debris pulled off of it, see? You are talking about something which has been unbarriered, see? And this makes an enormous difference to the individual. He gets very close in a native state and all that sort of thing. See what's wrong with the question is, is you are stabilizing a Clear. All right, that's fine. Yeah he's going to stay Clear if there is no bank to run into. But, you see there's something else can be done with this person. See, you can put another engine in the racing car or something like that, you see and you've done a different type of action.

In other words you could drill this individual now into the reacquisition of skills just by the familiarity of things. Now you are doing a different type of operation and that is not doing anything to a Clear, see? You are going on into OT.

See, OT is the recovery of skills. That's overtly the recovery of skills of the thetan. And Clearing is just taking what you find and getting the bricks off the track, see. You haven't asked him to recover any skills. He quite incidentally recovered quite a few skills, you see, by unburying the situation. He'll come back to battery to a marked extent.

But the state of OT is another – another action entirely. That is the overt recovery of skills. You've got this guy Clear, but he can't speak Arabic. Spaceman walks up to him and says "*snob-snos-kerpop*" or whatever – some space lingo of some sort or another that they used to speak. And he says, "Sounds familiar but what is it?" you know. And, all right, well how do you recover the fellow's languages for him and all that sort of thing. Those are the questions asked at the level of OT, see? Just as OT implies Operating Thetan, you recover his skills of operation.

Clear, you just fix him up so he doesn't fall off the cliff every time he turns around. Not to minimize either state, but they'd be accomplished by different actions.

You say, "All right, get in that rubber tire and go round and round and round and round and round. You getting dizzy?"

And he says, "Yeah I'm getting awful dizzy."

You say, "That's a hell of a note. Get in the tire again and go round and round and round. You getting dizzy?"

And he says, "No, I'm not so dizzy now."

And you say, "Well good, we'll practice a little more. Go on roll back and forth across the George Washington Bridge on every truck that comes by here this morning and get so that you can stand the atmosphere of the tires and run round and round and round like that."

And he finally makes that, see. And you say, "All right, now go out and get yourself run over." You get him run over with steam rollers and he finally finds out this is pretty good and it's okay. He can be more and more there while being run over by trucks. [laughter]

And then one day he's on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, you know and he's practicing being run over and a big truck – a big truck comes along and at that moment he was sort of bored lying there, you know. He saw something pretty over at the right side of the road. I think the only pretty things on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, an ESSO sign or something like that. He saw this ESSO sign and he thought he'd go over and investigate it and he stood up at the moment the truck ran over him. Wreck on the Pennsylvania Turnpike. You know, something wild.

This is a – this is a wide field. Actually we know an awful lot about this field because we used to do this before we found out that the individual could get keyed in.

See, it looks to the thetan that if he does these things he's going to get his head knocked off, see? Well actually what knocks off his head? His aberration, his inability to reach, sustainedly, is inherent in his own bank – not inherent in the physical universe. As long as he has a lot of aberration, he'll key himself in by indulging in such exercises. But if there's nothing to key in, he won't. He will just get more familiar with the exercises. Got it?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. Did that answer the question now?

Male voice: The question was wrong in the first place.

Oh, I'm not trying to make you guilty. [laughter]

Male voice: No I'm making you guilty. [laughter]

I didn't notice. [laughter, laughs] All right. Okay, any more questions? Yes?

Female voice: All things being equal, Ron uh – if an auditor really knows his job, you know he's really – he makes no mistakes, what would be the fastest skill: Problems Intensive or Prepchecking?

All right, all things being equal if an auditor really knows his job. What's the rest of it?

Female voice: What would be the fastest skill, Problems Intensive or Prepchecking?

I can't quite ...

Female voice: What would be ... ?

Second Female voice: Problems Intensive.

Female voice: What would be the fastest gain, Problems Intensive or Prepchecking?

Second Female voice: Fastest skill.

Oh, the fastest skill ...

Female voice: Yes.

You mean what – what would do it ...

Female voice: Procedure, yes.

What would prepare him the fastest?

Female voice: That's right.

Ah, what would prepare the pc the fastest? Undoubtedly Prepchecking, hands down. A Problems Intensive is a sort of a junior grade Prepcheck. If you want to get where the case lives in this lifetime and clean him up and that sort of thing and if the auditor you are asking to do this is not very skilled ...

Female voice: Yeah, I'm talking about skills here.

... I said if your auditor – this is where this belongs – and your auditor isn't very skilled and you don't want to mess up the pc too much, you hand him a Problems Intensive. Got it? All right. But a skilled auditor, hands down, Prepcheck-CCH route. I would know no better route. I know no better route – that's why you are doing it.

Actually, I'm going up against the fate of the gods. It's almost impossible to teach an auditor how to prepcheck intelligently. See it's rough. Well, what do you think I'm climbing that hill for? I'm not climbing it just to get you exercise and me headaches, see. I'm not climbing it because I'm mad at your Instructors. I'm climbing it because you are not going to get there any other way. And if I knew a faster route up Mont Blanc, man, you'd be on it! And unfortunately there isn't one.

I've been experimenting for many, many weeks, months now, with repetitive processes for just working around with Routine 1 sort of oddities and Class I And trying to get rudiments phrased up into various types of processes and so on, so as to give some lower scale benefit so that some auditor could simply run these things repetitively you see and come out at the other end. There's a lot of value to it, there is no doubt about that. You do a three-way bracket: "What didn't you know? What didn't another know? What didn't others know?" And you keep that up for a while on the pc. Or "What did – what have you suppressed? What has another suppressed? What have others suppressed?" – same phrasing "invalidate," same phrasing "failed to reveal," same phrasing "been careful of." You've got these various buttons and you could run them repetitively back and forth and undoubtedly get somewhere. There wouldn't be much doubt about that. And it's all very well and so forth. And I can take an E-

meter and after you've ground one of those out for thirty-seven and a half hours or something like that, why I could have gotten there the first hour on a Prepcheck.

You see, I mean there's – I have not totally concluded that the repetitive process at Class I should be skipped because it has some uses. But I have, to some degree, doing a comparison on the thing, not to some degree, but Prepchecking, infinitely faster providing you prepcheck. That answers your question?

Female voice: Not entirely. Doesn't uh – by virtue of assessment on – uh – you know, on uh – the changes – doesn't that sort of hit the beginning of the chain in this lifetime instead of having to go down the chain. That's really what I asked you.

Now let me – let me hear that question again. Now I answered the first question. Everybody will give me that.

Audience: Yes, you did.

All right. Now we've got another question.

Female voice: That's right.

All right.

Female voice: In virtue of assessment on the changes ... Can you hear me?

Almost.

Female voice: All right I'll try and speak up.

All right.

Female voice: In virtue of assessment on the changes, you know on the various self-determined changes.

You're still talking about a Problems Intensive?

Female voice: That's right. The reason why I am asking this is governed by virtue of assessment on the changes. Doesn't that sort of give the first, earliest incident and that's the bottom of the chain?

No. There's something wrong with this question because changes, the changes he's had in this lifetime, leave you still with the task of a full Prepcheck. But they will get the chronic PTP of the pc and this is very pleasing to the pc and this is a very good way of finding out what you ought to prepcheck. But of course there is no substitute for Prepchecking. See? You got your processes; they're not quite lined up.

A Problems Intensive with the change assessment list that goes with it, you inevitably would do a case assessment on the pc. This would tell you something about the pc somewhere early on, you see. Now, cutting loose into a Problems Intensive with the change list and finding out what was the biggest change – the biggest self-determined change of the person's lifetime – gives you a very good place from which to jump off to do something for the pc. This is an excellent way to do it, particularly if you are not very skilled at prepchecking. You see, because you are going to get this anyhow if you are a very skilled prepchecker. It's almost – I wouldn't say it's not worth doing but it actually is to some slight degree a waste of time.

You're going to try to prepcheck the rudiments in. You're going to try to prepcheck this pc so the rudiments will stay there and so everything is going to go along fine.

All right. If I'm prepchecking in the rudiments I don't try to get the pc, lifetime problems handled, because I know they're all going to shift anyhow the second I start running a Routine 3 process. So I don't pay any attention to the pc. I just satisfy myself I can keep the rudiments in and let it fly. You see the different philosophy here?

All right. Now, if you're going to – if you've got – if you've got Mrs. Gotlumbosis sitting in front of you and she is howling about lumbosis all the time on the subject and you wanted to find her lumbosis prematurely and that sort of thing – if you wanted to get this chronic present time problem out of the way and handle some little portion of it to make her happy – do a "changes of her life" and an assessment of those changes and get the prior area to that and prepcheck the living daylight out of that and find the fundamentals on the thing – you can burn yourself up, by the way, fifteen, twenty hours doing this – and you can drop a lot of worry off of this thing. In other words you've done something for this person's chronic somatic.

But don't make a mistake. You probably have done nothing for yourself or your rudiments, see. But this is a very good thing that an auditor can do. That – he doesn't handle his Prepchecking well. He sits there and he says, "Could you – willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" He gets a fall and he says, "What's that?"

And he says, "Well I – I don't know, I have an awful lot of difficulties trying to get enough paper clips, see. And I don't like to talk to people about that because I think unkind thoughts all the time about paper clips."

And if this is as deep as this auditor is capable of steering a pc, he'd better do a list of changes on the person's life and get the one that assesses the most and go at it that way. Got the idea? And well, now we're going to get someplace. See, we're going to get someplace with this pc because we couldn't enter in.

We might have to do it. I'm not trying to run it down, you see. I mean we just can't seem to get anyplace with this pc. Well the pc's interest – we know we can always get the pc's interest on one of these change assessments, you know. What is the biggest self-determined change in this pc's lifetime? Well, man, you'll find it *there*; it registers. You go in *just* before that and ask him all about the prior confusion. Get a list of the people. Assess that list. And you are going to find out where they hid the body, man. And that's going to be very interesting to the pc and that will be very interesting to the auditor and you've got blood. Give the pc a win, all that sort of thing.

But actually it's an excursion. Don't classify it as anything else but an excursion. It's something that you would do either to train somebody to handle things, or to handle the pc that just wouldn't confess to anything. It'd be sort of *in extremis* and isn't a substitute for Prepchecking because that itself is prepchecked. After you've found this change – I haven't given any talks about this and so forth, because we haven't been doing it much, but you see it now on your class line – well, that's to give you, in Routine 3, a crack at assessment.

What is assessment all about, see? Well let's give you something to assess, because people made more mistakes on those, assessing for the biggest self-determined change of a person's lifetime, than any series of mistakes I ever saw in my life. And if a fellow can be taught to assess that list they can be taught to assess anything, see. So you've got – you've got this long string of people and we want to know *everybody* they knew before that time, see. We'll make the auditor make the pc list. We want to know everybody they knew, see. We haven't laid the stress down on this yet. I should be getting out something on it. We want *everything*. We want the *milkman*. We want everybody. We want everybody they *knew* prior to this time. We want *the cousin of the school teacher who taught the schoolroom next door to the schoolroom that was taught by the teacher who was a sister...* You get the idea? We want to know if there are any more people in that area. And that will give the auditor more drill in milking down a list. See it's just a list milked down, that's all. You are going to bleed this meter for a list. Let's find out if there is any other human being anywhere in the world, you see, on that prior confusion.

Well, that's marvelous, see. First you've got a kind of a Goals Assessment in problems. See it's a kind of a mock-up Goals Assessment and if you get it wrong, so what – it isn't going to do the pc any harm. And then we've got this *long* list of people and we're going to get this list of people and we want a nice long list of people there. We want 75, 80, 100, 125 people that they knew just prior to January the 3rd, 1938. Man if you don't think that isn't going to make that pc dig, you see. And that'll teach the auditor how to get some more people, you know. "Any more items on this list, see, any more people than that? Did you know anybody else prior to that time on January the 3rd in that lifetime – in this lifetime did you know anybody else?" And by God you will finally dig up the girl who knew the girl next door. You get the idea?

Just teach them to bleed a meter out to nothing and get their middle rudiments in. And every time they get their middle rudiments in they get the suppressions and things off, why then they find out the person's memory opens up and we finally get the age before January of 1938 so exposed that the pc thinks he's living in it.

But you see that's a method of doing a parallel action to a Goals Assessment and a parallel actions to listing. We can find out at that stage. Because you see, we suddenly lost 3D Criss Cross to train auditors in. 3D Criss Cross occasionally somebody did lists, got all stuck up in the lists – too hard to straighten out, that sort of thing, so it had a liability so I fell back on a Problems Intensive. Problems Intensive has the same two steps. The problem sounds like a goals list and the assessments, so he's already done it and we can teach him to do these things without fooling around with the pc's goals – because that is tough.

In other words there is a process that we can teach him to do it before he does it. This is a marvelous thing because we can teach Johnny to swim before we let him go swimming. And that's actually all the Problems Intensive is there for. Don't get it as a Problem Intensive – as a comparable magnitude to Prepchecking, because actually Prepchecking is how you would *do* the present time problem when you finished up.

You get the earliest incident on the mostest person that was involved with the prior confusion. You'd find out that'd blow the whole thing. You understand? You'd assess these

people. You'd find the one that was left in – I don't care what nonsense you engage in here – and you find out that it was Aunt Gertrude.

All right, let's get all – "What about doing things to Aunt Gertrude?" and let's get this thing bled on down to the bottom of the barrel, you see. Let's get the earliest thing off of this thing. This thing will blow up along the line. You'll find out that problem will blow right at that point. But they are not comparable processes, okay?

I didn't mean to answer so long, but there's some data here which I hadn't handed out. I thought I might as well mention it. Okay? All right.

All right, after that exhausting thing, you understand I answered two questions there. [laughter] All right. Okay, any other questions? Yes?

Female voice: There's a rudiment question on end rudiments.

Yes.

Female voice: The last question on the end of the rudiments is asking about goals and gains.

Yeah.

Female voice: One of the last. Now, if the pc uh – gives you an untruth on that or an impress on it – it throws all the rest of the end rudiments out that you've already gone over.

Mm. That's right.

Female voice: What is the best way to handle that? Just repeat the – the package after the goals and gains?

Forget it.

Female voice: Forget it?

Forget it. Totally non-significant. First place it's not a meter question.

Female voice: Mm-mm.

Person isn't on the meter. I sometimes keep a pc on the meter. I did today when I was asking it. I put in first goals on a meter occasionally, particularly if I've got the pc holding the cans and he starts about goals. And I ask him, "Well are there any more goals you'd like to mention?" And I get a dirty needle. Let's not go into the thing with a missed withhold, if you please. So I get the – *the goal I don't know about* and get him to tell me that in the session. And the missed withhold reading disappears and the pc goes into session beautifully.

But at the end of the session *don't weight* those last two questions. Give them no weight at all. It's, "Well have you made any part of your goals, you know, for this session?"

And the pc says, "What are they?"

And you cheerily, cheerily – but my God he's off the meter now, I mean, you are not looking at the meter. You've almost, you've made the gesture to – sort of brushing the whole session off, see.

This is the point where you are slowing down. Nothing you are doing now is of any importance. That is the weight which you give it with your voice and that sort of thing. "Oh, well, all right. Now we're, you know, end of session," you know. I mean, that's the sort of an atmosphere we have. "Well we can stretch now," you know. "Thank God we're over the – over the Great Divide now. All right, okay, made any part of your goals in this session?"

Pc says, "What were they?"

And you tell him cheerily, "Well it's so-and-so," and "did you?"

"And, yes, yes, yes."

You don't correct him. Put no weight on it at all. And then you say, "Well any other gains you'd care to mention?" or whatever it is.

And pc says, "Yes" and so forth and so on. Of course if you are really smart as an auditor you know damn well when a pc is propitiating you.

And I handle that. I have a special rudiment that I put in at that point, is I tell the pc, "You don't have to tell me that," when I see the pc is propitiating. I wouldn't advise you to use it. It requires – it requires a great deal of sensitivity. You see the pc is looking at you and he sort of, the eyeball does a small corkscrew. [laughter] That's the way you can tell.

And he says, "Well, I – I actually feel tremendously better. I came into the session, you see, with a terrible stomachache, you know and I feel much better." I mean you get that kind of a response.

I say, "You don't have to tell me that. How did you really feel at the beginning of the session?"

"Well, I didn't feel too bad."

I say, "Fine" that's it and "anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session," you know, that sort of thing. Then I give him "End of session" Tone 50.

Two little kids the other day, eight and nine auditing each other. One of them really got the CCHs in. She used Tone 50. She was nine or something. I put it in an Information. Wildest tale of a session you ever heard in your life.

No, honey, that's a matter of weight. Don't put any weight on that end of the line and you won't throw anything out. Your session actually ends, to all intents and purposes – as far as your determinism is concerned, you see – just before you introduce the idea of goals and gains, see? It's over, it's all over.

It's a wonderful time to slow it all down, put on the brakes, you know. Start picking up your jacket and looking for the pencil you dropped underneath the chair, you know.

There's a bit of skill in weighting. You don't want a session to end this way – you don't want a session to end this way. You don't want a session to end that way anyway. You want a session to end sort of this way. Only I end them this way. Give tremendous weight to that "End of session," see. Really make sure they got out of session. You'll have a drill on that pretty soon. But that's all under the heading of weighting.

Yes, it is perfectly true that the pc could give you a half-truth and an untruth, but if the answer isn't terribly important it won't make much difference to the pc either. That is a courtesy rudiment. It has no real value in the session beyond making the pc realize he got someplace and bring him to the end of the session.

That's sort of like fishing a cognition – the old TR. You make him realize that something happened in the last couple of hours. Only you don't work at it. And in view of the fact that your – it could be pushed to a point of evaluation, you put it that way, you see. So it's got to be very light. "Well, did you make any part of your goals in this session? If you didn't it's all right with me and if you did it's fine with me," and so forth. "I'm not particularly influenced one way or the other whether you made your goals or didn't make your goals. And you make any additional gains? All right with me if you made gains, if it isn't – if you didn't make gains, why..." That's the atmosphere you see. I'm adding the additional words just for the heck of it. "Well if you didn't make any more gains that's all right with me. The world isn't going to perish tomorrow, so what."

And then well, so we're all finished up around here and you've already more or less ended your auditor's report, sort of time we got out the cigars, you know, that kind of thing. Then all of a sudden why you bead the pc with a beady look right straight in the eye and you say, "Now" you know, "is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session?" See, this is not important, see. It's not important that he say anything. You don't care what he says, but that's the warning light, see. That's five, four, three, two, you see. And he says, "Well, thank you," or something like this.

And you say, "All right, now." Really fix him, you know. Here it is, "*End of session*. Now, is the session ended for you? All right. Good. Good. Now tell me I'm no longer auditing you. Good, that's fine." We don't care what he said. One auditor upstairs by the way got in a hell of a fight with a pc because the pc wouldn't tell. This was months ago. The auditor isn't here anymore. But the pc wouldn't say, "Is it all right?" he wouldn't say, "You are not auditing me now," you know, but said, "Go to hell." [laughter] And it was – totally conversational thing and the auditor jumped right in there and tried to 8-C and Tone 40 this pc into saying it. But of course the session was over. The auditor has no control value over the pc once the session is over, you see. And the auditor was Q-and-Aing with the purpose of that last remark which destroyed the control value, you see. And the auditor went right there puppy to the root. I think she even hauled the pc downstairs and pushed him into the training office with all four feet, I think, something like that. Most horrible squabble, fantastic, never saw such a ruckus in your life. Pc wouldn't say, "You are no longer ..." Well, that's the wrong weight, see. [laughter]

Now, you see that – yes, very easy – very, very easy to miss this and I will give you a method of getting over it if you want to. Before you say, "Is there anything you'd care to ask or say," so on, you can ask again for, "In this session have you done anything I haven't found out about," or something. You can ask for a missed withhold, in other words, again, just before that. If you are queasy at anytime during rudiments why ask for that. And any time you've got a dirty needle showing up or something like that, you can work that one to death.

But, if you wanted to be very sure – to answer your question very precisely – after you'd asked for goals or gains and you'd figured out they told you an awful half-truth and an untruth and impressed you and were actually trying to damage themselves or something and you could ask at that time, "Well have I missed a withhold?" Well this would get you out of any liability for this. They won't be mad at you then after the session, see? At least get off the missed withhold. And that's right before you ended the session, why ask for a missed withhold.

But I must tell you that this would be unusual because there's no weight, see, to "Have you made any part of your goals and any gains," see? There's no weight to it at all. It's just a courtesy to a pc. This is part of our free service, you know. That's all. That answer your question?

Female voice: Yes it does except if the pc is asked by somebody who is checking his rudiments out ...

Oh, I knew there was probably an ARC break there. [laughter] Why doesn't somebody pick up her ARC breaks? Somebody has found your pc's rudiments out.

Female voice: No, to the contrary, but it could happen. If he's done – if he's ...

Then you're worried. Then your pc's rudiments should have been out and they didn't find what... [laughter] You're right, you're right. If I was having my pc's *rudiments* checked at the end of session they would never find them out, because I would *always*, just before I said, "End of session" or "Anything you'd care to ask or say," I would say the middle rudiment from one end to the other and I would knock it cleaner than a toaster. And I would say "That's it, man." Whizzer-whizzer and the pc would go out of there and so on. And if that didn't work – that didn't work I'd just simply ARC break the pc. [laughter, laughs]

Now, does that answer your question?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. [laughter, laughs] Okay. We have time for another question here. Yes.

Male voice: Ron, could you say a few things – words on the importance of havingness and the use of havingness in Routine 3.

Yeah, yeah. I could. It doesn't apply to Routine 3 anymore than it applies to anything else. It's just the importance of havingness. A pc is going to start to have odd reactions if the havingness goes down.

Let me just fill you in, just to this degree. The pc's havingness goes down and you start to get physiological reactions, eyeball swivel, they notice the carpet and they get a theta bop, you know? And if you notice this you should ask yourself this question – why does the auditor say, "Look around here and tell me if you can have anything," see? And watch the meter. See, why does he do that? And if the meter reacts, then run Havingness. If you don't know this point, you see, that would seem illogical to you.

You'd say it much better than that, "Have you had any trouble in this room? Are there any objects around here which restimulate you?" You do all kinds of other things, but not just run Havingness, see? "Look around here and tell me if you can have anything," and it goes

clank! And then, if you are very observant you turn this tone arm down here from a 16, where you had it maybe a minute ago – and you turn that down – and you turn it down to zero and you say, "Squeeze the cans," you see. All right, the pc squeezes the cans and he gets – he gets *zooo*. Inevitably if you say to the pc, "Look around here and tell me if you can have anything," and he looks around and it causes his eyeballs to move or his neck to go or something like that, so as to make that kind of an action – unless he's done something weird with his hands, which you should know better than to accept anyhow – let's just rule that out – the pc just looks around, you know and you get this thing going tick, particularly if you get a little sharp tick. Well, what do you need? Neon signs to give you the word? How come it gets a sharp tick?

Well it gets a sharp tick because Havingness is what draws the *noives* – that they are having in New York right this minute, *noives* – very, very taut. It takes the masses and brings them down physiologically against the body. It packs this pc up like something that is going to be sold at the Safeway, see.

Male voice: Hm.

And this pc then, physiologically, could actually go like this and you're going to get some kind of a meter reaction. This is why I laugh like mad when somebody comes around and tells me, "Look I can make the meter react by swiveling my ears." *Nobody argues* with him. What we're trying to tell him is, "*Yes, if your havingness is shot to hell you can always do this.*"

Now we could – we could run – we could pick any of you up and run you for a half an hour solid, "Look around here and find something you could go out of ARC with." And then ask you to "Look around here and tell me if you can have anything." And the motion of the eyeballs will cause the meter to go *clank-thud-dirty needle-boomp-theta bop-crash*. You get the idea?

So it doesn't – wouldn't matter what you did. Now, some people they just move their head like this, you see and you could get a meter reaction. But why do they get that kind of a meter reaction? Well it isn't – that is not how the meter is supposed to react. And the meter doesn't react that way on the bank – except when the person's masses are so borne down on the body – the GPM, man, is right there, see. Every PTP the person has ever had is sitting on his left eyeball before it'll do anything, you see. You've got these solid electronic masses which are invisible which are sitting right up against the body with no relief or relaxation of the things and this person is a bundle of piano wire, see. They – they've got him tuned out to high C, you know.

So, you of course tell him to look around here and find out if he can have anything is *pling-poooh-bing*, you know. Well, you are going to run into infinite numbers of troubles on getting meter reads and so on.

There's two ways you can do it. One, miss a withhold, but that's what? Miss a withhold, the withhold the guy's pulling back against himself, see. So you get a missed withhold. So it registers twice as much as anything else. It gives two ticks where it should give one, see. What's the second tick? You see that's just hard up against the body, that's all. see the person's got masses pulled down on him.

And the other one is when his havingness goes down. When his havingness goes down, the guy just sort of wiggles one ear, you know and you get a *thidth*, you know, on the meter. You get this thing going *tick-tick-tick-tick-flurb-surge-whoop-woop-burr-ba-ba-burr-burr-burr-ba-ba-ba*. [laughter] What the hell man? Why bother!

See, along about this time you say to him – you say to him, "What's your Havingness Process?", or something, you know. You say – by the way, you very seldom do this. You should coordinate this. When you get real clever at reading the meter you will see that something is going wrong here. There's one of two things go wrong The guy's got a missed withhold or he's got a very dirty needle and the last twenty-one auditors in the last forty-five intensives have done nothing but miss one withhold per minute, see. And he's got so that he's got nothing but a dirty, swinging needle all the time.

Well, of course, this runs his havingness down which is the same phenomenon compounded. Or the person's havingness is down – badly and you'll get these interjected, wandering needle actions and they wander and they tick and they do this and they do that. The person isn't even thinking of anything. The person closes one eye and you're going to get a needle reaction. See? It's not a needle reaction, it's just an action. Goes click-click-click-click, wiggles his big toe, going to get some disturbance in the needle. Well why? It's a very extreme condition of no havingness. It's a very extreme condition. It's nothing funny, man.

Well, if you want that kind of a circus going on while you are prepchecking or while you are looking for goals, why just skip Havingness, see.

But watch it in the beginning of Routine 3. Now, this is what you want to watch. I'll give you some very – I'll give you one out of the session today. I was checking a goal, actually prepchecking, but it was about goals and things. Now, in this session today, it became apparent that the pc's havingness ran out. Pc's havingness ran the TA down. This is not always true – this isn't a reducing TA reduces the havingness, see. But it became apparent to me that when the pc's havingness went down, the TA dropped down toward 2. So I became alert to this and after the session was all over, after we'd done goals and gains, why, we did Havingness and some missed withholds. Sounds funny doesn't it? But I had noticed that the TA, when the pc's havingness was going down, came down here to 2 and that the pc's Havingness Process pushed the TA right back up to 3, neat as you please. So I noticed that in getting goals and gains the pc lost his havingness – for some reason or other lost his havingness, because it – goals and gains brought the TA down here to 2.

It was very peculiar, so I simply told the pc to squeeze the cans again and we got a *good, broad* can squeeze, see – we got that *much*, you know, *huh-huh*. I wasn't going to let a pc leave the session in that condition. So I just uncorked the Havingness Process and ran the TA back up and all was happy and everything was fine. That's all, see.

So there was – there was, right in today's session, there was something happening after the end ruds, see. And as far as running a Routine 3 is concerned, you start watching the pc's behavior pattern and you will learn what the pc looks like when his havingness goes out. You'll learn how he looks. And the pc starts going this way or the pc dopes off, the pc that ... All right, it's a missed withhold or havingness, you see. They are both cousins, so if you are just doing a – if this pc's havingness – by your experience – you ran fifteen commands of

Havingness and it brought the pc up to a dial drop. And after you'd been auditing this pc for twenty minutes, it came down to that much drop. If that was your experience, testing around on the pc's reaction to Havingness, you'd do the middle rudiments and run some Havingness, see? Every time you did middle ruds, run some Havingness, see – *bang-bang*. Well, there you caught both ways from the middle, you are not going to get this eyeball click.

There is just no doubt about it whatsoever, you know, that a pc can move and influence the meter by wiggling their big toes, swivelling their eyeballs, clicking their teeth together or raising their ears higher. There is no doubt about this whatsoever, but *only* when their havingness is out the bottom. So if you want to avoid vagrant manifestations of the needle, why, keep the pc's havingness up.

By the way my record was sustained. There hasn't been anybody around here whose havingness has been found. Before he came to me his Havingness Process didn't work. This is getting to be an all time championship. I found another one today. Pc's Havingness Process didn't work. Everybody had apparently been running this Havingness Process, but it didn't work.

Do you realize that to run the Havingness Process effectively your first squeeze is tested with this sensitivity knob practically off. Bring it down here to nothing, see. Now, tell him to squeeze the cans. Now they quite ordinarily and routinely will get that much of a fall, see? If their havingness is off they are liable to get this much of a fall and it's liable to go up here and then fall back, but not all the way and other goofy things. You understand? But it's just a little bit – maybe it's going to be an inch, inch and a quarter, something like this at zero sensitivity. Let's say something like that.

All right, if that is the case this is the havingness drop you want. You want more than third of a dial. You want about a half-a-dial drop if you can possibly get that. If you've got the pc's right Havingness Process, you will get your half-a-dial drop. Your pc's havingness was there, let's say there, now, you ran the pc's havingness for a few commands and you got the pc's Havingness Process and it's a half-a-dial drop.

You watch that. You'll see then – you see apparently you aren't giving enough attention to how much *increase of fall* there should be for the pc's havingness to be up.

Now, don't think this will continue. This gain happens almost at once and then happens very gradual increase from that. So, just a few commands, see and bang. You've got the – well that's the last command, the hell with it, see and you are off your horse and far away, see.

But we've got to have a third to a half-a-dial drop with this sensitivity knob at zero before we can say the pc has any havingness at all. Otherwise you are going to get the eyeball click phenomenon. Besides the pc is going to feel bad. The pc will get withholds faster. He will suppress things bad. He'll do think, think, think, think, think much more quickly. Why? Because the ridges and things are down and the masses are talking.

And if you want to really get masses talking, run a pc's havingness down, you know. "Run around – look around here and find something you couldn't have. Thank you. Look around here and find something you couldn't have." And the next thing you know these inert

masses and spheres around him will even start talking. He'll all of a sudden hear circuits turn on, other goofball things start to occur, see, by running his havingness backwards.

So just – the answer to your question is when do you use the Havingness Process on Routine 3? Same as any other time when the pc's physiological condition is liable to influence the E-Meter by reason of dropped havingness. Okay?

Male voice: Yes. Thank you.

All right. Okay, that's it. Take a break.

Thank you. Thank you.

SECURITY CHECK PREPCHECK- ING

A lecture given on 29 May 1962

Thank you.

Well, we probably ought to have a lecture this time. You've had that, but I haven't got anything to talk about. I haven't. It's a fact. Wouldn't have me guilty of a missed withhold amongst so many people.

Second lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 29 May 62.

And now, the use of the Sec Check with the Prepcheck. It's been the subject of a bulletin recently. If anybody's got that bulletin, you can hand it to me.

Female voice: May 10th.

May 10th? The – you got one up here? Thank you.

This is the material of – it is covered on HCOB May the 10th, 1962.

Now, the easiest way in the world to do a Prepcheck is to let a preconceived form guide you into the overts which you're trying to cover.

Now, that's a very easy way to do the thing. Now, such a preconceived form would be a rudiment question. Let's take a – let's take the – an early variety of this sort of thing. Just take any one of the beginning, middle or end rudiments questions. Take any one of these and use it as your Zero and then just put "Have you ever – " type of questioning on the front of it or "Are you willing – " or "Have you been unwilling to talk to an auditor about your difficulties?" You see how you'd have to convert the question? "Have you been unwilling to talk to an auditor about your difficulties?" – something like that.

It wouldn't much matter how you worded this thing, but try to word the rudiments so there's little more span to it, don't you see?

"Have you ever had a problem during a session that you didn't tell the auditor about?" I don't care how you add these things up. Do you see?

You take your rudiment question as your Zero, you reword as your Zero A. Let's be very precise. You're going to reword this thing so that you get a Prepcheck going on it. "Had any trouble with problems lately?" You see?

The Zero is "Do you have a present time problem?" Your Zero A is possibly arrived at after you've done a little talk to the pc or something like this, you know, just present time

problem, "Do you ever get messed up with present time problems in a session?" you know, that sort of thing

And he, "Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah. Oh, terrible. You're never going to get rid of them."

And you say, "That's – thank you very much now. All right. Now, did you ever have trouble with present time problems in a session?" That's your Zero A, see?

All right. And then you fish around. This question is hot. You see, that's the only reason you'd have a Zero A. If you've asked the Zero A, you know, you check the Zero A – the guy tells you something, then you check the Zero A – your drill applies, just let's – applies to a What. This thing is still hot. You know you've got a Zero A. Otherwise, you'll have to monkey around and find another Zero A, because that one cleaned up, don't you see?

So you've got to have a hot, persisting Zero A.

Now, you start fishing around trying to find out what goes with this and did he ever do anything with this, and what's this all about and keep his mind on the subject of problems, and you suddenly see a dirty needle tick or something like this, and you say, "All right. What was that you were thinking of?"

"Oh, well, that was that time. See, I had this auditor who was very unsympathetic and he just never – never would let me get rid of any present time problems and that sort of thing, and ..." You know, lovely motivator sort of a reaction. Well, you have to remember to convert this. You're searching for your What question now, you see? And you have to remember that the question will be something like this, "What about lousing an auditor up by having present time problems?" You know [laughs] – something like this, see?

You have to ask What questions until you get a reaction. Now, your What question is tracked right out of your Zero A, don't you see? And there is your What question.

"What about getting lots of problems before you came to an auditing session?" You know? "What about worrying about problems in an auditing session and not telling your auditor anything about it?" You know – that sort of thing.

I don't care what you finally cook up out of this Zero A. It's going to be something that is very applicable to the case. And you're going to test around on it until you've got – he's told you an overt; make sure that it is an overt, steer him down till it is an overt. First he says, "Well, auditors just keep giving me problems all the time. Auditing itself is a problem," and so on.

Fish up. What's he done with problems here, see? Get an overt action, get your What question formed, make sure that it reacts. Now you ask your What question; the pc gives you the answer. Well, the same formula holds, see? You got to ask this What question again and you're in the soup if it cleaned up.

You've got to go find another What question. Your whole job is you're trying to find a question that's going to hold. And everything you write down, the Zero.

First, of course, your Zero had to be persistent, see, before you would monkey with it; and then your Zero A dragged from it has to be persistent before you'd monkey with it; and then your What question has to be persistent before you would monkey with it. Do you see?

Each time – each time you follow this same drill. You ask the question which you have finally cooked up here, and the pc gives you the answer to this question directly – even though you've just discussed it and he's given you something like that. You ask that question you just cooked up very directly, and you say so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so, and it goes *plang* on the meter.

He says, "Well, I – something or other, something or other, something or other." That's an answer to the auditing question.

And then you say, "I'll check it on the meter." And you ask him this same question again. And if it's there, well, you go to your next step. And if it's not there you retreat a step. This formula is *always* the way you do it. See, you go back to your Zero.

All right. Supposing your Zero was impersistent. "You willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" You're going to write that as a Zero Question. You got it on there? "That's fine. That's what we're going to check on now. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Well, of course, it's one of the rudiments questions, so therefore it gives you a pat question to proceed from.

All right. Dandy. *Voilà!* This is there. You say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

Now mind you that you can rephrase that so that it gives a little more span – like, "Have you been willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" But, let's not go very far afield here. It's *best* if you just run it, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" and you get a fall. Or you know you consistently have difficulty with this, see?

But that's got to be persistent.

Now supposing the guy says, "Yeah, I can – found out I can talk to you everything a – except Indian tomahawks, and I just – just can't bring myself – I haven't been able to in the past – bring myself to talk to you about Indian tomahawks."

And you say, "All right."

This is just your Zero. You see, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" You've had it.

But because this has already been cleaned up in the rudiments, you'll find out you have best luck if you broaden it for the Zero. Otherwise, you already got by it once, so you're not going to expect it to hang up again, are you?

So something better: "Have you been willing" see, "to talk to me about your difficulties?" You know? Anything that you wish to put down. But it has to represent that rudiments problem and preferably has to give more track.

You check it now and you say, "All right. Have you been willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

"Yes, everything except that." you got no reaction at all. You've had it. That rudiment can be expected to stay in because you broadened the rudiment, see? You broadened the rudiment one way or the other.

Now your Zero A. Now, let's say it stayed in. "Have you been willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

The fellow says, "Indian tomahawks. Never have been able to discuss Indian tomahawks."

"Good. Have you been willing – have you been willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" *Clang!* And you say, "Oh, well, that's all right." Well, we're in there now. And now we're going to go to the Zero A.

And the person says, "Well, I don't know. It has to do something with uh – your – well, I don't know. It's just, I have never been able to – to really express myself, and so forth. I feel that you're down on me."

Anything that you care to wangle out of this situation; it all depends on what occurs. Now you still want a very broad field here.

And he says, "Well, it's when I start to tell you something – well, I just feel all suppressed."

Well, your Zero, "Have you ever felt suppressed when talking to me?" I don't care if it's a motivator, see, because we're going to turn that into an overt. We don't care what are – those Zeros are that we clean up because it's not very serious.

From there on, it's got to be overts for sure. By the way, it is not necessary to have a Zero A in all cases. You understand that?

All right. Now, the person says, "Well, I – I just – just felt unwilling," and so forth. And you say, "Well, have you got any particular instant when you felt unwilling to discuss sex with me?" whatever he says. (You know, he says, "just unwilling to discuss sex with you.")

"Unwilling to discuss sex? What about – what about not talking to me about sex? What about hiding sexual data? What about ..."

He says, "Well..."

You say, "You done anything specifically to me or have you done anything specifically to auditors on the subject of sex?"

You see, you're not going to buy anything or put down a What question that isn't an overt.

And the person looks at you and says, "Well, I – actually, I was being audited by somebody one time, and I – I made a play for them and they rejected me."

And you say, "All right. What about making a play for auditors?"

And it goes clang! Now this same rule applies.

And you say, "All right. Thank you very much."

You asked them once, didn't you, and they'd already given you this thing. So frankly, you have checked it twice. You get this – this is a little bit tricky. But if you want to be absolutely by the boards – very pattern about the whole thing – ask it again and let them tell you

something and then check it to see if it clears. And if it clears, all right – it clears, man. Don't argue with that. You've got to go back up to your Zero or your Zero A, and come on down – anything is still reacting. Don't you see?

Supposing the whole thing wipes out and nothing is reacting now. Fine! Well, you've skipped it. Go on to your next Zero, see? Got the idea?

Audience: Mm-hm.

All right. Supposing he says, "Well, making a sexual – I ..."

"What about making a sexual advances to auditors – making sexual play for ...?"

It's always best to use the pc's wording in the thing, you see? "What about making a sexual play for auditors?" *Clang!* You see?

And he – "Well, I did. I did. My – my first auditor. I – I actually thought he was awfully attractive. Ha-ha."

And you say, "Good. Thank you very much. I'll check that on the meter," if you want to be lugubrious and laborious. Because you've already done this twice, you understand?

So, "What about making a sexual play for auditor?" and so on.

"Well, yeah." It's clang! Well, you're in the Prepcheck business at that moment.

"When was that?" See, he gave you the specific incident. You didn't form the What till you had one. "When was that?" "Is that all of it?" "Is there anything more to it?" See? "What didn't appear?" or "What did appear?" or "Who should have found out about it?" "Who didn't find out about it?" You see?

Your wording is varied on these things, by the way. You start using the same wording every time and you're going to be in trouble, because you're actually not listening to the pc; because these questions have to be adjusted to what you want to drag out of it. It doesn't require too much skill, but adjust this thing.

The person is telling you, "Well, I was trying to hide this thing."

And well, you say, "Who might have appeared there?" or "What might have appeared there?" you see?

And the person says, "Well, I've just – nobody told me anything about it."

"Well, what didn't appear there?" That's a very natural question. And he'll tell you. And then – and "Who didn't find out about it?" "Who should have found out about it?" Any one of these formula, see? "Who didn't you reveal that to?"

Doesn't matter what wording you use; it has to be appropriate. It follows these four things and you're saying them in various ways.

All right. You go down that once and you want to beat the pc to death, go over that eight or nine times. If you really want to get nowhere with Prepchecking, run the When, All, Appear and Who about eight times on every overt you find. That would be very good. That would get nowhere at a high rate of speed.

It all depends on what your needle action is with all this. You can watch your needle. Now, you are not checking your When, your All, your Appear, or your Who against the needle. You're just talking, see? And he's just talking. But you've got an eye, and that eye can be on that needle. And if this thing looks quite active as we discuss it, we can be very sure that we are not on an incident that is going to clear.

And actually, it'd be all right if you passed over it twice and it was unchanging – oh, my God, you should have been off of it the first pass over, see, because you're wasting time.

Now, your magic question you use after that is "earlier." See? "Was there an earlier instant where you did that?" See?

"When's the first time you can recall that happened?"

And now you can fall into your own trap.

You've asked him, perhaps, for the first time that this occurred, and it was during auditing and he gave you something which had June 1950 on it.

Now, you know confoundedly well that there's nothing earlier than that. So you abandon "earlier." You give up the ship right at that point. Well, let me assure you if this thing is still banging after once over on the – that is so powerful as the When, All, Appear and Who – the thing is still banging once over, you haven't got the first overt.

See, "What about making a play for an auditor – a sexual play for an auditor?" See? And it's still banging. You've got June 1950. Well, God, you're getting awful far aft. I mean, they – hardly even known as auditors. Heh-heh.

And you say, "Well, you can't get any earlier than that," so you give it up. See? Now don't – don't logicize yourself out of business.

Actually, a little thinking goes a long way. It didn't clear up. Now, what anybody who's having trouble with Prepchecking hasn't gotten through their heads is the old, old, old Book One material about basic on the chain will clear the chain. And nothing works so gorgeously as this.

If you want to see some marvelous examples of this, they're to be found in Prepchecking. And if a *chain* isn't clearing, you are not getting the basic on the chain. Actually, a this lifetime basic is usually most – a great majority of the time perfectly adequate.

So he says, "Well, I made a play for an auditor in 1950 in May, and that was when it was," and so on. And you're looking at this thing and it's going *cling, clang*. Well, now don't figure yourself out of existence and say, "Well, it could have been a psychoanalyst – could have been trouble – they had trouble with their accounting department." Now, don't figure yourself around the bend. Just ask them, "Is there any earlier incident?" That is the magic cure for all of this. "Is there any *earlier* incident?" You can't get before then, can you?

Well, he drags up – he drags up May, or she does. You've got May of 1950. *Ooo-oh-ho-ho!* And when you've covered that, it still falls. Well, don't lose faith, don't lose confidence. You just haven't – this is the only reason you haven't got the thing clear. You haven't got the first incident. So you ask them if there's an *earlier* incident. See?

Yeah, there was a person audited him out of *Astounding Science Fiction*. They'd forgotten all about the session; session totally buried. They weren't called auditors then. They weren't called sessions then. This person did talk to them about it and try to get them to remember something because of it. Don't you see?

But I really wouldn't call it a session. "Well, would you call it a session?" and so forth. "Well, wouldn't, no." See? And all of a sudden they give you this, and that happened in – sometime in the end of April of 1950, see?

Ahhh! We go over this and we notice when we say, "when – " you know, why, we get action, but the action damps. And when we say, "Is that all of it?" "Is there anything more to it?" the action is much milder than it was. And we ask – we go around it again, see, and we say, "All right. When was that?" And do you know that there isn't anything happening on that needle?

So we say, "Well, all right. How about this incident there in April when you made a sexual pass at an auditor?" whatever it was – "play for an auditor," so on. Yeah, that's it. Everything is ...

You come straight back. Don't go through all those overts They're not there anymore. You're just going to waste time, man. You got the first one – it's scrubbed. He – you is going to come right back up the channel, and you're going to ask the What question again. That is your next immediate action. If you've got the chain, that is it. There won't be a breath in that – left in that What question.

What question is null; you mark it null. That's all the writing you've done so far. No matter how many incidents you got, you just wrote the What question.

It's all null all the way – What question is null. The Zero A. Ask the Zero A. The Zero A is still alive, which is improbable. You've got to have another What question, so you proceed from there.

In other words, you go as far north as it's gone null, see, and you go as far south as it's necessary to null things. You just play within those two limits. And the next thing you know, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" and there's no response, there's no action, there's no nothing "Have you been willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" whatever it was that you were trying to clear.

That's all gone; everything's gone; everything's fine; needle looks better; pc looks better; everything's fine – well, get the hell out of there. What are you doing monkeying around with that rudiment?

It doesn't take a week to clear a rudiment. It doesn't take a session to clear a rudiment. It actually doesn't take fifteen minutes to clear a rudiment. If you're very slippery as a Prepcchecker, you're in there, down the chain and out again with stuff that the pc hasn't ever remembered and was totally occluded before he has time to marvel at it. It's cleaned up quicker than he has a chance to worry about it. There isn't any value in it, except that you get auditing done. And you'll find out that you could get these things in fairly rapidly.

But you understand that a person – now that's just checking the rudiments in. You take them one by one and check them in, in this particular fashion. No matter how many What questions you had, it would be as many What questions as you kept coming back up to the Zero A and found a Zero A still alive.

Well, yeah, that leads to another What question, see?

Now you clean up a big chain of that, and you come back up, and you'll find that Zero A is still alive. Well, you better get another What question and clean that thing up. This is getting unusual though, for that to happen, see?

All right. Now we start – start in on this thing. We are talking to the individual about *exactly* about those things which are absolutely pertinent to the subject of auditing when we are prepchecking rudiments. These we've got to have in.

Well, the funny part of it is if the pc is living a life of secrecy, if the pc walks out of the session door every day and looks up and down the street wondering if the police have arrived yet and that sort of thing, we're going to find that we put the rudiments in on a Prep-check broad basis and they go out; and we put them in, and they go out. Why?

Because there's something more fundamental about this particular activity than rudiments. Then we eventually find out that there is something wrong that would ordinarily be covered by some type of a form as – such as the Joburg. This is so wrong; never been discovered about the pc; we have a horrible time trying to lean into it – it's actually a hidden factor on the case.

You notice the pc that has this once in a while will get a dirty needle and then you can't find out what it is. And it's mysterious and it sort of – you get the case lined up and then the case isn't lined up.

And this case keeps falling on its face all the time. Well, that's because there's an unknownness about the case – of magnitude.

Now, cases that go mad have simply got a number of missed withholds – if you want to know the anatomy of madness. It's the missedness of it all.

Sunday afternoon, Thornville, Ohio, was mysteriously, uniquely and suddenly on the telephone. I happened to pick up the telephone. First told the person that I wasn't here because I just didn't feel like going into all that, and – and it was a collect phone call. So after I'd put the thing down, it got to be a right-in phone call and they would pay the charges. And I talked to somebody that said that they had done some Self Analysis a long time ago, but now these days they felt they were going out of their mind. This girl felt she was going out of her mind and going stark, staring mad and insane and couldn't go to the organization or anything of the sort, and expected me to be on a plane at once and go to Columbus, Ohio, to audit her.

Well, this is all symptomatic of this and that and the other thing. Although people do call me up rather constantly here and there and expect me to go to the North Pole to audit them, or something like that; I always say, "Well, if the guy is worth saving, he can at least come within range." I always offer some auditing if they'll come within range, sort of thing. But you find out when they're in that kind of a state of mind – this is what's very interesting –

their reach is very difficult, and their departure from an area is very difficult, and the number of crimes they have under their hats are absolutely uncountable.

And if you were to take such a person in that *extremis* and try to put their rudiments in – *pssssssss* – you'd find their rudiments would go out faster than you could get them in. Why?

Because there's tremendous weight of unknownness, of crimes, of other things on the case. They're not related to Scientology or are related to Scientology. Now, the more nearly these crimes are related to injuring Scientology, the less you will be able to keep the rudiments in. Quite interesting. That has a definite coordination. That isn't just me talking.

People kick the bucket on these things. I mean, there's nothing to fool with about them. We just had a doctor up in Scotland die just the other day, by the way. He had been calling me up rather persistently and constantly and telling me I had to go to Scotland and process him. I actually knew the man's background. Possibly, if it had been any of you, I would have said yes. Do you understand?

But this guy's background – he'd had an awful time. He'd been murdering people and doing other odds and ends and putting women into trances and using anesthetics on them and raping them and – pleasant, you know? His activities – now never kid yourself – the activities of people of that particular character are gross.

Now, I'm not maligning the dead, because he's probably already picked up a body in Scotland. But don't kid yourself. When they're – when they go spinny, you've got a wrestling match on your hands if you don't get your paws on what's making the case so woogy, see?

I know this boy's background pretty well – I knew his background. I knew something about it, but more than that, I knew my Scientology. And I knew well, if anybody in his family could boost him up and get him down here, why, I'd happily get somebody to pull a few of his overts and so forth.

The girl that called from Ohio, I simply told her over the telephone, told her sister-in-law, to write – sit down and write all the things nobody knew about her except herself and send them in a letter to me. See? So that when that gets here, I will simply say, "Well, this is all very, very interesting, and thank you for sending this, but you have omitted several," you see? [laughter]

And I'll just keep this thing going, and eventually this person will straighten out. See? But don't be so filled with sweetness and light about all this sort of thing. People who invalidate E-Meters and have a hell of a time with this and with that and the other thing are actually having a hell of a time with something they've done in life.

Don't be naive. This is not just talk – this is fact. This is fact. And just stop wasting auditing time. Just accept the fact this bird's – you can't keep his rudiments in – he's got overts. Just accept that fact. And don't keep knocking your own brains out, see?

Here's this *dear* sweet, old lady who belongs to the Cat Society and who is kind to Half Decayed Flowers clubs. See? And you say she's never done anything in her life. But you can't keep her rudiments in. That's the only test.

Their rudiments keep flying out in various directions – man, they've been busy! I don't care – and probably the apparency they're sitting there with – and that's not in some past life, that's this one. And the apparency they're sitting there with is a – is a camouflage. Anybody that would join the Society for Decayed Flowers and Protection of Cats – camouflage.

They sit there with one flower waving on their Victorian hat. Camouflage, man. And you're probably talking to Mata Hari of World War II. Who knows? See? Used to kill partisans for the fun of it.

Don't be so naive, in other words. It's just a direct coordination – absolutely direct: can't keep the rudiments in – they got a lot under the lid.

Easy way to get it out is to take some broad, pervasive thing like Form 3, the Joburg. Take that thing (and it's got every crime known to man and beast on the thing one way or the other) and you clip some corner of what they've been doing. See, you'll take some – you'll scrape at it at least, see?

You'll notice every time you mention the word "rape," or something like that, their hair stands on end or needle goes off the pin or something like this. There's something going on here, see?

And in that way, a packaged form is of enormous use. Now, who knows? You'll be able to take perhaps one pc and directly – directly put their rudiments in. Overtly. They stay in. You can do a Routine 3. Everything is going along swimmingly, you see?

Now, I'm not saying the pc, the worse – or pc should be taken up in some other way, particularly, but you're going to get the next pc to that and you prepcheck all the rudiments in and they don't stay in. And you prepcheck them in, and they don't stay in. And you prepcheck and – and it's all like living in a world of hot grease. It's slippery. What's going on?

Well, what's going on is they've been up to things which in this lifetime would be termed, to be very understative, antisocial. See, it's not they believe they has been doing something antisocial. They've been doing something antisocial, for which they would be damaged if discovered. Get that? I mean, they'd be damaged. So, of course, they can't get off the withhold easily.

They wouldn't dare say, "Well, I – ha-ha – actually accepted German marks all during the war to turn in the number of ships passing Point Conception." They don't know. They read in the paper every once in awhile, huh-huh, that they're still trying war criminals, you know. They're not sure. Their judgment is never good on these things, you know? It always looks to them like everything is still rigged and these have to be pretty juicy. They have to be pretty good crimes. They can't be mild.

You know, one person doesn't consider crimes wilder than another person. The crime is the crime. I mean, that's all there is to that.

One of the reasons you don't get anyplace – when you don't get anyplace with Prepchecking – is because you say, "Well, Joe," you see, "is much queasier than Bill. So then Bill would have to have much less crime on his background to be as nutty as Joe," see? See? "Because, you see, Joe here, he gets all upset." Let me put it another way: "He gets all upset here

at just the *thought* of doing something bad, you see? Whereas Bill, he's very extrovert, and he can do something bad and not be that upset. So therefore, Joe and Bill being entirely different people, you'll be able to get Bill's rudiments in even though he has done many criminal things. But Joe, you can't get his in because he is a – a delicate flower, you see? And he really hasn't done anything. You just, you know, it's just his – his – the feeling of guilt is stronger."

Man, you're just rationalizing yourself into a hole, that's all. I get any of these girls – there's a girl, lay up here in a hospital and died one time – I guess about a year ago or something like that. I asked a staff auditor here to go up and give her some auditing, and he did, and the hospital was so upset, crowded and appetite over tin cup, there wasn't any way you could even get to her bedside and she went ahead and kicked the bucket. It wasn't no Scientologist – just a local girl up in town. We heard about it and so forth – thought we'd do something. And didn't make the grade.

Well, this girl wasn't even injured very badly. This girl was lying in a funk and was saying nothing. Ah – fascinating. Now, you think this is because she picked some flowers in the town council's front yard? No, brother. There's something her family didn't know about her, and she went ahead and was leaving. And the extremity of leaving is kicking the bucket. See? And when they get too many overts and too many withholds, that are too antisocial – they're very damaging themselves – they want to get the hell out of there.

That's all they can think of and so they die very easily, given the least provocation. Now, in the process of doing one of these, if you simply went and monkeyed with this case – I'm talking about dying people here with malice aforethought actually – if you went and monkeyed with this case and thought it was because they picked some flowers out of the town council's garden, and you went in at that level of expectancy of what you were going to find in this case, this case would be a corpse before you got anywhere.

See, you've got to say, "What is this now?" See? A kind auditor could actually – in this type of case, lying in the hospital – a kind auditor would just pat them on the head and say, "God bless you, because that's all that's going to happen."

And of course, the guy gets out of his head and tries to find God, but that's another story.

What's going on here? Well, the auditor has kindified him to death, that's all. This girl, the only way you could possibly have rescued her or snapped her back – if the medicos had built enough beds up in the hospital, you know, and didn't leave so many patients dumped in the corridors – you actually couldn't even walk to the side of her bed if I remember rightly or some such exaggeration – the auditor going in there, he has somebody who has a very, very short attention span, see. They aren't long for this thing. Well, he can't monkey with it; he hasn't got any time to monkey with the thing, you see? So he's got to ask some pertinent question.

He'd have to find out something about the person, you know? Is the person married? Not married? Living with family? See? Who is it here? You see? Something of that sort. He actually couldn't even spend very much time on rudiments on such a case. Don't you see? Because the person's concentration is withholding on a specific thing. You'd have to parallel what the mind is doing.

You'd say, "Well, where don't you want to go back to?" You know, "Where don't you want to go back to, dear?"

"I don't want to go home. Oh, no, no. No, I don't want to go home."

"All right. Very good. What don't they know about you, dear? That's right. All right now."

"Ooo-oooh, ooo-oh."

"Yeah, well, what have you done that you're hiding from them? Come on. Tell me. You can tell me, you know."

And "Oh – wow!" and they tell you, and they're out of bed and dressed and gone home. [laughter]

Magical. Magical. And of course, if you're kind and you go in and you say, "Well, you can confide in me. Have you ever smiled at somebody?" You know, some big overt. They haven't got the span or anything else, because their mind is straight on to the withhold when they're trying to pass out.

So you can try your pc's attention and you can throw your pc wildly out of session by not taking it somewhere where the pc's mind is concentrated. Now, to that degree, a pat list has a certain liability. See? It bores your pc stiff before it ever gets to his crime. So therefore, you should learn to rapidly sift the coffee beans from the chaff, with rapidity.

Here's the way you run one of those lists. That's what we're talking about.

"Have you ever stolen anything?"

The guy says, "Yeah, I stole a penknife once."

You say, "Good. I'll check it on the meter. Have you ever stolen anything?"

That's your Zero A, don't you see? And you say, "Have you ever stolen anything?" You say, "That's null, thank you very much."

"Yeah, have you ever drowned a waterbuck?" *Clang!* "All right. What's that? It's reacting. For your answering, I'll repeat it there. Have you ever drowned a waterbuck?"

"Oh, yeah, I'd forgotten all about that. Yeah, I did. I was down on the south side of the Brisbane River. Yeah. Yeah, I did."

"All right. I'll check that on the E-Meter. Have you ever drowned a waterbuck? All right. That's clean. Thank you. All right. Have you ever raped anybody?" *Clang!* You say, "That's reacting. I'll repeat it for you on the meter. Have you ever raped anybody?"

"Uhm – I've been worried about being raped."

"I'll repeat that for your answer. Have you ever raped anybody?"

"No, no. No, I never have."

"All right. I'll check that on the meter. Have you ever raped anybody? I'm awful sorry, but that is very, very live."

All right. Now we're going to go into it, see. And you say, "Well, let's fish it up here. What have we got? See?"

Let's get a What question wrapped around this thing. Let's get an incident. Let's get him raping somebody. Let's talk it over. What is this all about? Let's get him discussing the subject. Get him immersed in it one way or the other. Get a What question out of some overt.

"Well, I actually – I actually touched a girl once in a subway." That's all you can make out of it, man. That's the first chain you're going to have to clear.

And you say, "Well, what about touching women?" or "What about touching girls?" Test it out – see. "What about touching people in public places?" Whatever it is, get something. This pc is queasy, see? It's actually doing something. It's touching something. All right. Get that. Clean that up.

"What's the first time you ever did this?" You know, I mean, you've got the incident all right. We're going to chew it up.

"When was that?" and so on and etc., and so on. Fine – that's good. *Boom!* You know. "When's the first time you ever did this? Come on. When was the first time? Let's get to the bottom of this chain. All right." We picked that up and so on.

"Well, it was actually in school. I used to get a kick out of pushing around my kindergarten teacher and that sort of thing. Used to hang on her skirt and used to get a tremendous bang out of it."

You – "Thank you very much. When was that?" "Is that all there is to it?" So then you notice this thing is deader than a mackerel.

You say, "Ah, ah, that's fine. Thank you very much. All right. Now let's check this question. What about touching people? That's null. Thank you very much. All right. Now – *ahem*. Now, heh! Have you ever raped anybody? That is the question." *Clang! Boom! Thud! Crash!* Pots and pans falling out of the E-Meter.

"Well, I thought about it once. I actually considered it once."

"All right. I'm glad. Glad you got that much now. All right. Now. Have you ever raped anybody? That's what I want an answer to."

"Ah-whooo! Well, you wouldn't really call it rape." [laughter]

"All right."

The doors are going to open on that one. Get the first one on the chain. Get back up there again, man. Clean up that "Have you ever raped anybody?" You really got the chain. You have got a thing knocked out, so you null it off and that's that Zero A gone. Shouldn't take you very long to do it.

Now, because this is going to strain the pc's attention when you're doing a pat list from one end to the other, you should do it rather – well. See, you should do it rather positively. You should do it well. You should steer his attention very much. You shouldn't be in any doubt about what you're doing, because otherwise you're just going to wander on and on and on.

Now, in view of the fact that you're already not well paralleling his central crime – you're going to find it someplace on the list, but you haven't got it yet – and his attention is going to require an awful lot of direction because it tends to disperse all the time. He's actually hiding something from you, knowingly or unknowingly. And if he's knowingly hiding it, then it's got an awful lot of unknownness connected with it that he doesn't know about either.

And it'll be a tremendous relief to this character when you finally get down to that. But where is it? Where's the key question? Is it on the beginning of the list? Is it in the middle of this long canned list? Or is it at the end of the list? Or – you know, where is it? See, you can't tell.

So therefore, because you're checking – Prepchecking, Sec Check Prepchecking – a lot of dunnage ... Although it'll be very important to him, it'll make him feel a lot better and everything'll be a lot better. Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah; but there – it isn't right exactly what his mind is doing, therefore we have to do it rather well. You have to do it slippily, you have to do it fast. You have to be able to carve right straight in there and get right what you're going – clean up the chain, come right back up to the top again.

I don't know how many chains of this particular character you could clean up, but I think I could handle any number of null questions. I mean – let's say fifteen or twenty questions that had only one question that released them, see, plus at least twelve questions you had to prepcheck the living daylight out of in one two-hour session. I mean, I'd consider I was doing about all right if I did that many – about twelve Prepcheck chains out. Clean – clean as a wolf's tooth, plus about maybe ten or twelve, twenty null questions – all clean. See? That's the expectancy of rapidity.

Now, if you were doing it that fast, you'd be getting enough gain on the pc, you see, so the pc would be interested and in-session even though you weren't in the center of the pin.

Wheeeee!! You know? Now, there's no monkeying with one of these things. You don't sit down for a Scientology career on one question, because it won't clear on one answer. You see? Don't take the next 25-hour intensive to clean up "Have you ever hit anybody with a pease porridge pudding" You know? It doesn't take that long to clean up man, I guarantee it. Not if you fish the What question into view, you see? Not if you get that What question hot. you get the actual overt; get a What question that matches that overt; get down that line like a rabbit going down his burrow, you know, and just pull that basic-basic right *psszzzzt*. The rest of it'll just go *rrrrrrrr*, just like a bunch of dominoes, you know? Knock them one *brrrrrrr* – *bang!* There it went out at the top end.

You say, "That's it."

You can do it; you can do it. Actually, the patter that you use with it is becoming narrowly quite precise. There's very few questions about how you vary from one to the other and so on. You just do it, you know?

You say, "Have you ever raped anybody?" and then you ask a What question, "Have you ever raped anybody?" and it gives you a tick-tock, splash, you see, on the meter. You know? And then you get a What question that goes tick. I don't think you're on the right chain, you know. I really don't. I think there's something wrong with that.

I think somehow – usually something wrong with your wording, and you sometimes wake up out of a dream and realize that you're on a motivator chain or something stupid of this particular character. See?

You're talking to this girl. You've asked the question "Have you ever raped anybody?" You'll find out – you got to be pretty well grooved in or you get tired or something. And you suddenly got this thing all wrong. She's a girl, so therefore, she's the logical person to rape, so she was raped. So she gives you this rape thing.

Obviously, he says, do you mind – missed withhold. See, it's a missed withhold. And she's never told anybody before, and therefore, it is perfectly legitimate and then you go on, and you go on, and you go on, and you pull incidents, and you pull incidents. You find out she was raped when she was one, when she was two, when she was three, when she was four; raped twice when she was five, six, seven; skipped the whole eighth year. She was unconscious the whole eighth year for having been raped in the seventh year. And you can – it's just going to get worse and worse and worse, because the pc is not being prepchecked on the auditing question.

The question is "Have you ever *raped* anybody?" She's a pretty girl. You know very well that pretty girls never rape anybody. Oh, yeah?

And you'll sometimes get tricked into one of these things and dead end. And then you'll come up at the other end, and you'll say, goodness gracious, you know. It sure takes an awful long time to prepcheck something like this. Golly, it takes a long time to get one of these Zero Questions, you know, and get the Zero A, you see – and then get a What and then just-just takes – what really takes time is trying to get all of the overts on that particular chain from one end to the other. And if you ever find yourself in that frame of mind, listen to what the pc is telling you sometime. Because the pc never is answering the auditing question if that's the way it is.

You've kind of heard it crosswise. You got caught napping.

You said to this pretty girl, "Have you ever raped anybody?"

She says, "Yes, I was raped."

You say, "Good. All right. When was that?"

"Well, I was raped at the college prom. College prom, my freshman year."

You say, "All right. Now let's get a What question for that. What about being raped at dances?" and so forth.

And you got – you got to figure it out, and you – a little bit hard to figure it out. [laughter] And you finally get something that reacts there very well. And you go on and you get the earlier rape. And next thing you know, you're throwing your end rudiments out like crazy, you see? You just – pc is at effect. Got the whole thing backwards, but – I'm giving you a very silly example, but these can be pretty interesting.

A pc can really throw a curve at you and you all of a sudden realize that you're sitting right there square on a motivator, and this thing is a motivator chain and you weren't listening. And that's about the only time Prepchecking gets rough.

Or you're on some kind of a think, or a figure-figure base that sounded all right when you went into it, but somehow or another didn't turn out to be all right.

The pc has ceased to answer the auditing question. Is audit – answering something else. That's what happens to Prepchecking: It's that the auditor buys the wrong answer to his auditing question, see. The auditor asks for an overt: he gets a motivator. He asks for an action, he gets a think, see? And the auditor, unwittingly, at that moment goes on into that channel. And you'll find out, if you're ever training auditors, this is what gives you gray hair. It's grim, you know?

You say, "How could he possibly ask this?" You say, "What about being beaten by your mother?"

You know, you'll see this as a What question. You say, "For God's sakes, man. How the hell did that ever get on there?"

And you'll find out, if you coordinate them, you'll find a question, "What about being beaten by your mother?" is then followed by the remainder of the session auditing time.

They found this – it – the session was between 2:00 and 4:00 and they found this at 15 minutes past 2:00. And then down here at the end of it, the thing is still in full bloom and isn't marked null yet and it's 3:55, end rudiments. And then you look at next day's reports, you see? And they start into this question. And you'll find out that when they give these motivator answers – these think, these figure-figure answers – or answers not to the auditing question.

Say, "We're clearing Zero A. Have you ever raped anybody?"

And we got some What there that has to do with kissing.

"What about not wanting to be kissed?"

Well, the auditor sitting there has got to be able to translate this right away into the proper action. Otherwise, he never gets a fast Sec Check Prepcheck.

Here's the way you go astray:

You say to somebody, "All right. Have you ever raped anybody?" *Clang!*

And the person says, "Well, yes, I – at the junior prom, I – I was raped at the junior prom."

You say, "All right. Good. I'll check that on the meter. Have you ever raped anybody? Uh-huh. This isn't clear, so I'll have to go into a Prepcheck now. Let's see now. You say the junior prom. All right. Let's see now. What about being raped at the junior prom? What about being raped at dances? What about being raped by young men at dances? That seems to register well."

And all of a sudden, you say – I *hope* you will say to yourself, if you get that far – "What the *hell* am I doing?"

"Say, what was the answer to that question? Oh, come off of it. Look, look, you didn't answer my auditing question in the first place. Look, have you ever raped anybody? That is

the answer I want. I want – and you gave me some other answer. I'm sorry, but we've got to go back and pick it up."

You know, you'd have to do it in order to get your end rudiment in.

"Now, look. Listen, listen carefully. Have you ever raped anybody?"

"No." No reaction.

You say, "Good. Thank you. I'll check that. Have you ever raped anybody?" No reaction.

All right. Well, on to the next question.

You see, it's corny mistakes, actually, that get you into these fixes, and then you think Prepchecking, Sec Checking, goes on forever but actually the mistakes are quite corny. And you go back and you laugh at yourself.

I know the early times when I was doing some Prepchecking, working out Prepchecking, I mean, I got some outrageously weird cross-steers some ...

In the first place, while you are still learning your tools, you feel like an Indian juggler on the stage, you see, whose nearest rival has covered the whole stage with little round sticks. And there you are, you see? And you're learning your procedure and that sort of thing and you just don't hear these things as they go by. And you form this opinion that Sec Check, Prepchecking kind of takes forever and takes a long time. And your training pattern then becomes that this is a very slow action.

So you say, "Well, have you ever stolen anything?"

And the fellow says, "Well, I stole a clock once. I stole a clock once from my brother."

And you say, "All right. Thank you very much. I'll check it on the meter. Have you ever stolen anything? That still reacts. Thank you very much. All right, you said you stole a clock once from your brother. When do you suppose that was?"

"Back in the fe-."

"Oh. All right. Now let's see, what could that be about? Let's see, 'What about stealing clocks?' 'What about stealing things from your brother?' 'What about stealing things from your brother?' That'll – pretty good – *heh-heh-haha* – pretty good, there's the original read. All right. Thank you very much. All right. Now, when was that? All right. Anything else you'd care to say about that? All right. What didn't appear there? Okay, thank you. All right, who didn't find out about it? Oh, all right. Thank you very much. Now, is there an earlier one on that chain? Earlier – earlier than that?"

"On what chain?"

"Stealing things from your brother. Is there any earlier time you've stolen anything from your brother?"

"Stolen anything from my brother? Stolen anything from my brother? Oh – oh yes! Yes, as a matter of fact. As a matter of fact, yes, we were – when we were thirty, I borrowed

his car one day and he said it was stealing, but it wasn't. I sold it I know, but actually he ..."
[laughter]

"All right. When was that? Is that all there is to it? All right. What didn't appear there?"

Well, cripe! Thirty – you know this thing is going back there, man.

All right. Work it over. Work it over. Buy it. Give it the dignity of it. "All right. Who didn't find out about that? All right. Thank you very much. Good enough. Were you and your brother together when you were kids?"

"Oh, yeah. I suppose so. Yeah. Oh, yeah, yeah. Big occlusions in the area, but we were together when we were kids."

"All right. What did you steal from your brother when you were kids?"

"Oh. He used to pick on me a lot!"

"Good. All right. That's fine. That's – that's good. But what did you – I'll repeat that. Now, what did you steal from your brother when you were kids?"

"Nothing actually. I didn't – I never developed the habit until he stole ..."

"Good. Thank you. What did you steal from your brother when you were kids?"

"*Whew!* I stole my mother's affection from him. That's what I did." "Good. All right. Thank you. All right. All right. That – that's okay. When was it? And so forth. When was it? All right. That's good. Good, that's now all right. Okay. Now is there anything earlier than that?"

"You can't get any earlier than that."

"Well, why can't you get any earlier ...?"

"Well, we were both eight."

"Oh, I think we can find something earlier than that." And all of a sudden, well, this comes up at five he used to... His brother was smaller than him – and you've all this time had the idea that the brother, you see, was years older. But actually the brother is years younger. See? Suddenly, he gets this straight. Cognition – you see? *Ha-ha*.

And you find out that he used to tell his little brother that ice cream was poison, [laughter] that meat was poison, that dessert was poison and where his mother came in, was telling him that his mother was always trying to poison him, and befriending him by eating the food for him. [laughter]

And he just never remembered this. And you can see that thing just fade out; the pc square around. You ask some question about it, you know? It's just deader than a mackerel. You come right back up there. "What about stealing things from your brother?" You know? Null. "Have you ever stolen anything?" Null.

Fine. *Clang!* You're out of there, man, and you're on to the races. But actually, it shouldn't take you any longer to get that out of the pc than it took me to tell you and that was three minutes. See?

You're driving a pc – if you're not sitting there just going along for the ride, if you got your hands somewhere near the wheel – I don't absolutely insist at first that the auditor run the session. We like to sneak up on it and get him up to a point, well, where the session actually gets some control.

But, if you're sitting there right, with your hands on the wheel, you have that guy back down the track and snap that thing out of there and get the pc back up the line again. And that question nulls so fast, he hardly knows what has happened, except he suddenly feels so much better.

"Any goals or gains?"

"Yes, for some reason or other, I've – you know, I've always had this feeling like I've been poisoned. That's very funny. I don't have that feeling now. Yeah, that's some gain. Must have been something in the session that had something to do with that." Sometimes when you're in private practice, they call you up at twelve o'clock at night saying, "I just remembered. It's because I was trying to tell my brother I was keeping him from being poisoned, that I felt being poisoned."

[in a tired voice] "Thank you. Thank you very much." [laughter]

Well, there's your Sec Check, Prepcheck rundown. I tried to give you some idea of – rather than an example of doing it and so forth – I'm trying to give you the feel of it – trying to show you where to push, the pressure to put on the thing, and so on. And canned lists of predetermined overts of one kind or another are of tremendous use. Don't minimize their use, because they scrape up areas that the pc is trying desperately to avoid. And because they are a generally formalized – formulized thing that contain all that particular type of thing that would be considered reprehensible in this lifetime, then they scare up an awful lot of material and lay it in your lap and generally will come into some collision course with what the pc is trying to suppress.

You get one of these things done, get this thing done very well; you go back; you put your rudiments in; all of a sudden – with a Prepcheck, see, you prepcheck your rudiments in now – you'll find out they go in quite easily. That pc is very happy about the whole thing and they will stay in. Now you can move over into a Routine 3-type process and you are all set.

But unless you get up some of that stuff, you'll find out the pc just kind of keeps spinning, and he gets up and he falls flat on his face, and he gets up and he falls flat on his face, and so on.

Now, if you've gone over a lot of these things, your case repair, your checkout and so forth is to go over the same list of What questions. I must tell you this.

When you check up to find out if some auditor knew his business on a canned Prepcheck, look over the What questions. Do not look over the Zero A's. That's quite important. The Instructor or you or something, when you're trying to check up to find out whether or not the auditor cleared this up, *don't* look over the Zero A's, look over *only* the Whats. Check up only the Whats in Prepchecking. Never check – when you – just like when you're checking somebody's rudiments – never check somebody's Zero A's. Why? Because the process of Prepchecking increases the person's responsibility.

So if you checked Form 3 again, the questions consisting of Form 3, of course, there are many of them going to be alive, because they came alive because of the improved responsibility of a pc.

Well, why were you prepchecking the pc, see? To improve his responsibility. But what won't come alive are the What questions you've nulled. So you always check the What questions.

And if you find one of those out, why, really start chewing on the auditor. If he's gone on and left the What question live, he has sinned, because the pc's returning responsibility does not come up and revivify that What question. Do you follow that? And that's what you check. That's the only way you check out an auditor's ability to Prepcheck – is check his What questions, never his Zero A's – and you'll find out this will work rather like a dream.

If you checked his Zero A's, the increased responsibility of the pc will show them to be alive, when actually at the time he went over them, they were quite flat. And that's how you keep from hanging somebody falsely.

Now you check somebody's rudiments, of course, after they have had a whale of a session and if the rudiments are checked for the session, they are just in – for that session they just now had – the scale of improvement and increased responsibility of the pc is more or less on a plane, and you'll find out those things will be in. They'll be in for that session if they're checked right after that session.

If you want to have some fun sometime, start – and get really mad at early auditors, check the (quote) rudiments (unquote) or absence of them of very early auditors. Because, of course, the gain of the pc in the interim knocks the action and attitude and responsibility of the earlier sessions out of gear. It won't happen for the session we've just had this last day or so.

But you ask him if he had a missed withhold. He's liable to make a total mistake. He's liable to tell you yes, he had a missed withhold from that auditor. Whereas at the actual fact, the actual time he was being audited, he didn't consider it a withhold and he didn't consider it an overt, but he does now. You see the trickiness involved in all this. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

But you can develop a lot of speed with this, and you can get a tremendous number of results with this. You can make people really shine. These results are just as you see that a What question remains null, these gains stay stable with the pc. It takes quite a bit to knock out a Prepcheck gain.

So anyway, there is how you Prepcheck and Sec Check, and I hope you'll be able to make use of it.

We're overtime again.

Thank you very much. Good night.

TV DEMO: GETTING RUDIMENTS IN, PART I

An auditing demonstration
given on 30 May 1962

This evening what I'm going to try to do is just get in some rudiments, show you it can be done, get in some beginning ruds, get the Havingness command, run that for a few commands and then run end ruds. And I'm just going to do this on the Instructors and give you an idea of this particular type of session. I want you to notice the instant read characteristic of the meter and where the meter reads. Those who maintain that they have gotten the ruds in on the pc and then have – somehow or another – mysteriously they have gone out since the end of the session, simply didn't have the ruds in. That is – it's as easy as that.

LRH: All right, let us take the first candidate we have on this. Okay. Little closer. Pick up the cans, would you?

PC: *Right.*

LRH: Okay. Now. We – what I'm going to do here, is I'm just going to rapidly go down the rudiments, get them in, try a little Havingness and get them in. You've had a lot to do with this setup, and so forth, and you've never been audited. [laughs]

PC: *Never been in this chair.*

LRH: That's right. All right, see where we sit here on the meter. All right, you're reading about 2.5 on the meter here which is fine. All right. Is it all right with you if I start this session now?

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: All right, here it is: Start of session. Has the session started for you?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Sure?

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: All right. Very good. What goals would you like to set for this very short session?

PC: *Oh, I'd like to get the ruds in.*

LRH: All right. Any other goal?

PC: *No, I think that'll do, Ron.*

LRH: All right. Any goal you'd like to set for life or livingness?

PC: *Yes, to be more able as a result of this session.*

LRH: All right, to be more able... Good. Any other goal?

PC: *No, I think it'll do for this session.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Okay. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything.

PC: *Yep.*

LRH: There's a little kick on that. Now we're going to take up havingness in the body of this session, and we're not particularly keen on throwing this thing now. But, just look around here and tell me if there is anything out of order or you feel misplaced or something of that sort.

PC: *Yeah, there was a missed withhold there that I didn't tell you. You said look around here and see if you can have anything, and of course I observed it wasn't the usual rudiment that one expects.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *So I didn't communicate that I did notice that.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right.

PC: *No, there's nothing seems out of place.*

LRH: Okay. Good enough. All right. Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: That's null. Thank you very much. Good enough. Now, are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: Well, there's just a little tiny tick on that. Anything you'd like to say concerning that?

PC: *No, I just flashed talking about the difficulties of the – getting the television set up into the new building.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I flashed on that when you asked me the question.*

LRH: All right. All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: All right, there's a little tick on that. So, who'd I have to be to audit you?

PC: *You!*

LRH: All right. Very good. Who would I have to be to audit you?

PC: *Just yourself.*

LRH: All right. Very good, who would I have to be to audit you?

PC: *Well, I can't think of anybody better than yourself there, now.*

LRH: All right, very good. Let me check this. All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: That's null as can be. Thank you very much. That was the last command.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Now, I don't think I've audited you very dress parade and so forth, or maybe a little coffee shop.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: So I can't ask you "Since the last session." But, since your last session, when was that?

PC: *Oh, about three weeks ago.*

LRH: Three weeks ago. Since your last session have you done anything you are withholding. I got a tick. That's it.

PC: *Fused the lights. But I'm not withholding that.*

LRH: All right, all right. You satisfied you've answered the question?

PC: *No, not really, because I wasn't withholding that. I've already told you about that.*

LRH: All right. All right. Let me repeat the command. Since your last session have you done anything you are withholding? That's the tick.

PC: *Well, possibly something to do with a meter read, that I'm checking. Sometimes I'm not too sure of every meter read. I feel I set a high standard there.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Let me check that on the meter here. Since your last session have you done anything you are withholding? Now, that's clean. Thank you very much. Okay. Now, do you have a present time problem?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Well now, I got just a little tick there.

PC: *Well, a problem getting that – uh – it's right here – the TV set up on – over in the new building.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Let me check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? All right, that's – that is an equivocal read. Let me check it once more. Do you have a present time problem?

PC: *No.*

LRH: I have the tiniest, faintest suggestion of a reaction. It's hardly a reaction.

PC: *Well, what I think of now is I'm not very good at putting things on paper. And I did say I would draw a*

sketch of the room, and I've started to do that. And that does present a little problem to me.

LRH: All right, very good. Let me check it on the meter now. Do you have a present time problem? I get a latent read on that now, so it's all right. Okay?

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Very good. All right. Now, I would like to run some Havingness on you. What would you say to that?

PC: *Very good.*

LRH: All right. Very good. What is your Havingness Process?

PC: *Look around here and find something you could have.*

LRH: All right. We'll at least check that out and see what we've got here. All right. The command I am going to give you is, "Look around here and find something you could have," okay? Now, is it "could have," or "can have"? Which – which has it been?

PC: *"Could have."*

LRH: "Could have." All right. Here it is: Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That settee.*

LRH: Very good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Your hair.*

LRH: Very good. Squeeze the cans. Thank you. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That camera.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The curtains.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The paper clips.*

LRH: Very good. The paper clip?

PC: *The clips...*

LRH: Oh, my goodness I could – didn't even see them! All right. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The carpet.*

LRH: Very good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The switch gear over there.*

LRH: Okay. Squeeze the cans. All right. Lay your hands up on top of the table. Just relax them, relax them now. Now close them. All right. Now just squeeze – just these fingers... Yes. All right. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Those three marks – small cut marks on the wall.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The door.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The fireplace.*

LRH: Very good. Squeeze the cans. Oh, that seems to work. That Havingness Process seems to work. All right. But just on the offbeat chance that there's some suppressions on that...

PC: *Yes...*

LRH: On Havingness Processes – on Havingness Processes, have you suppressed? I smell a mouse here, on this Havingness Process, okay?

PC: *All right, yeah.*

LRH: All right. I'm not getting tone arm action on it.

PC: *Do you want my hands up here still ?*

LRH: You can drop them.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: I'm sorry. Now, on Havingness Processes, have you suppressed? Well, what have you suppressed on a Havingness Process? I got it there.

PC: *I've suppressed – suppressed a desire very often in being run – in being run on a process, to beat the auditor to the command. In other words, I know what's coming and I'm halfway there, and I've suppressed doing that.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. On a Havingness Process, have you suppressed? Yes, I've still got a reaction to it. Anything else you can think of? Should be "suppressed anything?"

PC: *Sometimes when people are running a Havingness Process and they speak of permeating things and so on, I'm not always with them, and so I have suppressed any idea of getting up or saying I – that – that doesn't seem real to me.*

LRH: All right, very good. All right. Let me try this again now. On Havingness Processes, have you sup-

pressed anything? That's null. At least for – can I check it again?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: On Havingness Processes – on Havingness Processes have you suppressed anything? Well now, that read – that is latent. That is latent. That's an equivocal read. I'd better search it a little bit more. Can you think of anything else on suppressing things on a Havingness Process? There it is.

PC: *Um...*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *... yes. I know I started to Q-and-A sometimes with myself on – or argue with myself, as to whether I was really doing the process.*

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: *And so stopped any – any idea – suppressed any idea of doing that. In other words, just do what I feel like doing when you – they give the command.*

LRH: I see. And what have you suppressed there exactly? I didn't quite understand that.

PC: *Suppressed any idea that I wasn't doing the process correctly.*

LRH: I see, I see. All right, all right. I got it. All right. Let me check that now. On Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything? I've still got a bit of a reaction there. There's a tick.

PC: *Well, I haven't got a specific incident. I've got a feeling that in running – in sometimes checking a Havingness Process, when I've been auditing, that I haven't always*

had a full dial – an increase in the squeeze...

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: *... in the swing when I – I've got them to squeeze the cans.*

LRH: All right...

PC: *And sort of suppressed that. Well, I oughtn't to pass this, but I did, you know, suppress the fact that you hadn't really got the full swing on the needle that you should have.*

LRH: All right, I understand that. Okay. Let's try this again now. On Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything? That is clean. Thank you very much. Okay. On Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything? There is a latent read on that, and there's an immediate and a latent, both.

PC: *What I've got then was the first Havingness Processes that I had run on me...*

LRH: Oh yeah?

PC:... *by Pearson, which was mocking up gold balls and pulling them in to me. And they always seemed to work very effectively.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But uh – so I suppose I have invalidated those processes by reason of the fact we're running more in present time processes on havingness, you see.*

LRH: All right. I get you. All right, let me check this now, on the meter. On Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything? I still got a reaction.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: That's it. That's it.

PC: *Yes. Now this is something along the lines of – um – a process may – another process might run down a person's havingness...*

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: *... and I've always – it's all been guided by the fact that any process that turns on a condition will run it off...*

LRH: Right...

PC: *... and so – uh – I wouldn't interrupt it to run Havingness, despite the – being advised to the contrary.*

LRH: All right, all right. Very good. Very good. All right, let me ask that question again; check it here on the meter. On Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything? Now, that is probably clean. But let me make doubly sure here. On Havingness Processes have you invalidated anything? I've got a little reaction on that. It's a little tick-tick. That's it. Right there. That's it.

PC: *Room upstairs, I'm getting.*

LRH: That's it. That's it.

PC: *Oh! This would be on you – you've published and said that it's when you've – can have the largest object in the room.*

LRH: Right.

PC: *Now, then there's a tendency sometimes you find yourself starting off a process – I've only just realized this – I started off with the settee tonight when I was running the Havingness Process, and so that hasn't – as far as my case – that*

particular point hasn't become real to me.

LRH: All right, very good. Very good. All right. Let me check that now on the meter. On Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything? All right, there's an equivocal read because it read on "invalidated." Is there something here about the word "invalidated"? Yes. What is this on the word "invalidated"? I mean that – that's what we're tripping over here. I'm not even asking you to answer this very seriously, but have you got something on the subject of "invalidated"?

PC: *No, it's very real to me. Um...*

LRH: Yeah, there it is.

PC: *Well, what – the thought that comes to mind here is, I am – I always feel that I myself am easily invalidated.*

LRH: Yeah...

PC: *I mean, other people feel – they feel they invalidate me.*

LRH: Did you ever conclude somebody else was?

PC: *Pardon?*

LRH: You ever conclude somebody else was easily invalidated?

PC: *Um...*

LRH: There's the tick. There's the tick.

PC: *Well, some.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Okay. All right. There's a tick right there, there's a little double...

PC: *Well, what I was thinking of there – that's – uh – I was – had this feeling of being, you know, easily in-*

validated. Only I'm not putting it in those words, it was – I had the feeling it must be something earlier than that.

LRH: Well, all right. Well, now, we have no business tracking down this word "invalidated" anyhow, it – just – except it's getting in the road of my read.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. So, let me check it here on the meter again and see if we get the same phenomena, okay? On Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything. Now, we've got a little double read. We've got a double – little double tick here, on "invalidated" and on "anything" so we – we've got – we've got the lot here. Shed any light on that? There's the tick. There it is.

PC: *Oh, yes! Well, this – of course! Going on quite – on remembering something you told us – I probably got this out of context, I'm not putting it forth as data – but you suggested that havingness was just something to keep the guy happy.*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *Do you see? And uh – that it doesn't make a lot of difference, really. This is the impression I've got myself. And so I'm – I'm not all that bothered, I'm not all that concerned about running a pc's Havingness as such, because I feel that the major processes do him good.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *And although we do it, and so on, then I always feel that... Well, I don't think we should really... It is-*

n't necessary to do all this with a Havingness Process.

LRH: All right, very good. Very good. Let me check that on the meter now. All right. On Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything? All right, the read has now altered, but I've still got a read. But you're – you're making progress now.

PC: *Yeah. This of course comes to the session in the Mayflower...*

LRH: Oh yeah.

PC: *... that I was running. And there was a tick on the radiator in the other room...*

LRH: Yes...

PC: *And I felt afterwards that that process had been probably spoiled for the reason that I let the pc take control to some extent at that stage.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *So I probably invalidated that session to some degree...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... as a Havingness session.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Now let's see what we've got here on the meter. All right. On Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything. All right, we've still got a tickety-bang, here. Is there some early Havingness Process that you said didn't work or wouldn't work or anything like that? This – I'll tell you – let me – let me be frank here. There's a bit of a double-tick missed with-hold on this, see, so somebody must have missed one.

PC: *Well, this again – it's going to lead back to this Havingness Process that I used to – that Pearson used to run on me. And for the life of me I used to get most cross when he would do the process and I'd go – dope off and he'd say, "Okay, mock up eight gold balls and pull them into you," you see. And I used to do this and – uh – sure enough it used to... And I used to get very cross that this would work!*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *And, in the end, it got to such a state I'd be doping off and he'd just say mock up... And I'd say, "Okay, I'll wake up," you see, and I used to wake up and I just... I see there I've invalidated the process and decided to wake up myself or – or put this interpretation onto it, at that time. Did I explain that to you?*

LRH: All right. Okay, yes, I understand that. Very good. All right, let me check this now. On Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything? All right, we've changed the read markedly now. And we've got a broader one. Did Pearson – missed a withhold on you?

PC: *Oh blimey, he must have missed a hell of a lot.*

LRH: No, I mean on that Havingness Process. Did he miss that withhold? This germane to that?

PC: *I didn't tell him that.*

LRH: You didn't tell him that?

PC: *I – I told him as far as that – I didn't tell – explain to him that I had invalidated a process in any way.*

LRH: Yeah, yeah...

PC: *But I said – I did make a remark to him, "All right, I'll wake up."*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Said he needn't run the process.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Let me check that on the meter again. On Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything. Well, what do you know, our read is now latent.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: So, we're getting there. We're getting there. But I'll recheck this later. And right now, on Havingness Processes, have you failed to reveal anything? All right. I got no read on that. On Havingness Processes, have you been careful of anything? We've got a read now.

PC: *Well, that's always very – as I say, careful to – um – do the command when the auditor says.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *Careful to squeeze the cans right at the end so as to make sure we're getting a read. Um – careful, of course, to try and get the process out of the way so that we can get on with the main body of the session.*

LRH: Hm. Hm. All right, all right, very good. Let me check that now. On Havingness Processes, have you been careful of anything? All right, we've got a couple of reads here now on this, all of which amount to nothing. Well, I'd better check this and just make sure now. Listen very carefully to the auditing command now. On Havingness Processes, have you been careful of anything? Now, I've got a read. Right at the end. Got a read there.

Nice one. Shed a little more light on this.

PC: *Well, I– I'm careful to try, when I'm running a Havingness Process, to get the squeeze before I start to run and after a few commands. Sometimes I've slipped up, but it's something I sort of take pains to do, because sometimes I forget to do it. So therefore I'm careful when I do, to try and get this done.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Let me check that again. On Havingness Processes, have you been careful of anything? All right. I'm going to read that once more. On Havingness Processes, have you been careful of anything? Now, as far as we're concerned, we're dodging around on this. I'm going to test it one more time. On Havingness Processes, have you been careful of anything? I've got a read there. I've definitely still got a read. It's a different read than you had, so you're cleaning it up.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Shed any lights on this? There it is... There it is. There it is.

PC: *... Careful to look behind me sometimes when I'm running a process and when I'm having a process run, so as I get uh – all the roo... all the room in... And one other thing comes to me: Careful, yes, to make sure that I include the auditor sometimes so that the guy won't feel insulted.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. Thank you. All right, let me check that again. On Havingness Processes, have you been careful of

anything? And that is clean as a wolf's tooth. Thank you very much. I'm going to run all of the middle rudiments now.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. On Havingness Processes, have you told anyone a half-truth? Now, let me check that again; it might have been a read. On Havingness Processes, have you told anyone a half-truth? No, that's clean.

On Havingness Processes, have you told anyone an untruth? Let me check that again. On Havingness Processes, have you told anyone an untruth? There is a tick.

PC: *Well sometimes, like this evening, sometimes I start the process off and you sort of say you can have something, and then you – you wonder whether you really are having it. And to that degree one is telling an untruth.*

LRH: All right. All right. Thank you. Let me check that now. On Havingness Processes, have you told anyone a hal... an untruth? Got a tick, maybe that was my reading of it. On Havingness Processes, have you told anyone an untruth? This is tagging around here. I don't – it doesn't quite settle down on this. I'll check it once more. On Havingness Processes, have you told anyone an untruth? Definitely a little reaction there. Shed any light on that? There it is.

PC: *Something I wasn't – um – this comes on TR 10. I've instructed people not to use that in a test for*

havingness and I'm not quite sure whether that's true or not.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *Is wrong data going on – maybe...*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me check it again. On Havingness Processes, have you told anyone an untruth? All right, I'll have to check it once more. On Havingness Processes, have you told anyone an untruth? That is clean. Okay. On Havingness Processes, have you said something only to impress someone? That's clean. On Havingness Processes, have you tried to damage someone? On Havingness Processes, have you tried to damage someone? I've got a reaction.

PC: *Well, what I thought of is not a doingness, but – um – somebody once told me that anybody – uh – uh – uh – expect that – anybody that's put in the family way, if you ran Havingness on them, it might help them get rid of the baby.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *And I always thought this was rather – I didn't like this idea, but I never done that, I swear!*

LRH: All right, all right. Okay. All right. On Havingness Processes, have you ever tried to damage someone? That is clean. I will check it once more. On Havingness Processes, have you ever tried to damage someone? I get no read on that. Okay. Now, on Havingness Processes, have you tried to influence the E-Meter? All right, I get this equivocal reaction. I will ask it again just to check it on the meter. On Havingness Processes, have you

tried to influence the E-Meter? I got a reaction.

PC: *Well, this is on the... Sometimes I feel you squeeze the cans a bit harder to – to get the – on a Havingness Process, squeeze the cans a bit harder to get a read so that we – we can get onto something else.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. Thank you. Let me check it on the meter now. On Havingness Processes, have you tried to influence the E-Meter? Got a reaction. Instant, but I – right on the button.

PC: *Well th – this – what I think of there is – I mean, is a "tried to," that, well, it's a – you're finding a Havingness Process, you always try to move the needle over so that you've found it.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Let me check this now. On Havingness Processes, have you tried to influence an E-Meter? All right, there's a reaction on that. Tiny bit tardy, but there might be something else there.

PC: *Well, here again it – it's a question of uh – like now, my hands are warm and moist and uh – I feel inclined that before you test for havingness that I – it would only be fair for me, if you allow me to dry my hands. Do you see?*

LRH: I see.

PC: *So to that degree there's an attempt to influence the E-Meter.*

LRH: All right, very good. Let me ask the question again. On Havingness Processes, have you tried to influence the E-Meter? Now we got a

dead one there that's clear as a mackerel. Okay? Very clear. All right.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: Now. On Havingness Processes, have you failed to answer a command? And we got a reaction.

PC: *Well – I just got a whole – must have been a number of commands I didn't answer on Havingness at times. You know, you... Especially if you've just come out of something and the auditor is struggling to get you around again and he bats on.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I know I just get an occasional... In my last auditing here, where the auditor said um – did you answer commands, and I said 'no, I – there's some commands you missed.' So he said, well give me the answers now. So I gave him the three answers and that seemed to clear it up.*

LRH: All right. All right. All right. Let me check this now. On Havingness Processes, have you failed to answer an auditing command? That's clean. All right? Just because some student would think that wasn't clean, I'm going to ask again. On Havingness Processes, have you failed to answer an auditing command? All right, there is the tiniest suggestion of slowdown. Let's be pedantic about it. On that first session, you just gave me some a few minutes ago.

PC: *The first session with Pearson?*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Yes, I suppose I didn't answer that*

command when I said, "Okay, I'll – um – all right, I'll wake up." He possibly... Yes, yes that would be the – the time.

LRH: All right.

PC: *I just didn't do the command.*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. Let me check that again. On Havingness Processes, have you failed to answer an auditing command? All right, we still got a reaction. There's something there. There's something there.

PC: *Well, this is running um – Op Pro by Dup. When Pearson was running it on me.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *That's the command, I mean, I may have got this twisted up with a Havingness command in those days, and it's a question then of his asking me the temperature of the book and how the hell could I tell the temperature of the book because I hadn't got a thermometer with me anyway. But it was something roundabout, and I gave him an answer. But I never felt that I really answered that question.*

LRH: All right, very good. Now, let me ask this in relationship to a Havingness command.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Now, on running a Havingness Process, have you failed to answer a command? Well that's – there. There's something there.

PC: *Well, I've got one on somebody else.*

LRH: Yeah, what's that?

PC: *When I uh – let uh – a pc get away with – uh – without answering a command, even though they queried it.*

LRH: All right, all right.

PC: *Got that time, they uh – I – they said did I answer those commands, and I said yes. And on the inspection I thought, no, they didn't. And so the poor guy's going around with an unanswered Havingness command.*

LRH: All right. Is there one on yourself? That probably freed it, but let's get a specific answer on that.

PC: *Well, there's one with my last auditing again, when I missed out on one. This would – this would be um – oh, the same session I was talking about, where the – I'd said at the end of the time I hadn't answered all the commands.*

LRH: All right, okay. Good enough. Now, let me check this. On a Havingness Process, have you failed to answer an auditing command? That's clean. As wandery as the needle looks, it actually is clean. Okay? Now, we are going to resume this havingness activity. And we will get back right into it now, if that's all right with you. And how about you squeezing the cans? All right. Thank you very much. Good enough. Put them back in your lap.

All right. Here's the next command. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Those flowers.*

LRH: Very good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That arm of the settee.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Key to the lock.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Fire.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That ashtray.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *Telephone.*

LRH: Good enough. Squeeze the cans. All right, that Havingness command is for the birds.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Okay? And not to go into one of endless this and that, we're going to start more or less at the bottom. And if it works – dandy.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right, put down the cans, would you? All right, we're going to run, "Feel that."

PC: *Good.*

LRH: All right. Feel that tablecloth.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel that board.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Okay, thank you. Feel that ashtray. Okay, thank you. Feel that curtain. Okay, thank you. Pick up the cans now, would you? All right. Squeeze them. Like a breeze. Okay, put them down. All right, feel that chair. Thank you. Feel that jacket.

Okay, thank you. Feel the top of your head. Okay, thank you. Feel your right ear. Okay, thank you. Feel your left ear. Okay, thank you. Feel your tie. Okay, thank you. Feel your chair. Okay, thank you. Feel the tablecloth. Okay, thank you. Pick up the cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. Dandy. All right. Now, I'm going to give you two more commands and then we'll end this process, if that's all right with you.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Feel that can.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Okay. Feel that can.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: All right. Thank you very much. That's the end of... Anything you care to say before I end it?

PC: *No, thank you.*

LRH: All right, end of process. Okay. Now we're going on into the end rudiments. All right? Here we go. In this session have you told me a half-truth? Untruth? In this session have you told me an untruth? I'd better check that again. In this session have you told me an untruth? I really don't have a read here. But I'm getting a little double tick. That's all right, we'll catch it. Let me check this once more. In this session have you told me a half-truth, untruth? Tried only to impress me? Did you just think of something there?

PC: *I just thought that I had been trying to be a good preclear. At times, yes, trying to impress you that way.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right, thank you. You tried only to impress me? All right, have you tried to impress anybody else?

PC: *Well, there's quite a little crowd downstairs watching and I just thought of them, but that's all.*

LRH: All right. Have you tried to impress them?

PC: *Yes, I should think so.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me check this again. In this session have you tried to impress anyone? All right, there's a tick on that.

PC: *Yes, I think I tried to impress you on the subject of this early subjective Havingness Processes that I – I'm very fond of those and I feel I've tried to get that line over to you.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Let me check this again. In this session have you tried to impress anyone? Cleaner than a wolf's tooth. Okay? In this session, have you tried to damage anyone? Tick. That's it.

PC: *Tried not to damage anyone.*

LRH: All right. All right. Tried to damage anyone? Tried positively to damage anyone? Got a tick there. We're wandering around here with a tick.

PC: *Well there could be a tried to damage – there's a possibility of damage of Pearson.*

LRH: Oh really?

PC: *I was saying that he didn't – that he let me get away with that unanswered command.*

LRH: All right. Okay. All right. Let me check that now. In this session have you tried to damage anyone? All

right. Let me check this now, and listen – listen to this auditing command. In this session have you tried to damage anyone? Clean. Okay. Thank you. All right. In this session, have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Thank you very much, that's clean. In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command? I got a clank here. What's this? In this session have you failed to answer any question or command?

PC: *Well, I did. I altered a command, so, inasmuch as you said, "Look around here and find..." I first thought of that settee and then instead of giving you that answer – that was the answer I failed to give you – I gave you the arm of the settee instead.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. All right. Let me check that now. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command? This is practically clean, but there's a tiniest slowdown now. Can you think of another one or that one or any one of them?

PC: *That one, yes. And that was followed by the – the key, where I – no I'm sorry it was followed by the telephone when I was about to... Sort of made up my mind to have that and then so – when I'm – I was ahead of you and beating the gun, so I changed to the telephone for your answer, so you didn't get the co – uh – that command – that answered.*

LRH: All right, all right. Are you satisfied you just answered the auditing question?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right, very good. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command? Now, this is – this is nervous. This is a nervous little tiny needle here. I'm sorry to be dragging you around the bend on this.

PC: *Well, what I'm getting on this is just when you asked me then, was um – this question of having, again, whether I had really had these – decide I could have them when I named them off to you.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *And sort of chanting names to you, rather than definitely saying – deciding I could have them.*

LRH: Well, all right. Excellent. All right, let me check this now. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command? Got a reaction here. All right, just let me steer this; just think over the session here for a moment, and let me see what I've got here. Questions or commands you've answered in this session. There it is. There it is. There it is again.

PC: *Something to do with these cans. You asked – you gave – you said you would give me two more commands of the process.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And uh – you – and I went to put the cans down.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *So there was an unspoken command to keep them in my hand, which is the nearest I can get one –*

it sounds awfully get-out, but that's the nearest I can get to.

LRH: All right, did you feel those two there, when I asked you to?

PC: *I felt the two, but no – before there, you see, I thought you were going to say put them down on the table.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *I anticipated that command. So there was the unspoken command to keep them in my hands, but I went to put them down, do you see? So to that degree I didn't fully carry out the unspoken command of putting them down.*

LRH: All right, all right, all right. Let's – let's put it this way. Let's put it this way – there's a tick. All right. In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command? Now I've got a reaction on 'command'. There it is. There it is. There it is.

PC: *Hm. I'm just not getting anything.*

LRH: There it is. There it is.

PC: *Well, this is the uh – beginning of the session then...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... when you said, "Has the session started for you?"*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And I said "Yes." And you said, "You sure of that?" I'm not sure that I answered that second command of "sure of this." That's the nearest I can get to anything there. In other words, you asked me a question, or – which is a command, because you asked me something and I can't recall definitely giving*

you an answer to the second question.

LRH: All right, very good. Very good. All right. Let me ask you this question again. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command? That is clean, thank you very much.

Now, in this session, have I missed a withhold on you? All right, let me ask it again. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? I got a tick.

PC: *Well, the only thing was that I didn't tell you names of auditors – all the auditors and pcs that I was referring to.*

LRH: All right, very good. Let me ask that again. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? Tick.

PC: *This has to do with Havingness Processes – um – running of them. Perhaps you didn't get the... I said – perhaps I said occasionally that I've done this, and you didn't get the time, place, form and event of times when I hadn't...*

LRH: All right, all right.

PC: *... done this Havingness Process right.*

LRH: Good enough. All right, let me check this again. In this session have I missed a withhold on you? Once more I'm going to check that very carefully now. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? There is a hang-up, right on the end of that. Could you answer that? That's it. There it is.

PC: *Um – yes, this is um – was – it was again the full circumstances of getting – letting – letting a pc – letting*

a pc not answer a Havingness command.

LRH: All right. All right. All right. Now, let me understand this now. The full circumstances of not letting a pc answer. Did that happen in this session, that? Now, what did you refer to? I just didn't get all...

PC: *No, I – during this I – I had told you about when I was running a Havingness Process and so on, so that had you pressed me you could have had some more details about that, and I didn't tell you all about it.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, let me ask you again. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? That's clean. Thank you. All right. Now. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Well, I got a little tick on that. What do you suppose that's all about?

PC: *Well I thought, "For God's sake don't let this one be out, clot."*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *"For God's sake don't let this one be out, clot."*

LRH: All right. All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Seems to be clean now. All right, what were you doing – making sure that was really clean?

PC: *Yes!*

LRH: All right. Now, look around here and tell me if you could have anything.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. I got a slight tick on that so I'm going to run a few more commands of Havingness. Okay? Would you put down your cans? All right, feel that cloth. Okay. Feel that ashtray. Okay. Feel that board. Okay. Feel those paper clips. All right. Feel your right sleeve. Good. Feel your left sleeve. Good. All right, pick up the cans. Okay. All right. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right, good. You get a bang on that.

PC: *Hm?*

LRH: You get a slight bang on that, just – just even so. Look around here and tell me if you could have anything.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right, now, I get a bang on that. I get a bang on that. Is there anything – any way you'd care to answer that?

PC: *Well, I can have the door and the settee and...*

LRH: All right. All right. Let me check that now on the meter. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything. All right, thank you very much. That's clean. All right. Now, have you made part of – any part of your goals for this session?

PC: *Well, we certainly got the ruds cleaned up.*

LRH: All right. Okay. And have you made any other gains in this session you would care to mention?

PC: *Yes, I feel a lot freer and brighter now. And this isn't propitiation,*

there's uh – I felt a bit heavy and nervous when I came into session, I mean you sprung a surprise on me, and I did. I feel very, very free, and um – well, I'm very happy to know that I can go through a session like this in front of the audience – now I've remembered them again.

LRH: All right.

PC: *On that I've had quite a gain.*

LRH: All right. Well thank you very much. Is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session?

PC: *Yes, I'm interested to know what the tone arm action was on running these rudiments, and so on.*

LRH: Well, your tone arm action here – your tone arm action with sensitivity at two – uh, pardon me, at sixteen...

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: ...is sitting here on 2. You came into session, at about 2.5, and then you went down to about 1.75. So the total tone arm action has been .75, and oddly enough, the greatest action you have gotten has been on Havingness.

PC: *Hm-hm. Yes.*

LRH: And I think that that – that answers your question. I can add something else on the thing.

PC: *Please.*

LRH: I think your Havingness Process has not been functional. That – this is a clean sweep as everybody that I have checked Havingness Processes on, their Havingness Process doesn't work.

PC: *Hm, yeah.*

LRH: So that's from my viewpoint. But you got .75 action there and it's been very good.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: All right. Is it all right with you if I end this session now?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Here it is. End of session.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: All right. Session ended for you?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC: *You're no longer auditing me.*

LRH: Okay. Take a break.

TV DEMO: GETTING RUDIMENTS IN, PART II

An auditing demonstration given on 30 May 1962

LRH: Now, here we go. You don't mind my fixing up an auditor's report for you? We will dignify this with an auditor's report.

PC: *Very good.*

LRH: Okay. I don't think I've ever audited you, have I, Mike?

PC: *Think you did a Goals Assessment on me when I first came here.*

LRH: I remember. Yeah, that's true.

PC: *Well, that wasn't even really started in the session!*

LRH: Well, you're right. Okay. Is it all right with you if we begin the session now?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right, here it is. Start of session.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Okay, has the session started for you?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Very good. What we're going to do in this session now is just check your ruds out, run some Havingness and run your end ruds. Okay?

PC: *Okay. Fine, yeah.*

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

PC: *Um, well I've got a bit of a present time problem with my girlfriend. I'd like to – uh – feel a little bit happier about that.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Any other goal you'd like to set for this session?

PC: *Um – yeah, to feel a lot brighter at the end of session than I do at the moment.*

LRH: Okay, will do. All right, any other goal?

PC: *No, that will do.*

LRH: All right. Are there any goals you'd like to set for life or livingness?

PC: *I'd like to get married.*

LRH: All right. Any other goal you'd like to set for life or livingness?

PC: *Well, I – I'd like to sort out my future prospects. I'm feeling in a bit of an undecided mood about what to do about the future at the moment.*

LRH: Okay. Very good. All right, how's that, okay?

PC: *Yeah, that's fine.*

LRH: All right. Let's see where you're sitting on this, here – 2.4.

PC: *That's quite usual.*

LRH: Is that quite ordinary?

PC: *That's quite ordinary, yeah. It seems to sit around about twoish.*

LRH: All right, look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me check that. Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Okay. Anything occurs to mind about your ...

PC: *Well, as I – as I was looking past I noticed that camera up there and that sort of reminded me I was on view.*

LRH: Right.

PC: *Other than that, the room as itself is all right.*

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

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. I got a tick now.

PC: *Yeah, I thought – well, I was probably avoiding looking at the camera this time.*

LRH: All right, okay. Okay, we are going to run Havingness in this session.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. All right, that's clean. Thank you. All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right, there's some slight reaction on the end of that.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Anything you care to think of?

PC: *Well, the only thing is, I felt I'm perfectly willing to talk to you about my difficulties; I'm not sure about the fifty people down there.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. There is still a slight tick on the end of that.

PC: *Um – well, I was mainly thinking about – uh – sex problems with my girlfriend, which is – a lot of problems come up, recently.*

LRH: Uh-huh, hm.

PC: *And that's what came up at that point.*

LRH: All right. All right. Let me check this again on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?? That's clean. Thank you. All right. Now, when was your last session?

PC: *Oh, it was, when I was on the course. Last week I was on the course.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Be about three weeks ago now.*

LRH: All right. Since the last time you were audited have you done anything

you are withholding? I got an action.

PC: *Yeah, well I thought – well, I've been to bed with my girlfriend a couple of times, and been unsuccessful in trying to have sex with her. It's a sort of a bit of a loss.*

LRH: Okay. Very good. Let me check that again. Now, since the last time you were audited have you done anything you are withholding? The tiniest shadow of a slowdown.

PC: *Yeah, I thought, well, on a couple of occasions I've agreed with students here when they've been complaining about various aspects of the course. I sort of agreed about it and I felt a bit bad about this. I thought, well I should have just said, "Okay," and acknowledged it, or pulled some missed withholds or done something about it. But these were points I did think needed picking up. So that's how I went into agreement with them.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, let me check that on the meter now. Since the last time you were audited, have you done anything you are withholding. That's clean. Thank you.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Do you have a present time problem? I got a lot of reaction.

PC: *Yeah, I mean I've got lots of them! Um – the present one at the moment is with my girlfriend. Uh – I want to sort some things out this weekend. Possibly another problem is that we finish this session, I got a chance to phone her tonight.*

LRH: Oh, yes?

PC: *Yeah, hm. I've got a deputy to do this in case I don't finish session in*

time, so I guess that isn't so much of a problem.

LRH: All right, very good. Let me check that again. Do you have a present time problem? All right. I got an equivocal reaction there. Let me ask it once more just to be sure. Do you have a present time problem? Now you listen very carefully, to me now. Do you have a present time problem? I got a reaction.

PC: *Well, what I thought of then was I have a little problem keeping these ca – I notice my hand was shaking a little bit.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And, uh, that was beginning to be a little bit of a problem.*

LRH: It isn't reading on the meter.

PC: *Hm. Okay, fair enough.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me ask you one more time. Do you have a present time problem? All right. Now, there's – it's probably zero, but I'm going to check it one more time.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Do you have a present time problem? I got a reaction on it.

PC: *Yeah, now I seem. The whole subject of sex seems to be a present time problem to me at the moment.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Okay. Your thinking about it ba – Is there a missed withhold on this?

PC: *Hm, well a lot of people have missed the fact that I – I've never had any success in having sex with – with a girl.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And I feel bad about this.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And uh – hmmm that's it – a lot of people missed this!*

LRH: Okay. All right. Let me ask you one more time here. Do you have a present time problem? All right, the read has now gone latent.

PC: *Hm, okay.*

LRH: So let's check it one more time, and before we leave it. Do you have a present time problem? There is a little ghost of a slowed rise.

PC: *Aaah, well, what I thought of there, was getting these checksheets out for the course ...*

LRH: Right.

PC: *... and uh – it's a bit of a problem to me when I can't give as many checkouts as I'd like to, to students.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *And I don't feel like Qing and Aing with them all the time; they keep on saying to me, "We want tests; we want tests."*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *And I still feel a little bad if I can't give them all the tests that they need.*

LRH: All right, very good. Let me ask you again, now. Do you have a present time problem? Equivocal read. Do you have a present time problem? I'm not getting a reaction on this.

PC: *Well, the only thing I was thinking of there, was that it – it just got a little bit of a problem if this was going to clear or not. I was getting a little bit anxious about it.*

LRH: All right. All right. All right, don't – don't be anxious, because it's a – you're reading on present time problem, and then, click. And so forth.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Do you have a present time problem? I didn't get an immediate response there.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Uh – but I'm getting a little, two – two ping-ping dirty needle proposition here, that I have no business taking up in the rudiments.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: But I know better than to go by this.

PC: *Mm. All right.*

LRH: All right. So I'm going to repeat this rudiment. Okay?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: In this session ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... in this session, have you failed to reveal something? I got a little reaction there.

PC: *Well, uh – let's see, it'd be on the subject of sex.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *Uh - well I've told you I've not had success in having sex with a girl. I – I've had this trouble of – of feeling that there was some latent homosexuality on my case.*

LRH: Right.

PC: *And this has bothered me.*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right, you've got the ...

PC: *That might have been what I've been thinking of, yeah.*

LRH: All right, very good. Very good. In this session is there something you've failed to reveal? All right, I got a reaction on that. Anything else?

PC: *Just thought about masturbation.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Let me check it again. In this session, is there something you have failed to reveal? All right, there's a tickety-tock here.

PC: *Hm-mm.*

LRH: Now, you listen to my question.

PC: *Yeah. All right.*

LRH: Just listen to this. In this session ...

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: ...is there something you have failed to reveal? All right, there's a – there's an action on it.

PC: *Well, I haven't had sex.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I've told you this.*

LRH: That's right. There it is – right there. That's it – right there.

PC: *Ah yes. Well, some trouble with – uh – various people on this – living with homosexuals and things like that.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It always seems to (quote) happen (unquote) and I've never been able to pin down the overt on this line.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *When I was being audited on the course, we messed around for about*

four days trying to find some What question on this. And uh – I nev – .

LRH: Really?

PC: *Yeah. I never really felt satisfied we ever got an overt on that.*

LRH: Hm. All right.

PC: *The one I think which came out was something about, what about withholding affection from a man or something peculiar. I've forgotten exactly the thing. And this – this seemed to be an overt, and it ticked on the meter, but we never really seemed to get to the bottom of it.*

LRH: Who was auditing you?

PC: *Um – Kevin.*

LRH: All right. Thank you very much. All right, didn't mean to ask you a second question there.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. In this sessions, is there something you have failed to reveal? I got a reaction again. Click. Click.

PC: *Yeah, well, I thought at the moment I'm living with one – with a homosexual.*

LRH: All right. Okay. All right. That must be it because it blew more.

PC: *Yeah. Hm.*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *And – oh – this is something I'm not at all happy about.*

LRH: Hm. All right. Okay.

PC: *And I can't find the overt behind it.*

LRH: Okay. In this session, is there something you have failed to reveal? Well now, that is just sitting there on a

constant dirty needle. I don't know whether it's reacting to this or not. Uh ...

PC: *Yeah, I think I've got it.*

LRH: What is it?

PC: *I think I'm trying to protect the guy.*

LRH: Oh, really?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *I tend to go about on some sort of a protect of homosexuals. On my goals list this was the last goal to null out before my goal, and what actually came out was to, I think, "Help a homosexual," something like that.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Okay. All right. Let me check this one more. I'm running a middle rudiment in the rudiments.

PC: *That's all right.*

LRH: All right. All right. In this session, is there something you have failed to reveal? That is clean. Thank you.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Now I'd like to run some Havingness on you. What would you say to that?

PC: *Fine.*

LRH: All right. What was the last Havingness Process that ran on you?

PC: *I believe it was, "Point out something."*

LRH: Okay. We will see.

PC: *Okay. [giggles]*

LRH: Now, I'm not trying to invalidate your Havingness Process, but you would be the first one.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Now put your hands up here with the backs of the hands on the table. Let's grip that can very nicely, there. All right. And make sure that that can is sitting down in the palm. Now relax. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right, thank you very much. All right. You can do what you please with the cans.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Point out something

PC: *That nameplate.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *That cigarette butt.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *Uh – those scales.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *That telephone.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *That camera.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *That lamp.*

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: *That curtain.*

LRH: All right, very good. Now, squeeze the cans. All right. Thank you very much. That is not your Havingness Process.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Put down the cans. All right, we're going to run – just to be in the complete groove we'll start at the bottom of the pile.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. I'm going to run, "Feel that object."

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Okay. Now, you understand, when I say "Feel" I want you to get the feel of it, okay?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Feel that tablecloth.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel that board sign.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Okay. Feel that ashtray.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Feel that paper clip on this side. That's it.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Feel that can.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Okay. Feel your right sleeve. All right, thank you. Pick up the cans. Okay. Squeeze the cans. Yes, there's your Havingness Process.

PC: *All right!*

LRH: All right, put the cans down. All right. Feel that tablecloth. Okay. Feel the back of your jacket. Attaboy, all right. Feel the buttons on that cuff. Okay. Feel that curtain. Okay. Feel that lamp column. Okay. Feel that telephone. Okay. Feel your tie. All right. Thank you very much. All

right. Now what we're going to do here is in the middle of this – not because you're doing anything wrong ...

PC: *All right.*

LRH: ... but let's just check out the middle rudiment on a Havingness Process, okay? Pick up the cans. Now, here we go. I'm going to ask you, "On – on Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything?" A tiny speed up of the fall. There's something. There's something right there. There it is.

PC: *Yes, I think I've suppressed some sort of disinterest in the Havingness Process. You know, Havingness Process being run for the purpose of sort of cheering me up before the end of session. And well, I think I sort of suppressed the disinterest that I felt. I didn't really feel much better or much worse, but I said, "Oh, yeah, I feel fine."*

LRH: All right. All right, thank you. Thank you very much. On Havingness Processes have you suppressed anything All right. There was a tiny reaction again on that. Anything else?

PC: *Oh yeah, I suppress doing that – sort of letting out breath and yawning and stretching.*

LRH: Oh, really?

PC: *On Havingness, yeah, I sort of felt, I should sit here and do nothing and just do the Havingness Process.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Okay. Let me check this on the meter now. On Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything? All right, I have to check that again. On Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything? I've got a reaction.

PC: *I think I suppressed telling the auditor I didn't think it worked on a couple of occasions.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Let me check it again. On Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything? The read is latent, but I'm going to clean it.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Think of anything? Oh, I'll repeat the question.

PC: *Yeah, I wa – I was off thinking of something else at that time.*

LRH: Yeah. On Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything? There's a reaction.

PC: *Hm. Um...*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Well, this seems to boil down to this uh – bit on homosexuality again. Don't know where that comes in. I think I felt if an – if a – if an auditor who was a homosexual, who I know – knew was a homosexual – audited me, I felt I had to be a particularly good preclear in session.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *I probably suppress some stuff on this in session, so I probably am suppressing the Havingness Processes if they're in it.*

LRH: All right. Okay. All right. Now let me check this on the meter.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: On Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything? All right, that looks clean. I'm going to check it one more time before we leave it; it looks

clean. On Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything? There is still a reaction on that thing.

PC: *Hm!*

LRH: There it is. There it is.

PC: *Yeah! I think, on previous Havingness Processes when I've had to touch things, I sort of suppress feeling it very long. I felt this was all wasting the time in the process. You know, wasting the auditor's time, feeling it. And you told me to feel it, and it felt a lot better.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. Okay. All right. Now, we're going to check this again. On Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything? Well that is probably clean.

PC: *Great, yeah.*

LRH: That is probably clean. We're wandering around in the middle of a needle here that's going this way and that. But that's probably clean. Let me check it just this one time. On Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything? Oh, I got a speeded rise.

PC: *Could have been in the same session. Um ...*

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

PC: *Something to do with the Havingness Process, um ...*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Something to do about a curtain somewhere.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Something to do about curtains.*

LRH: Yeah, yeah, yeah, that's reacting here.

PC: *I think the process was, "Look around here and find something you could have," or "Where is the..." or something like that. And I looked at the curtains – it was something to do with reaching curtains – the idea of reaching curtains and I think I never really felt I could – I could reach those curtains. I felt I just couldn't have them. And they're not anything substantial enough to have. Some peculiar idea like that.*

LRH: All right, very good. All right, let me check it now. On Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything? There's a reaction there. Tick. Tick.

PC: *Um – well, I always felt it was a good point in the session, if I were being run on Havingness.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And I sort of felt, well, I shouldn't feel this way because I'm probably trying to avoid something else in the session.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *You know, something like this. I'm – I mean, well, I actually enjoy this to some extent. It's one of the few processes actually that I enjoy and I shouldn't feel that way about a session.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Here we go. On Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything? All right. I still get a speeded rise on this. Now look, just give me a little – I'll give you a little help here.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Can you pick up the first time Havingness was ever run on you? Just to speed this up a little bit. There it is.

PC: *Well, I – I'm not absolutely sure, but I believe this is the first time Hav-*

ingness was run on me. Yeah, it was in St. John's Wood and Peter Cowell was running some – was trying to pull me out of the mess he'd got me into by out of session running some Confront Process. And he probably ran some Havingness at the end of that session.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I don't actually recall him doing so, but he probably did. It's the first real session I can recall having.*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right, was that suppressive?

PC: *What, the session?*

LRH: No, the Havingness.

PC: *The Havingness? I don't know.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Possibly.*

LRH: All right. That was more than I really ought to be piloting you into, but I was trying to give you a little breadth of reason here.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right, let me check this thing again now. See where we're at. On Havingness Processes, have you ever suppressed anything? I got a reaction.

PC: *Goddamn. I've been thinking about lots of other things, but I can't think of anything on havingness.*

LRH: What are you doing

PC: *Well, I was still sort of back in that session, thinking about what happened during that session.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *You know, with Peter Cowell.*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right. Now, let me check this word: Suppressed. That word is hotter than a pistol.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Well, we're just checking Havingness Processes.

PC: *Okay, fair enough.*

LRH: Understand?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Now you listen very carefully to this question. On Havingness Processes, have you suppressed anything? That is clean. Thank you.

PC: *Okay. Very well.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I guess that word would be hot.*

LRH: All right. Now, on Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything? Got a reaction here.

PC: *Well, I think I invalidated this, "Point out something" before I came into session.*

LRH: Really?

PC: *Yeah. Well, I thought, well that didn't – probably because I didn't seem – feel to get very far on my auditing on the course. Well, not as far as I'd like to have gone.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *It never really made me feel terrifically bright and cheerful. So I probably invalidated that before I came into the session.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Let me check this now. On Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything? Reaction.

PC: *Yeah, well, on this one, "Look around here and find something you could have," at one time this was what was considered – what probably still is considered – to be sort of the most high toned of Havingness Processes. And if anybody ever tried to run this thing on me or test it on me, I sort of used to invalidate the fact, well, I wasn't up to the point where I could run this process.*

LRH: Hm. All right, very good. I'll check this on the meter again now. On Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything? All right, there's probably a reaction on the end of that.

PC: *Um.*

LRH: We're cooling this off markedly.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: There's something right there.

PC: *Yeah, I've got something – invalidated this, "Feel that" you know, I felt this uh – sort of reactively felt, well, this is a CCH-style process and it's – I should be able to run some more thinkingness style thing, you know. Something – something crazy like that probably crossed my mind.*

LRH: Good enough. All right, let me check this question again.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. On Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything? All right, "invalidated" is falling, so let me give you this question very, very strongly here. Now, you listen to it. On Havingness Processes, have you invalidated anything? That's clean.

PC: *Okay!*

LRH: Okay. Let's try the next one now.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: On Havingness Processes, have you failed to reveal anything? That happens to be clean.

PC: *Really? I had an answer ready for you.*

LRH: Give me the answer, by all means.

PC: *Well, I think I fail to reveal to auditors – mind you I've told you this before – but I think I failed to reveal to auditors the fact that I didn't think this was working really well. And also the fact that a lot of them didn't seem to ever tell me whether the damn thing was loosening and they often looked a bit puzzled – left me in a bit of a not-know. And I didn't reveal the fact that I felt that way about it.*

LRH: All right, very good. Very good. All right, just to cheer you up, I'll check it again. All right?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: On Havingness Processes, have you failed to reveal anything? Now, the reaction on it is quite latent.

PC: *Yeah. Okay.*

LRH: I'm going to ask it again just because we're cleaning up Havingness Processes.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: You give me an answer to it. On Havingness Processes, have you failed to reveal anything?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right, what?

PC: *Well, as an auditor, I failed to reveal sometimes to my preclear, at the time I should have done, the fact that the thing wasn't particularly loosening. There have even been a couple of occasions where I've more or less said, well, this thing seems to be a little better, when I couldn't really detect any difference. You know, it was a half-truth, or an untruth to the preclear.*

LRH: Very good. Very good. All right. We'll check this out again. On Havingness Processes, have you failed to reveal anything? All right, we got a reaction there. A nice dirty needle.

PC: *Yeah, well I think this is all in the same line, you know, of sort of pretending to preclears. Um – couldn't find a Havingness Process, couldn't get anything to work, so I sort of more or less said to the preclear, "Well, that seems to be doing something," and run it for a few more commands.*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. All right. We're going to check this again now. On Havingness Processes, have you failed to reveal anything? Got a reaction now. The dirty needle's gone.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: You got a just a straight fall.

PC: *Um – think I've done this quite a few times. You know, up and down during auditing.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *Um – failed to reveal the fact that the Havingness Process didn't seem to be really doing much.*

LRH: Hm-hm. Hm-hm.

PC: *Is this clear? It's all on the same line.*

LRH: All right. All right. Very good. Check it again. On Havingness Processes, have you failed to reveal anything? All right, there's a reaction on the end of that line now, again. We're getting somewhere though. I tell you we've got the dirty needle off of it. We've – it's moving right along here. We've just got a little flick up.

PC: *Uh.*

LRH: There's something right there. That's it. That's it. That's it.

PC: *Yeah, I think on some Havingness Processes I failed to reveal that I haven't answered the command, you know, I haven't answered the command on a lot of the processes.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Didn't tell the auditor that.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Let's check that out. On Havingness Processes, have you failed to reveal anything? Getting better. Your needle's loosening up on it.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Go ahead and answer it. I'll repeat it. On Havingness Processes, have you failed to reveal anything There it is. There it is.

PC: *Ah, ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha, yes. If – if uh – if being audited by a man, I always felt bad that anyth – in a CCH Havingness Process.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And uh. ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... any touching of body parts, this sort of thing I think I failed to reveal this to the auditor.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah, that's it.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Hadn't thought about that.*

LRH: Very good. Check this again. On Havingness Processes, did you fail to reveal anything? All right. This is getting quite clean now. There's a little more here. There it is.

PC: *Well, this is merely a thought, this isn't something that I've done. But you – you were talking about this – this uh – process of touch my knee or something like that, you see.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And uh – I was sort of thinking, well uh – this wouldn't be a bad process to try out on my girlfriend .*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And I thought of that then. I never have tried it, but that was the thought that came up.*

LRH: All right, let's ...

PC: *I wonder if this is a – this is as dangerous and as effective as you say it is.*

LRH: Okay. Here's the question again. On Havingness Processes, have you failed to reveal anything? Got a reaction. There it is. There it is.

PC: *I don't get anything there.*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *I no – I did – I just noticed a little somatic in my elbow there, but don't get anything else. Um ...*

LRH: There it is. Tick.

PC: *Well this is rather taking in the scope of something more than a simple Havingness Process, but taking any CCH*

Process to be somewhat of a Havingness Process. I guess I fail to reveal things at various times to the auditor.

LRH: Hm. All right, let's see if this cleans up. All right. On Havingness Processes, have you failed to reveal anything? All right, apparently it's very clean.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Apparently so.

PC: *Apparently so. All right.*

LRH: No, fail to reveal is – is still mucked up.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: A bit.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: But it's just a restimulative word, you see. But the question itself is clean. Okay?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. And here's the last one of these middle ruds. On Havingness Processes, have you been careful of anything? I got a reaction.

PC: *Yes, I think I've been careful of – of not sort of reaching out. Um – you know, I always felt that if I got daring and actually dared to reach out towards a – a larger object in the room ...*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *... there'd be something wrong in this. I don't quite know why there should be anything wrong, but I sort of felt careful, "Well, I must do it on a gradient scale."*

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, let's check this one.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: On Havingness Processes have you been careful of anything? Latent ...

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: ... but still, we must clean it.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right, on Havingness Processes, have you been careful of anything? There you've got it.

PC: *Yeah, well I been – I think I've sort of been careful of – of letting auditors know that I can run a Havingness Process well.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *For some reason or another that's what came up there.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Don't seem to make much sense, but, uh.*

LRH: Good. Good. Yeah. Good.

PC: *Yeah, that's what I've been doing.*

LRH: It reacts as a missed withhold.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Here it is: on Havingness Processes, have you been careful of anything? Reaction. Right on the button. Right on the end of it.

PC: *Uh...*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Yeah, when – um – when auditors have been checking out Havingness Processes, I sort of sat very careful and still ...*

LRH: Hm.

PC: ... not to let my breath, or any sort of extraneous thought get in the way of the can squeeze or anything else.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Always sat there very carefully when squeezing cans, been very careful of the way I squeeze the cans.

LRH: Hm-hm. All right. Very good. Okay. Now let's see if this is clean. On Havingness Processes, have you been careful of anything? Cleaner than a wolf's tooth. Okay?

PC: Yeah, fine.

LRH: All right. Now, let's return to the Havingness Process. Okay?

PC: Okay, yeah.

LRH: Put down the cans there. All right. Feel that tablecloth.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Okay. Feel that chair. Okay, very good. Feel that sleeve. Very good. Feel your tie. All right. Feel that can. Good-oh. Feel the back of this E-Meter. All right. Thank you. Feel that sign.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: All right. Feel that curtain. Okay. Thank you. Pick up the cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. Very good. Squeeze them again. All right. Put them down. Okay. Feel that tablecloth.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Okay. A moment ago, did you miss a command on the chair?

PC: Did I miss a command?

LRH: Did you just do something – did you wonder what part of the chair you should feel, or something like that?

PC: No, I was – all I was noticing there was that I really felt – I was really feeling it.

LRH: All right.

PC: I thought I had a stray thought. Well, I wonder if I'm taking up too much time, you see, on the TV again. You know?

LRH: All right. You take all the time you please!

PC: All right.

LRH: All right. Feel that sign. Okay. Now feel the lettered side of it. All right. Now feel the unlettered side of it. All right. Very good. Feel that tablecloth.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Okay. Pick up the cans. Okay. Squeeze the cans. That's my boy! All right, put down the cans. I'm going to give you two more commands and end this process, if that's all right with you.

PC: Fine, yeah.

LRH: Okay. Feel the tablecloth.

PC: My favorite tablecloth.

LRH: Very good. All right, feel your chair.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay. Pick up the cans. All right. Is there anything you'd care to say before I end up?

PC: No, I feel a bit brighter after it.

LRH: All right. End of process.

PC: Okay.

LRH: Okay. Now let's go into end rudiments here, shall we?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. In this session, have you told me any half-truth? Tiniest little flick.

PC: *Oh, I didn't mention the names of all these people I've been staying with – the homosexuals, people like that.*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *Didn't mention all their names.*

LRH: Excellent. All right. In this session, have you told me any half-truths? Reaction.

PC: *Well, perhaps it's a half-truth that I haven't really sort of had sex. I suppose I've attempted it enough times. I've never really had it satisfactorily, you know, or really got anywhere with it.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I've never had it, period.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now let me – let me check this with malice aforethought now. All right. In this session have you told me a half-truth? It looks clean.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. I'm going to ask it one more time just to make absolutely sure. In this session have you told me a half-truth. No, I got no reaction on that to amount to anything.

PC: *I sort of had a latent thought on you looking down there. All right.*

LRH: Yeah. Well, there's a question in my mind concerning it. Your needle is doing a bit of a – of a swing here, and of course I didn't have your sensitivity up to 16 for the first question.

PC: *Ah, I see. Oh.*

LRH: I swung it up late. That's what you've just missed and the reality of it.

PC: *Oh I see, all right. Yeah. Possibly I feel there is some sort of half-truth in that I haven't laid my complete case out at your feet in this session.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I've sort of got a – a feeling that I ought to and yet I oughtn't to.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. In this session have you told me a half-truth. I got no reaction on that to amount to a hill of beans.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. In this session, have you told me an untruth? Let me check that again. In this session have you told me an untruth? Got a speed up.

PC: *Hm-hm. Well, perhaps it was an untruth of we – I didn't get anywhere in my auditing on course. I did get somewhere on it – not as far as I – as I would have liked to. Perhaps I misled you on that.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Let me check that again.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: In this session have you told me an untruth? Got a reaction.

PC: *Well also, that we didn't dig up any overts on th – I probably gave you the idea that we didn't dig up any overts on Prepchecking. We did dig up some things,*

and odds and ends that were overts. I don't really feel we got to the bottom of it.

LRH: All right. Very good. Okay. In this session have you told me an untruth? All right, that's clean. That's all right now.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Now, in this session have you said something only to impress me? Reaction.

PC: *Well, I thought that – well, yeah, perhaps the bit on the checksheets. Um – sort of giving the idea I've been working terribly hard to get out these checksheets, and I'm so pressed that I couldn't get anything else done.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I guess that was somewhat to impress you.*

LRH: Okay. Let me check that. In this session, have you said something only to impress me? Clean. Thank you.

All right. In this session have you tried to damage someone? Clean.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. In this session, have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Got a reaction there.

PC: *Well, I did notice that on the Havingness my hands – when I put – when I – um – picked up the cans after we'd been running the Havingness Process, that my hands did seem a little bit looser. Probably, I was thinking, well, I'd like this to be looser this time.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And I did notice my hands were looser, and didn't tell you about this.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *They did – you know, they weren't gripping the cans quite so tightly.*

LRH: All right. In this session, have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Still got a tick.

PC: *Um – oh, the same thing. I wanted the havingness to be more.*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *That more or less seems to be it. I did pick them up and they were looser, and I didn't tell you about it.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Here it is again: In this session, did you deliberately try to influence the E-Meter? Still a reaction here.

PC: *Well, perhaps this is something on that I did – um, my hands were a little less sweaty when I put them back on the cans. Possibly I thought well, this will make them glue less to the cans and I might get a bit of a wider swing.*

LRH: All right. Now, let me ask – repeat this question very carefully. In this session, have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?

PC: *Well, I wanted the can squeeze to be bigger. So to that extent, yes, I did, because I picked it up and it – my hands were looser.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I did deliberately pick them up looser.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Here we go. Here's the next – here's the check-off on that. In this session, have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? All right. The needle turns around on the E-Meter there; it's changed its pattern.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Think of anything else?

PC: *Well, I can't think of any deliberate influence. There was a couple of times when my – my hands seemed to shake a little bit and I didn't mention this to you, but it didn't seem to bother you. But perhaps I felt I ought to have mentioned it.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me check this now. In this session, have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? All right. That's clean.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. You got a little bit of something on E-Meters.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right, but we sorted it out. That's okay. All right. In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command? Reaction.

PC: *Well, on this last one perhaps I didn't answer you straight out to start off with. On this last rudiment we were cleaning.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Good enough. Let me repeat this – check it on the meter. All right. In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command? That's clean. That's all right. You got a little – little slowdown on the word "command."

PC: *Well, the – the only thing I was thinking about was that perhaps I've been a little bit slow in this session in bringing up all points, some known points. You know, and sort of been a bit slow in answering the commands.*

LRH: I understand.

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: All right. In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command? A tiny slowdown on the uprise.

PC: *Well, on this bit on failing to reveal, whatever it was on the – Um – checking out on the havingness ...*

LRH: Mm.

PC: *... I sort of felt, well, there's probably a lot more on the whole subject of failed to reveal. To that extent, I didn't go into it.*

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: *And well, to a slight extent it's an unanswered command.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command? Now we're getting an anxiety here.

PC: *To some extent, yeah.*

LRH: All right, now you listen to this very carefully.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: In this session have you failed to answer any question or command? Clean, thank you.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. In this session, have you withheld anything from me? It's an equivocal read – a little bit latent.

PC: *I was a bit surprised at the question.*

LRH: Is that all that is?

PC: *Yeah. I think so. I just thought, well, I have withheld these people's names and odds and ends like that.*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right. Very good. In this session have you withheld

anything from me? All right, it's a – it's a slowed rise.

PC: *Hm-hm.* [clears his throat]

LRH: All right. Okay. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? All right, that was a reaction – probably followed the cough.

PC: *Hm, I don't know.*

LRH: Well, I'd – I think it was. So I'll check it again. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? The read is equivocal, a little bit late.

PC: *Well, I think this all comes under the question of goals. I got – on my goals I set to sort of get my future sorted out.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I haven't discussed any of this with you.*

LRH: Hm. Bang-bang.

PC: *Possibly there's been a bit of reluctance on this.*

LRH: Bang-bang. Yeah. All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? That's smoothing out now.

PC: *Hm. I think it's the same thing – em – on planning my future, knowing exactly how long I'm going to stay here and what my plans in the future will be.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *This that and the other. And I sort of left you out of the picture.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me ask this one more time.

PC: *Hm-mm.*

LRH: Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right, that's clean.

Okay. Now look around here and tell me if you could have anything.

PC: *Hm-hm. That chair.*

LRH: All right. I'll check this for meter read just to ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Look around here and tell me if you can have anything.

PC: *Yeah, that curtain.*

LRH: Yeah, I'm getting a reaction on that, so put down the cans.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. All right, touch the tablecloth. Thank you. Touch that ashtray – what were you going to say? You were going to say something?

PC: *No, I don't think I was going to say anything.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Touch that ashtray. Thank you. Touch that E-Meter can. Okay. Pick up the cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. Thank you. Thank you. That was the last command.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything. All right, thank you. Thank you very much.

Okay. Have you made any part of your goals for this session?

PC: *You better remind me of them. I've forgotten what they are.*

LRH: You said you had a PTP with a girl.

PC: *Yes, I feel a bit happier about that, yeah.*

LRH: All right, very good.

PC: *Less tense.*

LRH: And you want to feel a lot brighter.

PC: *I do. Much brighter.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, have you made any other gains in this session you'd care to mention?

PC: *I think I can confront the embarrassed students better.*

LRH: Oh, yeah?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Just how do you mean that now, just so I understand it.

PC: *Um – well, I feel that I've probably got off some withholds they don't know about, and got off some not-knows on the line. I guess there's more reality about the place.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. Any other gains you'd care to mention?

PC: *No, that about covers it.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *That covers it.*

LRH: That covers it.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right, very good. Now, is there anything you care to say or ask before I end this session?

PC: *Well, thank you very much.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I didn't think I'd survive it this well.*

LRH: You didn't, huh?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Here it is then.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: End of session.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Okay. Session ended for you?

PC: *Yes, it has.*

LRH: All right. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC: *You are no longer auditing me.*

LRH: Thank you.

PC: *Thank you. That was good.*

LRH: Good enough!

PC: *Whoow!*

VALUE OF RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on 31 May 1962

Thank you.

Now, you-uns saw a demonstration last night. I understand – I understand that a couple people here found out I could read an E-Meter. Actually were several comments on that. I mean, after the demonstration, "Why, Ron knows how to read an E-Meter, you know?" I thought it was marvelous.

Everybody has apparently been going on the thought impulse system – the thought impulse system. You see, life is a great pool, you see, and we are all unsegmented portions of the mush. [laughter] And you see, when the auditor starts to think the auditing question, and before he asks it, you see, that is when the meter reacts.

So an instant read is when this thought impulse, you see, is transmitted instantly. Then asking the question has nothing to do with the meter, of course. For the benefit of anybody listening to this tape, that's not the way you read a meter. [laughter]

Well, here we are at 31 May 1962, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture one.

I'm going to talk to you about *rudiments*.

This is a very interesting subject – fascinating subject. I have just done a tremendous amount of work on it. Not the rudiments which you already had got and developed and so forth, but tremendous amount of work. How vital, how valuable and how deep will a rudiments process go if run as a repetitive process? Interesting datum, isn't it, huh?

And we find out that if you took a small spoon and started to empty out the Atlantic Ocean, a rudiments process has that much effect on the reactive GPM.

You get that? I mean I've got the data now on it – working on it for a long time here. If I look haggard, that's why.

I've had some comparative runs made on this, I've done a lot of comparative work on it, I've tried to figure these things out. I find out that that which is kicked into view by Routine 3 is not kicked out of view by any repetitive process known to man. That's an interesting datum, isn't it?

But here is the anomaly [anomaly]. Here it is. Here's the oddity. Why is it that this tremendous bulldozer – Routine 3, listing processes, like 3GA and so forth – why is it that this tremendous bulldozer won't run forward at all in the absence of these gnats flying against the back of it. Yeah, just why is that?

Well, we have the answer to that, too. The rudiments apply to present time and this universe now. They are a nowness series of processes. They apply to now.

Now, you have a good reality on that in that if you got a rudiment in with a club on a pc – I mean, let's really get this rudiment in, I mean let's really work it over. Let's get down there: "Do you have a present time problem? *Hm-hm, hm-hm, hm*. How – how present time is that problem? *Hm*. Let's see now. And any other type of present time problem that you might have?" and so forth. And we work these all over, and we run responsibility on them.

I even got a brand-new responsibility process. I thought, "My goodness this ought to revolutionize something." Would have revolutionized everything under the sun, about 1955 or 56, but now it's just a silent drop into the ocean and nobody hears of it again, you know. Has that much importance. But anyway, you run this responsibility, "What part of that problem can you be responsible for?" and you run it with all the new wrinkles and everything else, and you just fix that all up just very beautifully, you see? And this present time problem has to do with not being able to eat soup, you see. And my God can this fellow – doesn't worry about eating soup – he eats – he maybe even can eat soup and so forth. He can't eat asparagus though.

Well, if you list the number of articles of food which are commonly considered comestibles, you're licked.

In other words, if you were to use these rudiments processes – this is new data; this is brand-new data, by the way – don't think this is anything that's been sitting around for a long time. You wouldn't have thought I'd been sweating over this with everything that's been coming your way – you know, all the data. But the fact is my mainline research is what I'm giving you right this minute, see.

These rudiments processes are incapable of even denting the Goals Problem Mass. They just won't do it. They will do a little bit of a tiny, oh, a just microscopic key-out. Let's say you've got the GPM keyed in on somebody with a crash. See, this is really keyed in on him. This person, by the way, the auditing or nothing else keyed it in on him, you know. I mean they got this in life, you know. They were a citizen of some country, you know, or something like that. They just went all out into the total degradation, you see, of nationalism or something. I'm sorry, I shouldn't bring that up, but I mean I – every – the more I see what these so-called leaders of man are doing these days, the more my goal gets invalidated. Anyway ... [laughs, laughter]

So the basic problem is how to defeat their own nation with a minimum of difficulty for themselves and a maximum of difficulty for their citizens.

Anyway, we got this situation here where this fellow has got this thing keyed-in, you know. He's just black mass from here to Halifax. So we sit down and we run any version, no matter how learned, of a repetitive rudiments process. And no matter how we run it we're going to wind up at the other end of the line with the same way that old Hendrick Van Loon described eternity. He said eternity was the Rock of Gibraltar, and once every thousand years a bird came and sharpened his beak on the rock. And when the rock was totally worn away an eternity would have elapsed.

Well, that's just about the way it would look. I mean it's that – it's that rough. It's that rough. Now, we don't really include Prepchecking in that. We're talking about rudiments processes, see?

Prepchecking can do a key-out. And rather interesting that you can key out any part of it with Prepchecking. You can move it around with the CCHs. And here are all these processes that have to do with havingness, have to do with willingness to talk to somebody about difficulties. They have to do with withholding things from people and they have to do with present time problems, telling half-truths, untruths, not answering auditing commands, have to do with influencing meters and more withholds and problems and difficulties or anything else you want to add up on top of it, plus your middle rudiments, suppressions, invalidations, missed withholds, failures to reveal and careful of. These are the middle rudiments. I want to take those up much more broadly in just a few minutes.

You take all these things, see, we put those into process combinations, repetitive process combinations and we audit them on the pc. Rock of Gibraltar, bird sharpens a beak, see?

I've been over the jumps on this, you know. As I talk to you, by the way, I have a headache from a test on it.

The difficulties of assaulting the GPM are absolutely heroic. They're tremendous in size. How in the name of common sense Freud ever expected, see ... "Well now, when you were a little girl, did any little boys look at you?"

And the patient says, "Oh, yes, yes."

"Good. You're no longer neurotic." Silly as that, you know. Look at these rudiments processes – they're marvelous. You run them – oddly enough running them you get a good subjective reality on exactly what they are and you think the bank is moving them, and you say, "Gee, we really get someplace."

I can give you some rudiments processes which are killers! These are just test processes. You might care to clean up some auditing on somebody someday. This won't do it very well, but it's the strongest process known. If you're running Routine 3 it won't do it. But that is a Routine 3 process, right? "What didn't you know? What didn't another know? What didn't others know?" Doesn't that sound like a lovely process? It is. It is very effective. It's very effective. It gives a person – it kind of shifts somatics and they kind of feel better and they're happier about the thing. Sometimes when you've had a horribly ARC breaky session or something like that, some form of that process will do things – will do things.

But that process run up against a locked-in GPM has no influence at all on the GPM. You'd swear that it does have until you look up afterwards and realize all the masses are in exactly the same place as they were before. Horrible to report, isn't it.

Now, that process itself is a killer. You run that on some pc sometime in some co-audit or in an Academy and the pc would be absolutely delighted with the whole thing, you know, he will, would feel kind of odd occasionally and so forth, but he'd be delighted. Cognitions, you know – marvelous. GPM – bang.

Now, Prepchecking and the CCHs are capable of keying something out, providing it isn't too thoroughly in. Doesn't do actually anything to the GPM. It just sort of can take the pc off of it a bit. And you get a key-out phenomenon.

Then when you start running a Routine 3 process you key it right straight back in again. So you know very well it was just a key-out.

No, the value of a rudiments process run in repetitive process form as a button, swamping up track left and right, you think, phrased up any way you want to phrase it up, the ability of it to affect the Goals Problem Mass is, by the way – well, call it the reactive mind except the GPM plus locks and free track would be the reactive mind. Free track is actually the only thing missing and the only additional thing to the GPM that is in the reactive mind.

There's a bunch of whole track engrams that sit independent of it, which can also be included in. Now there's the GPM and then there's the whole track engrams that are scattered around about the place and so forth, the pc knows nothing about. And the whole of that is the reactive mind.

You can do things with that if you're influencing anything with these repetitive rudiments processes, used on a whole track basis, you understand? That's the only thing I'm talking down on these things. These are used against the whole track. This is trying to audit the whole case of the pc, you see?

I'll give you another one. "What have you suppressed? What has another suppressed? What has another suppressed on you? What have you suppressed on another – or in another?" See?

"What have others suppressed in you? What have you suppressed in others? What has another suppressed in others," you know? A multiple bracket on Suppress.

Stands your hair on end when you first start to run it. You say, "Man, this is going to take up – this is going to clean up the whole track. Couldn't help it. Makes you feel so horrible."

Use Invalidate in the same way. Use – I've already given you the Fail to Reveal, the Missed Withhold, the Don't Know, all of which are the same thing. Careful of – oh, you'd get very interesting results, I'm sure, you'd think. Not worthwhile. None of them are worthwhile. These are all rudiments buttons. None of them are worthwhile.

One time a well-known auditor out on the West Coast sent me a cable to Australia saying – recommending that I test out at once something on the order of "What lies have you told?" or "What have you lied about?" Some such process as that, you see? Because obviously a lie is an alter-is and that actually would be what the reactive bank would consist of. A lie therefore would be very hot. And frankly it follows these other thought button symptoms, and the buttons are just – it's just – just goes so far and it looks terribly promising and then nothing happens.

But now this doesn't say those rudiments should not be handled, see, and this doesn't say you shouldn't use rudiments. I'm just talking about using rudiments to clean up the whole

case – using this button called a rudiment, let's apply it to the whole case. Nothing's going to happen. You're not going to clear anybody with it. I can tell you that.

Now, basically this is because these are all thought manifestations. These are all think-thinks, see? These buttons are all figure-figure buttons. And what's got your pc buried is the fact that his postulatingness is basically thinkingness on a lower scale, see?

Think-think or figure-figure, see, is below effort on the Know to Mystery Scale, see. It's actually not – it's actually not postulatingness, see? Oh, way up, way up here, way up at the top of the scale, see, postulating. And he's thinking. He's below effort. And none of those buttons, weirdly enough, will carry him up above or through effort. They just sort of keep swatting him on the nose and swatting him on the nose and nothing ever happens except he gets swatted on the nose, don't you see?

He doesn't go Clear or anything. That's because you're below effort. It needs something to carry the pc up through the effort band into the higher ranges of the Know to Mystery Scale in order to get the pc there and that's your Routine 3 processes. And these rudiments processes will not carry the pc up through that effort band. Very remarkable, but they won't.

But your pc, because he is below the band of effort with his figure-figure, he's doing figure-figuringness in the middle of these GPM masses. He's getting his dictations from the circuits. He's getting the word from circuit A to circuit B and he's getting the word of all kinds of conflicting and oppositional identities of one kind or another. And all these identities are in conflict with all these identities, so their ideas are in conflict with all these ideas. And as you audit him, you have to keep him from being obsessively alarmed about present time and defensive, otherwise he is not up to confronting the effort and the masses. See, he can't; he'll go *r-r-h-h*.

And yet all the time he's sitting there, he's got a bunch of automatic thinks going. And these automatic thinks are all characterized under the existing rudiments – beginning, middle and end rudiments. Those are the buttons which keep him so involved with think-think that he can't go up scale.

Now, to get him to go up scale requires something like a Routine 3 process. And the reason that works is because you are labeling masses. Labeling, identifying masses which brings about a differentiation amongst masses and gets the pc up to confronting masses.

Your effort however is not to get the pc to confront masses. Your effort is simply to get the conflict of those masses identified and resolved any way you wish to do so. It's rather easy to do once you know what you're doing. He's been a boy and the boy has conflicts with girls and the reason boy and girl are suspended right where he lives is because they are in conflict. All right, boy and girl are in conflict.

Now, he eventually – he's never really identified the fact that he has been a boy or a girl or that boy or girl are part of this great mass called a GPM, the gross mass. Boy and girl are little pieces of this mass, don't you see? But he's never identified these things as having anything to do with him. And one day he's labeling – you've got him listing and he's labeling – and he sees boy. He says, "What do you know, you know, boy, a boy. A boy." That gets kind of real to him, and girl – that gets real to him to. These things cease to oppose each other.

In other words, you've actually unhinged the tricky, almost-impossible-to-maintain balance of this glutinous bunch of electronic guck called a GPM, you see. And it can no longer hang up and recreate itself.

It's creating itself, you see. He's furnishing the energy while it creates itself. It's very interesting, you see. He's creating with his left hand, gazing at his right hand, you know. Very tricky.

But the identification of the mass, the labeling of the mass is the fringe line between the think-think and the mass. That will move him up into confrontation of the mass, he becomes aware of the mass, the mass blows. It actually is nothing – no trick at all for a thetan to confront the mass. That's not even difficult to do. It's what mass to confront; that is the main thing that worries him.

And the GPM – now that we have some of the anatomy of the GPM by the identification of the various chunks of it – of course, the thing disintegrates and it tends to come apart and various things occur because you're doing this. Now, you can get a pc into the GPM or find out what part of the GPM he's in with a Goals Assessment. That's easily the best way, as I've always said, because it identifies the think-think that is going in and the principal mass that he's got to get out of.

If you want to know what the – what the ambition of the mass is, that – you want to find out what goal the pc has that hangs up that he calls his goal. And of course, that is the first identification of the mass he's sitting in which by being opposed and counter-opposed and not opposed and all that sort of thing is suspended right where he is. Now, you start listening down on this thing, all the pressures and electronic mechanisms and masses that hold this in place are suddenly – start lifting and as these things lift, of course, it can't stay there anymore, and where did it go, you know? He isn't even aware of the fact that he is in it or being it and he is definitely not aware of the fact that it is of no value to him but quite on the contrary is a detriment.

He'd tell you at first, "Oh man, if I get rid of this ..." Is an easy and early phenomena of Routine 3. "God, it's a horrible feeling – wait a minute, if I get rid of this I won't want to do anything."

Well, that's because he's – there's some of the old lectures on games, and so forth. He's so fixated on this that he thinks there is only one game in the whole universe and that game is it. And if that's the only game there is, that's the only thing he can play. And for a little while, every time you start influencing this, he says, "Well there's no other game, you know, and if I get rid of this then I'll have no game at all." Where as a matter of fact if you look it over carefully, he's not playing that game, see?

And if he were playing it he hasn't had any fun doing it. See, this thing is all – he's in a heavy conflict about all this. As soon as he gets his attention unfixated off of this, he sees, well, there might be some other games around. And as soon as he sees there's some other games around, why, he can become more fluid and more action and he can start enjoying life. Actually he's in a no-games condition – no (hyphen) games condition. Not in a games condition. He thinks he's in a games condition but he's actually in a no-games condition, because he isn't playing the game he knows he has to play as that's the only game there is.

So anyway, you get the pc up through this band, and the boost is accomplished by permitting the pc to have his full attention there playing upon the objects you're trying to haul him out of. Now, if his attention is distracted by things in present time, he has just that much less attention with which to address this task of going up scale through the Know to Mystery Scale and he feels – he might have – but he feels like he hasn't got quite enough attention units to look at anything. He's distracted.

He's distracted by the think-think. He isn't actually throwing his own rudiments out; his own rudiments are going out because various masses which also have influential ideas are impinging ideas upon him, consistently, and by pulling these off, you get extraneous ideas off of him which are liable to yank him into PT. But your primary concern is that present time and the operation known as auditing will not drain away his attention.

You keep him up in a high-toned state, whereas he's not worried about the present, he's not worried about the auditor, he's not worried about the session – his attention isn't split in any way. Then theoretically he has enough attention to attack the GPM successfully. And if he is worried about any one of these things, he has just that much less attention to give the GPM.

Well, you're already telling this fellow, "Now, mount this little – mount this little tricycle, here – has one grasshopper-power tricycle, and there's Mount Blanc, now. All right, now just ride to the top of it. Thank you."

It's quite unreasonable, I mean, to ask a pc to go through the GPM at all because, man, it is tough. This is a rough, rough, rough proposition. I don't mean to aggrandize or say how fantastic a GPM is. Its strength becomes as nothing the second that you know about it and know how to get out of it.

But it isn't anything that surrenders to half-baked auditing. And it isn't anything that surrenders to a distracted pc. If the auditor hasn't got that pc's every attention on exactly what the pc is doing, then the pc won't be able to overcome the bumps. See, he won't ride any tricycle to the top of Mount Blanc, man.

Then you start – you see that he can't do it and you start getting impatient with the pc. You start buying him airplanes and that sort of thing to fly to the top of Mount Blanc and you eventually will find him at the top of Mount Blanc, but he hasn't accompanied himself.[laughs]

So, the relationship of rudiments, then, to a Routine 3 type of process is the same relationship as a hedge would have along the side of a road. It keeps the pc guided, pointed and traveling – the same function as small stones might have on an otherwise broad highway. You can't make any speed over this highway unless you get these stones off the road, see. It's a sort of herding, non-impeding action. But as far as a rudiment or rudiments processes or processes based on rudiments actually moving this pc along that road, they do not. They move the pc no place.

But they can retard the pc from going. And if really badly done – if you've gotten down over the weekend and thought it over real carefully as to how to get the rudiments well enough out, you could actually get the pc traveling in reverse. You could actually make him

travel in reverse. That is possible under today's auditing. The rudiments would have to be pretty wildly out. The meter would have to be very badly read, indeed.

But you've just got this situation that the make and break of whether the pc goes forward or not – if your rudiments are (quote) in (unquote) your pc will make forward progress because he has enough attention to blast himself through where he's going. And if the rudiments are out the pc does not have enough attention to blast himself through. In fact there is no blasting and the auditor winds up all sour and doing the blasting for the pc. And of course, this doesn't do any good at all. This gets him to the top of Mount Blanc without having accompanied himself and that is a very interesting state to be in.

They've done this for years in Tibet. They know how to exteriorize in Tibet – they go out the bottom. That isn't why dear old Tibet has busily succumbed now to the ultimate degradation of it all, of it all, of it all. It's got commies on – in it and amongst it.

I ran into somebody the other day who was worrying about whether or not the – any of the old teachings of Lamaism would survive the communist smash of that particular government and so forth. I don't think commie is that active, I don't think he'd get around those cliffs and so forth. No, I don't think so, man. It takes energy. I'm sure the old Lamas have got it pretty well buried amongst the hilltops and in the caves.

But anyway, the essence of what you're doing is to collect to the pc all of his potential power of confronting, his potential power of examination, his potential power of blowing things. Well, in order to collect this all together, you have to set him up so he is all fine with the auditing universe in which he is being audited, which is to say, his auditor, his E-Meter, his attitudes toward the session, his attitudes towards the environment, his worries about the extensional environment out at home and this sort of thing. These things have got to be taken care of and then he has enough horsepower to climb the hill. Otherwise he doesn't have.

Now, if you flagrantly throw these things out, you can get the reverse effect of dropping him further back down the slope. If you try to get a pc to concentrate his attention – you just keep inferring to this pc or telling him that he must concentrate his attention on something while you are making him concentrate his attention on something else, he gets to feeling worse than schizy. See? You keep saying, "Now concentrate on the GPM. All right, now go ahead and worry about your problem. Yes, worry about my E-Metering. Worry about the fact I keep kicking you in the shins," Do you see? "Worry about whether you left enough money with your wife. And now – now you've worried about all those things? Are you enough bothered? Are you sufficiently agitated and upset? Good. Now put your attention on the GPM." *Dz-z-z-z-z.*

When he does this, he gets a recoil phenomenon. A pc whose attention is put on the GPM and then suddenly jerked off of the GPM will get a mass straight in his teeth. Every now and then you've see – you've heard of this happening or seen it happening or made it happen to you: One fine day you were sitting in session minding your own business and all of a sudden the window weights broke or something like that – the window came down with a dreadful crash. It wasn't the noise that bothered you. It was the mystery of the mass that hit you in the schnozola. What was that? See?

And you say to the auditor, "What was that?" you see, and the auditor obliges and he said, "That was the window falling down." Well, that's a damn funny sensation, see, to result from a – simply a noise blast. Actually it wasn't a noise blast. The pc's attention was distracted over toward the window and his attention acted as a sort of a pressor beam and it had part of whatever his bank was in focus, and when his attention suddenly swept sideways, it was just as though you took the pole out of the hand of a pole vaulter when he was halfway up to the bar. [laughter] Uncomfortable.

So keeping the rudiments in includes not yanking the pc out of the session. See? That is an understood part of the rudiments. And something which probably is not sufficiently stressed or commented on because there is no remark made by the auditor that invites this situation.

In other words, you could get all of your beginning rudiments in and then drop the ashtray. All your labor would be in vain, because you see, you have gotten all of the rudiments in and then you have thrown them all out. Why? Because you've got the pc's attention braced into PT. Now you've got him pinned in PT. You've got his attention on something else rather than the whole track and getting him into session. So he can attack these masses and aberrations and straighten them out.

You've got his attention on something else. And if you've got his attention on something else, he can't do it, that's all. He's like the marksman who is firing for a record to get his medals and his corporalmanship and a pretty girl passes on the road down the side of the rifle range. You know. He didn't get his corporalmanship, even though he shot the corporal that was teaching him. [laughter, laughs] Pc can't hit anything.

It's very funny. If you jerk the pc's attention out of session suddenly and then ask the pc the next auditing command, you get gobbledygook. You may not have looked at it as that direct a phenomena. You may have had other explanations for it. But actually if he's in a dispersal – he's been hit back by something – and you ask a question into this dispersal and he can't concentrate his attention. His ability to differentiate at that moment is tremendously lessened. He confuses things with things. He doesn't know what's going on. He has no attention to concentrate for a moment. His anchor points are driven in.

It is a bad and a sad thing that the rudiments can be put in very laboriously for a half an hour and knocked out in a tenth of a second. See? How can they be knocked out in a tenth of a second? Well, I don't know – telephone rings, you answer it, you turn around to the pc without any further announcement – you know, he's not out of the session or anything, he's right in the middle of session, he's right in the middle of a GPM something or other, you doing something or other – hand him the phone and you say, "Well, it's your wife. She says the police are at the house." I don't think you'd have much luck auditing that case.

Well, the funny part of it is that you can do this as slightly – the person – the further the person's attention is dispersed, as you find him as a pc – the Tone Scale, tone of case, degree of dispersal, degree of nonconcentration – these are all of one breed of cat, you see. And this person who is not well concentrated on what he's doing, you give him a little noise like this – and if he's halfway round the bend in the first place or terribly concentrated on something, you'd be amazed. You can knock ten rudiments out just like that. All of a sudden you

examine your fingernail and you've had it, see? He'd have to be terribly dispersed in order for this to happen, but that would happen. See?

Some pc that you're busy auditing – you say, "Did you – did you mind that? I" – you know, you [flicks finger against something] – "Did you mind, did you mind that?"

"No, no, no. No, it's perfectly all right." He might also have added to it, "I always suppress those things." [laughs]

Doesn't matter what the pc said, the rudiments went out, that's it. It's a sort of a tight-rope walk at best. But when a pc has experience of an auditor – that is not of auditors but an auditor – has experience of an auditor, and this auditor has successfully put the pc's rudiments in several times, you will find the pc's anxiety expressed about rudiments, his anxiety about the rudiments being in or not, his anxiety about the present time universe, are of the same breed. They're parallels. They're the same thing. He says he's anxious about the rudiments or something like this. Well, he's anxious about present time, you see?

And after an auditor has successfully put them in several times, pc will sit there in session – my God, you could practically drop the E-Meter, you know, and nothing happens. They don't go out. This is a factor known as confidence. Expectancy. The pc begins to understand that his attention can be properly directed by this auditor. He begins to understand that this auditor is not going to get him into trouble but on the contrary is going to get him out of it. It's – an aura of confidence begins to surround the session and at that time, watch out, because you're going to get too cocky, man! Because the aura of confidence adequate to Prep-checking is probably short of the mark adequate to Routine 3.

In other words you need an even greater aura of confidence. Although the process seems simpler, the auditor has to be far less [more] clever. The stress is so great that the rudiments have to be in much better and they have to stay in very well – otherwise the pc never climbs that band through the effort scale. He never comes out of the mud.

Some auditor could audit Routine 3, I imagine, with the rudiments wildly out, year in and year out, and wonder why the pc was going no place. Well, the pc's going no place because the auditor doesn't have the pc's confidence. Why doesn't the auditor have the pc's confidence? Not because of his domestic or personal reputation, it's simply whether or not he can put the rudiments in. That's all. That's all there is to it.

Now the pc realizes that this auditor cannot put the rudiments in, that he has to lie and cheat and wiggle around. He goes on automatic. He goes on self-audit and he isn't going to blow much of a GPM. Believe me, he's not going to blow anything. He's going to stew and chew and stew and chew and it's going on and on and on. He isn't suddenly and miraculously going to mount up scale. He's sort of going to hang. And this is nothing to be worried about, this is just – only happens when the rudiments are out. It isn't the esoteric personality. It isn't the swamiesqueness of the auditor. It isn't any one of these other things it might be. It's just are the rudiments in or aren't they? And if the rudiments are in, the pc feels confident and if the rudiments are out the pc feels nervous.

Now, when a pc has been audited many times with the rudiments out, he becomes more and more and more nervous. It is terribly to your advantage that no matter how little you

expect of the session to do a good job of putting the rudiments in for that session. Because you've always made this little hidden gain alongside of all the obvious gains. And if you're good at putting rudiments in – that is to say, you can put them in – then the pc has learned one more time that you can put the rudiments in and the pc is that much more confident of being able to buck up things while he's in session.

You know the old expression of the pc is able to blow things. Well, in the absence of in-rudiments, the pc cannot blow things.

You get some pc and he's being audited by one auditor – Auditor A. And it's – he doesn't – hasn't had any difficulty. They start blowing engrams by inspection. They've gone into free whole track engrams, you see, and they inspect this thing. Well, he was a headsman in that life and that blew, you know, and he was – and there was this life, while he was – yeah – he made a specialty in that life out of slaughtering vestal virgins. He could probably even get up to blowing lives, you see? And you give him Auditor B – now you understand this is the same pc – you give him Auditor B and one fine day, why, you find the session has sort of deteriorated to Straightwire and the pc has remembered going to bed last night and he's got a stuck picture on it.

What's the difference between these two sessions given by Auditor A and Auditor B? Auditor A: Pc's confidence was very high, rudiments in. See? Only it's not just the rudiments for that session and this is a history of rudiments in. See? And Auditor B: It's just not the rudiments out for that session, it is a history of rudiments out. See, we've been auditing the last fifteen sessions and we have nine of the ten rudiments out, see. Wow, man, that is – and all of a sudden, why, he can't blow. He gets a stuck picture on going to bed last night.

Now you, trying to put – try – find this pc who has been audited by Auditor B, and you, Auditor C, move in and you're going to straighten out this pc, you are. And you start running rudiments and you've gotten nothing but a dirty, messy, twitching needle. No matter what happens, you know, you – it goes tick. There's five words in the sentence and although the sentence you ask him is actually live with an instant read at the end, as you approach it and draw in your breath to say something, you get an action on the meter, and you get two actions per word on down to the end. There are about twelve actions on the meter – this is a terrible exaggeration – and then it goes into stage four when you are finished, you see.

You're Auditor C. This is what you have inherited out of all this, see. "*H-oo-aa-h*, well this is an awful low-scale pc. How are we ever going to climb this cliff? How can we ever possibly do anything about this," you know?

Well, quite interesting, quite interesting, you wouldn't find any real difficulty in doing so, providing all you did was sit down and session after session put the rudiments *in*. And all of a sudden the pc's confidence comes up, his attention is collected and you're back to a point of where you're blowing lives at a crack. Because what are you doing in Routine 3? The pc has to blow a life at a crack, just by labeling.

I don't say this is hard for the pc to do. It isn't hard for the pc to do as long as his rudiments are in. And as Auditor C then, you have brought him back to the same state that Auditor A found him in.

It is the auditor, not the state of the case.

The first edge in may be difficult. We find this pc – twitch, clank, thud, stage four, rise, rise, rise, rise, rise, rise, rise – "Have you breathed lately?" *Reaction!* Tick, tick, stage four, dirty needle. "What was that? That? That? That?"

"Oh God, I wouldn't know. Oh, that's you sitting there." [laughter]

Well now, you'll see this work out as time marches on. You give him session one. Urrrh. You say, "My God, this pc is in terrible shape! Awful!" What do you mean by that? You mean he can't go anyplace and he can't blow anything. That's what you really mean when you say he's in terrible shape. Because you as a Scientologist are not necessarily impressed or unimpressed by his behavior out of session, except when he natters around and gives you a lot of trouble or something. Or horrifies you with something or other. You're not particularly critical of his behavior.

What do you mean by a bad pc and so forth? Well, it's a fellow who is just a hell of a mess in session. You can't get anything to read; you can't get anything to not read. The pc gets an ARC break; you can't do anything about the ARC break. The pc gets a present time problem and the present time problem is you sat down too suddenly in your chair after you sat him, and you work, work at this for three quarters of an hour trying to blow this thing and he just still got a stuck picture of a session beginning, you see?

You say that is a lousy pc. Yeah, true, absolutely true. You can take a pc that's in that kind of state and work him carefully with his rudiments – I don't care what you run in the body of the session. Of course, you get a long ways if you do something like a bit of a Prep-check, but it should be something fairly light in the body of the session while the rudiments are this crazy because he isn't going to be able to blow much. So, you just keep working away at it session by session, or short-session the pc if you're doing five and a half hours auditing. Do a session every hour or something. And just get the rudiments in, man. And again get the rudiments in and get the rudiments in, and the person says, "You know," he says, "I – I've got a present time problem. Yes, I have a present time problem." And he thinks to himself, "Why hell, present time problem – we'll just get rid of it. There's no use having one."

Even if he goes out the bottom on the subject of having present time problems. It doesn't care which direction he got, he isn't worried whether he has one or not. And do you know a pc who is really agitated up very often reacts on a present time problem just because they're afraid they'll have one, because they know that it can't be handled. Or if they do have one that it won't be handled. Or if they do have one, they will spend the next four sessions handling it. There are going to be penalties involved in this thing of having a present time problem. They're going to be punished somehow – not audited, punished. Well, that auditor must have the presence, you know, of a commissar.

Little by little, session by session, the phenomenon you will observe is that the pc's needle gets cleaner and cleaner. It's not particularly what you're running on him – it's the fact you're running him with the rudiments in and getting rudiments in. He's starting to get a reality on it. He feels better at the end of sessions. He stops being anxious about whether or not the rudiments are in or not in. He stops trying to run the session himself because it's so horrible being audited. See? All kinds of things occur. And you'll see – actually you should notice

it quite markedly at the end of a second session – that the pc's needle, if all goofed up when you took him over, is getting cleaner and smoother.

Now, if you go on several sessions, you actually – it actually isn't terribly significant what you cleaned up on the pc, don't you see? It's the fact that you did it neatly and the pc could handle all of the stuff you handed him to handle. You did it and he did it and, oh, this is a breeze, you see? And he'll be winning all the way along the line. You could interrupt this by giving him some hill to climb that was far too steep. You could say, "Well, there's the Empire State Building there and we're standing down here on the sidewalk. Now, I'm going to teach you to jump. I'm going to teach you to jump. All right. Now, squat down. Bend your knees, bend your knees. Good. Now, have you bent your knees real good? All right. Now, jump to the top of the Empire State Building. Oh, you couldn't do it, huh? Oh well, that's too bad. I guess we'll have to do something else," you know?

That kind of a reaction isn't going to do anything. You could put something in the body of the session, in other words, which was far, far too difficult for the pc, such as Routine 3 full-blown, "All right, we're going to run on down the line, getting goals." What do you suppose getting goals is but churning around these goals – middles of the Goals Problem Mass, man? Actually, when you're doing a goals list and assessment and nulling, if you did one badly with the pc all dispersed, he would feel like he was in the middle of a roomful of billiard balls or something of this sort. And they're all in motion and the room is in motion. He won't know what the hell's going on. Because goals are simply the expectancies or attempts of these various objects in the GPM, you see – of former lives, actually, is what they are collections of.

So you ask him to do something too steep, too fast, and the pc is overridden in his confidence. He feels like he's had a hell of a lose in the body of the session. So a good way to take hold of the pc is to run something real easy on the pc for the first few sessions. It doesn't mean you should prepcheck less arduously or CCH less arduously or anything like that. But Prepchecking and CCHs is actually just a little bit too high for somebody whose needle is going clickety-clack-clank, hit the pin, twitch, dirty needle. And you say – not because it's a rudiment – but you say, "Do you have an ARC break?" something like that you would say. Well, it turns out that he does have. And why does he have an ARC break? "Well, you breathed." It could get that sloppy, you see? It could get that grim.

You got a pc who is anywhere in that category, devote all of your time to the type of session which you saw me demonstrate last night. Notice each one of those sessions took about 50 minutes? There were two pcs. One of them, the first one, was in good shape to run a Routine 3 Process. First time I ever audited that pc. The rudiments went in very easily, didn't they? Second pc, they went in rough, rough, rough, rough, didn't they? The pc needs some Prepchecking and CCHs and actually needs more confidence on just rudiments alone. See? Somebody can get them in. Actually, he needs the exact session I gave him, see, but needs about three more of them. Pc will stop being anxious about rudiments, and so on.

But there is a pc that needs to be graduated up along the line a little bit and get a little more confidence in auditing. There was a pc who audited perfectly well. You could tell it just this way: The needle of the first pc was not doing anything unusual at all. It was ticking and

tocking here and there occasionally, but it was a pretty smooth needle. And the needle of the second pc was going *tickety-tock-pick-pong-thud-bang*. You ought to have seen it today, by the way, when they checked the pc's rudiments out. They checked the second pc's rudiments just to work out the same thing that I was going to talk to you about tonight.

The pc was sufficiently upset about rudiments in general that just checking the rudiments was upsetting to the pc. You couldn't get very much responding. He couldn't get very much differentiation on it. Why? Well, actually from an auditor's point of view that pc could be said to be in rough shape. That pc actually is not in rough shape except sessionwise. Now, with a few cool, pleasant sessions and so forth, you see that needle will – would just sit there and just ride around, and nothing very energetic about it. It would be smooth. And you get the rudiments in, why, they'd stay in. You wouldn't have to keep punching at them and picking at them and picking them up and putting them back and picking them up and putting them back – none of that, you see. All that would come out, providing you got the rudiments in every time.

Now, the first two times you get the rudiments in on a pc, the first two times you get the rudiments in on a pc, you should not expect the pc to respond well to a rudiments check. The pc won't respond well to a rudiments check. The pc doesn't know by that time whether his rudiments are in or out, don't you see? That's the first time – couple sessions with a new auditor. Rudiments check has relatively small validity.

The third time, this should be very manifest: If the auditor got the rudiments in for the length of time he got them in – if he got them in, in the first session thoroughly at the moment he was getting them in, and if he got them in thoroughly at the moment he got them in, in the second session, by the time the third session comes along, you are going to see that the needle has stopped acting up. It looks cleaner; it looks easier. And if that has not happened or if the pc's needle has roughened up by the time the third session's in, then the auditor did not get them in, in the first session, did not get them in, in the second session, did not get them in, in the third session.

You could check the third session quite validly for a check. You know, do a rudiments check the third time this auditor has audited this pc. That would be a very valid check. Check would be fine, providing it was a very precise check. But not as valid as the fourth and fifth check. Don't you see?

And the first two might have no validity at all. *Zzzzzz*. Now, that's a generality but intended to fit on numerous grades and types of pcs in numerous states of decomposition. See? So therefore it's a rough hat.

But the point I'm making here is simply that the pc feels the newness of the auditor, probably wouldn't have this auditor if he wasn't – if he had been going good with his last auditor. You see, a lot of things are monitored this way. A lot of factors add up to the fact that the first session – if he's having any trouble at all in auditing – it's going to be fully manifest. In the second session, why, it'll be less so, but it – possibly still be trouble there. Third session it's starting to look smooth and starting to look like something and then you could tell accurately then whether or not the auditor had been getting the rudiments in. After that, rudiments check – bang-bang-bang – hit them right on the nose every time, see. You got the idea?

But it'd actually be unfair to take a rudiments check on an auditor's first session on a – on a monkeyed-up pc, see. It'd be very unfair. For instance, you're going to get – you not only will get one rudiment out, on two or three consecutive checks, you'll get different rudiments out for the session past, you understand?

What's going on? Well, the only thing that's going on is the pc is very anxious about present time and actually can't differentiate between the present time he is being checked in and the session he just had, and you get all sorts of crossed-up relationships of one kind or another. But that will not exist after a few sessions, providing the rudiments had been gotten in session after session. You see how you check this out in full fairness to everybody.

Well, there's the value of rudiments. Rudiments are absolutely vital. You cannot do without them to get the pc up the hill. Absolutely vital. And they're not going to move the GPM a thousandth of an inch. You see how they fit?

But without them, the GPM is not going to be moved a thousandth of an inch. And there's the peculiarity of rudiments. And one of the reasons why I think you've maybe had a little bit of trouble understanding them or not understanding them – as the case may be – because they themselves do not have the power of resolving a whole case. But if they kept the pc in-session, then they should have the power of resolving the whole case. Problems like this have undoubtedly occurred to you.

So I rolled up my sleeve to settle it and I have actually been many weeks working on this, one way or the other.

And a rudiments process does not have the power of resolving a case, but in its absence a case won't resolve.

Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.

MIDDLE RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on 31 May 1962

Thank you.

And this is, second lecture, 31st of May, AD 12. Different time track than the first lecture. Same subject, only this one is middle rudiments. You will want to know about this one.

The middle rudiment consists of a package question, which handles suppressions, invalidations, missed withholds and careful of. That is your standard, basic middle rudiment. It is a package question, contains those four elements. And middle rudiments may also contain – this is less often – but may also contain the half-truth, untruth, impress and damage end rudiment, the question or command end rudiment and the influence of the E-Meter end rudiment.

Now let's expand the middle rudiment just a little bit further, you see, that would be this package suppression, invalidation, missed withhold, careful of, plus those first end rudiments. Now let's expand it a little further and you could run in "auditor," but less advisedly, and "room," providing there was a tremendous amount of disturbance in the auditing environment.

This would be the extent of any practical end rudiment – middle rudiments. Any practical middle rudiments would have that extent. Because before you got all the way up to all rudiments again, you had much better short-session it and just start – just end the session that you were doing with the end rudiments and start a new session with the beginning rudiments, which is much neater. See, so there is a point where middle rudiments become too numerous and too fancy and actually consist of restarting a session. There's a make-break point there. It is sometimes more economical to start a new session than to patch up the one that is running. And that would depend utterly on how many rudiments had gone out.

Now it's a matter of judgment. Now ordinarily, in Prepchecking and in Routine 3, only one package middle rudiment question would be considered mandatory. Middle rudiments have moved from the category of being a good idea over into the category of being mandatory. You always use a middle rudiment when doing Prepchecking or a Routine 3 process. You cannot get along now without middle rudiments. Because the middle rudiments have gotten sufficiently good that it just makes the case run so much faster that it would be senseless to omit them. And these are the middle rudiments that you would use ordinarily and when you would use them.

Middle rudiment would be, "Blank – " first phrase, but definitely a time span or a subject span, "(Blank), anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" Now that would be, "In this session, is there anything ... ?" "On goals listing, is there anything that you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" "On list-

ing ...," "On Havingness Processes ...," "In auditing ..." But when you get it outside, when you get it totally outside of the framework of one session, it becomes the equivalent of a Prepcheck and must be regarded as such. It's – it is very much better to take, "On the subject of goals is there anything you have suppressed?" as a single Zero Prepcheck question. Crash! "On the subject of goals, is there anything you have invalidated?" "On the subject of goals is there anything you have failed to reveal?" "On the subject of goals is there anything you have been careful of?"

Now, if you were to use these, as a session body, before beginning a Routine 3 process – now this is a Prepcheck session, which precedes a Routine 3 session – you would find that this case would really come up shining on this subject. But there you're going to beat him to death. You might be a couple, three sessions, on this, all told. But it isn't likely. I did a session identical to this in cleaning up somebody's goal that had been invalidated and it was one of the queasiest of goal mess-ups I have run into in some time and actually did it in, I think the length of the session was one hour and fifty minutes. And I prepchecked all of those questions, and got them clean, slick as a whistle. And got the goal checked out in addition to that. So you see this is nothing very arduous.

But nevertheless, that was a Prepcheck session which was a prelude to a Routine 3 session. Well, of course all Prepcheck sessions are a prelude to Routine 3 sessions, but this is instantly and immediately prior. So prior that it is a Routine 3 session. In other words, you're going to going to do goals on this person, you're going to do a goals list on this person, well, let's just get it all out of the road now.

We've already been working Prepchecking and we got all of our... we could – this pc could stay in session now, this pc is nicely grooved in. I mean we've got rudiments, pc knows you can get them in, you know you can get them in on the pc – all this has been going on for some time and you've got the pc feeling better about this lifetime and not so shy. He doesn't expect the police or his mother or somebody to rush in the door any minute and tap him on the shoulder, you know. He can be comfortable.

And now, before you did a Goals Assessment, you'd find it'd be fairly wise to clean up, slick up, polish up, put the fingernail polish on the middle rudiments. And you'd put them on in a Prepcheck fashion. You'd say, "Anything that you'd care to ask, on the subject of goals, on the subject of listing, in finding items, on Routine 3 processes." I don't care what beginning wording you use, it's got to be enough to embrace everything the pc has been up to, on the subject of doing goals or listing or 3D Criss Cross or anything else that has been a Routine 3 type process, don't you see? You get that and you use those as your Zero Questions.

And then of course there must always be four of them. If you said, "On the subject of flying airplanes – " to just get it out of the range of auditing, not that you would use these things, see, it wouldn't matter if it were on the subject of flying airplanes – you've got four Zeros. You've got four Zeros at once. You see? You've got suppression, invalidation, fail to reveal and been careful of, see. It wouldn't matter what you started, you're going to have to do all four of them. What you start is up to you, see. But you're going to have to do four of them and all those Zeros have got to be flatter than a flounder and of course they obey all the rules of Prepchecking.

You've got the overt, you get the action, whatever it was, realizing that things like this, the overts are very often against self. Suppression is against self or something like that. Prep-check it out, see. If it lasts for two questions, on the second question swing it in there, fish for your What, get that thing all straightened out, run it, run your chain down – I don't care if the chain only went back to last year, see. There's going to be action on it. Bring it back up, check the What, check the Zero. If the Zero wasn't flat, why, find another overt and run that on down the line.

You'll find out this works very rapidly. If you've done a lot of prepchecking, this will amaze you with the speed with which this will go and the immediate return that you will get in terms of auditing. Pc says, "Wow!" you know, "What happened?" you know, "Gee!" This is quite something. Because this is four very, very strong buttons. And they're good, strong, think buttons, man! And of course on the subject that you're addressing them to, why it's, "this lifetime" or, "since auditing occurred" – that's within the last dozen years, Routine 3 process last two or three years.

Whatever this thing is, you see, you've got a very finite piece of track and of course it cleans up at once. And don't let him go backtrack on the thing – he didn't audit anybody – he didn't audit anybody when he was two, you see. No, you got this little span. You find out it'll clean up fairly rapidly, but it all depends on how well you yourself can go over the hurdles, you see, with Prepchecking. How fast you can juggle these values and get it in there and get the pc to give you the overt and run the track back and clean it up, check the What and out of there, you see. It just depends on your basic handling of exact Prepcheck fundamentals. And if you are never guessing, if you know exactly what you're supposed to do and you get in there, *bang*, you'll find this thing will *roll*, man. And you'll find goals, you'll find wild things going on, you'll find all kinds of things, you know.

We already have a case, if I may mention it – I don't know who the pc is, but it was quite remarkable – the goals list was all complete, except those goals she had been so careful of she had never given any auditor. See, interesting manifestation. See, the "careful of." Yes, she'd been very careful of those goals and never given them to anybody. And I hope the pc will forgive me for mentioning that, I don't even know who it is.

But anyway, on another pc, who I hope will forgive me, pc on this little Prepcheck I just mentioned to you a moment ago, the hour and fifty minutes or something like that, pc actually sat down and didn't write his goals. See, he had a definite intention, you see, of writing something else. Got the idea? And we even found a goals list which way precedes Routine 3. Quite interesting, earlier goals lists. Pc was sitting there writing down things he wanted to be. See, sometime before. Fascinating base. I knew it must be there, however. See, when you get a good security on Prepchecking, you know it only stays in if the basic is still in. If you've still got the bottom of the chain in, it's going to stay in, man! And that thing is going to knock itself off the pin. So as unlikely as it is, you ask – . Actually the goals list, you couldn't get any earlier than this goals list, see. Obviously there was nothing earlier than Routine 3 had anything to do with a goals list. I still asked for one earlier. Why? Because I couldn't clean up the one I had. There must have been one earlier. And sure enough, there was an earlier one. And as soon as we found this earlier one – it didn't even belong in the body of Routine 3, don't you see?

I imagine you're liable to find somebody sometime that did one in college, "Things you want to be," you know, or something like that. Or did a – something wild like this. You'll find out your goals list isn't clearing up and the pc's having a hard time giving the goals, sitting on some piece of nonsense that occurred ages ago on some entirely different disrelated subject, but was a goals list. And you get the earliest one, each time, you see, on whatever you've got there, clean it up.

Well, that would be – that is a marvelous approach, this is not mandatory. I don't say you must always do this before you do a Routine 3. I don't have to because after you've used – after you've used the middle rudiments on a Routine 3 process a few times and you haven't done it, you'll wish you had! This is one of these obvious things. You don't have to even tell, "You always have to do this," because even if I omitted to tell you about it and just gave you the middle rudiment, you would find yourself trying to cheat on the auditing section by doing it over the weekend on the pc just so you could get the middle – [laughs] you'd be getting desperate! Because they wouldn't stay in, see, unless you did some fundamental action with it, see.

Now, there is one use of middle rudiments. That's its Prepcheck use. Prepcheck use for Routine 3. Now is there a use of middle rudiments for Prepchecking? Not just Prepchecking middle rudiments, but is there a use of them for Prepchecking? Yes. Yes. Be an awfully good thing – be an awfully good thing – to handle the pc, as I see it these days, and looking at the wins that you are getting and taking a chapter from your book and the wins you are getting right now and as cheerful and happy as you are about these wins.

Set the pc up in Model Session, do some Havingness in the body of the thing and just get the rudiments in. And get the rudiments in. And get the rudiments in. With some Havingness, you see. Now, I showed you middle rudiments last night in the demonstration. There was no reason under the sun, moon or stars to use them. I could have made the Havingness Processes work without them. But I just thought I would show you middle rudiments against a disrelated subject. I thought you might be interested in: what the devil is that? You probably recognized them for what they were. We're going to clean up the subject of havingness. Well, we didn't have to clean up the subject of havingness. We could have found a Havingness Process that worked. I just wanted to show you how they worked, using them as rudiments.

Now you see, you could use these four lines as Prepchecks, Zeros. When you use them as rudiments, you use them in an entirely different way. And don't ever confuse this. You use them with your good old drill, "Have you seen a cat?" Whatever the pc says, you say, "Fine, I'll check it on the meter" and you say, "Have you seen a cat?" You understand? You ask the middle rud, whatever the pc says you check the middle rud on the meter. You do not Q-and-A, you don't go afield, you don't try to dig chains, you don't do anything with it, but take what the pc says. Providing only that it is an answer to your question.

Now this will be a relief for some of – a dirty crack to make! This'll be a relief to some of you, you actually don't have to plow around and wonder about whether it's an overt or a motivator on running middle ruds. Because it's always a little bit of both. You see, they're just think-think, see. And the fact that the guy suppressed it is a sort of an overt. It doesn't matter whether he suppressed somebody else's item or goal or suppressed his own, it's an overt in

some way or another, he can't answer it without giving you that. Or how he said it was suppressed. We don't care how it was suppressed. It's just what the pc said, it's just answer the question, in other words. Of course, if we say, "In this session" – which would be your usual start to a middle rud – "In this session, is there anything you have suppressed?" And the pc says, "Uh – how soon are we going to finish the session?" Well, let me point out to you, that's not an answer to the auditing question, you're going to throw your end ruds out. So at that time, you have to insist that he answer the auditing question, simply by saying, "I'll repeat the auditing question."

Supposing he says, "*Bla-ll-zzzumm*," and you didn't understand what he said, you would say, "I didn't understand that," or "I didn't hear that," or "I didn't get that straight. What was it you said?" Now that doesn't challenge him with anything, that isn't invalidative, that's trying to get the pc's answer, not questioning the pc's answer, see. You want him to say the answer so you can understand it.

By the way the reason TR 4 doesn't work for an awful lot of auditors is they just complicate it up to the stars. All you got to do, you know, is just understand and acknowledge it and return the pc to session. Well, TR 4 often includes, "I didn't understand," when you didn't. See, the pc says, "*Bla-zzzmm*." And you're going to be a ruddy fake? And sit there and say you understood what the pc said? Heh! You better not! You better not Q-and-A and you better not not-understand it. See, you've got to understand it. So one of the steps you sometimes have to take to understand it is, "What did you say? I didn't get it." "I didn't get it." you see, the onus is on you. "I didn't get it," "I didn't understand it." "I didn't get that straight." Preface it in that way and there's never any ARC break. And you're asking the pc for Havingness answers, you know and the pc says, "Uh – and uh – the phonograph record." What are you going to do? Like a cheerful idiot sit there and buy a nonexistent phonograph record? Well, he didn't answer the auditing question, because something's wrong. Well, you'd better go to the mat right then or your TR 4 is out. You say, "I didn't get that straight. I didn't understand what you were talking about."

"Oh! Well it isn't a phonograph record, it's an ashtray. Ha-ha! Yeah, well, I'll take that."

He says, "Funny you noticed that."

You say, "I didn't notice it." I'd even go so far as to say, "I didn't notice it, I didn't understand what you're talking about."

"Oh well, fine. Swell, oh, okay. Swell, swell."

See. That's TR 4. TR 4 is understand and acknowledge. And you're looking for some fancy system by which to do this and there ain't none. The only – closest you can come to a system is, is you can't be a fake. See, don't be a fake – ever. Pc has a heavy Armenian accent, then by George, you have to ask him for a repeat about two or three times every time he says anything. Well, you want to know how to throw him out of session? Pretend you understand what it is. Boy, man! You turn false, he turns false, you've got missed withholds now from the pc, you get disinterested in the pc, your ARC drops with the pc, you start to goof. You leave the session being critical of the pc.

You show me an auditor being critical of his own pc and I'll show you an auditor who didn't understand what the pc said. TR 4 is out, see. Don't complicate it, simplify it. It says "understand." That's all you need. Well, make sure you understand it, see. I've had a pc even speak to me sharply on the sixth or eighth time. I just have to tell him, "Well, I just don't get it, I didn't get that, I don't – don't grab it." And the pc says, "*Sis-hallu-tha-lrrrum.*" "Well, what is it? I didn't get it straight." The pc sounds annoyed. It never registers as an ARC break. But this eventually will find you with an ARC breaky pc. "Okay." He says, "*Thall-uulm.*" And you say, "Okay, good." [laughter] Next thing you know the whole session – session doesn't exist, R-factor's gone, everything is out the window, see.

So this applies particularly to the use of these middle rudiments. It's your TR 4's got to be in. But it actually doesn't much matter what the pc said, as long as the pc answers your auditing question. Pc must have answered your auditing question. And that's the end of it. And then you just check it on the meter. Now that's the way you use a middle rudiment. You don't use it any other way, you don't try to run a chain, you don't do any – you just leave it. Don't Q-and-A and *hmmm!* You know? Just you – you ask him, he tells you. That's it, you see. You check it on the meter and that's that. Otherwise, man, you're going to go far afield, you're going to go adrift, you're going to go appetite over tin cup.

Now the other use is prepchecking *in* the Zero Question so that you can use middle rudiments. But the Zero Question, the Prepcheck Zero, "Have you ever suppressed an item?" or something, you see, that is actually not a middle rud. That's a Zero Question. And of course that's handled with the full panoply of Sec Check, Prepcheck, type action, see. You ask him, you don't get a read, of course you don't prepcheck it.

All right, now, and if you do get a read and he tells you and it doesn't clear, why, you're off to the races into prepchecking. See those are two different actions. Don't ever get these two actions confused in using a middle rudiment. Because you already have thrown a non sequitur into the session. Now it's all right to drop a few small stones on the road. They're not going to bother anybody. But now, don't start moving boulders onto the highway and stopping the whole session in order to go into whether or not his Aunt Tibia has possibly ever suppressed his libido. *Oooh!*

I got one from somebody, I will withhold this person's name and send them a bill. They aren't here, but they have been at Saint Hill. Had to stop a Routine 3 session in order to prepcheck out thoroughly some of the background of their difficulties. You do that to a pc, they think you drive wild. You start running... I'll give you a subjective reality on this, had a session one time where the auditor – I was worried about a government. We were in some kind of a mess and we ran a present time problem or something like that on governments, you know, just as a coffee-shop thing. And, all of a sudden the auditor missed an auditing command and I said, "Wow!" And so the auditor shifted over and ran "What have I done to you, What have you done to me?" As a repetitive process, see. That's dropping boulders on the track and we never did clean up the first one. See, you never come back on the road when you start that kind of thing.

So middle ruds are used with great discretion. With enormous thoroughness, but with great discretion. Minimum distraction. You're already throwing some pebbles on the highway.

But it's worth it. If you throw them on expertly you manage to get a few boulders off and the pebbles, too. See, if you do it expertly. But you don't use these things badly. You must use these things with a – a good rudiment approach. You must ask your question, get your answer, check it on the meter and if it's still alive, ask your question, get your answer, if it's still alive, ask your question, get your answer, check it on the meter each time, and now it's dead. It's not reacting now. Tell the pc so and get the hell out of there. That's all you do with it.

Now you use a middle rudiment after every What question has been nulled. Now I cannot give you the optimum time to use it in the midst of the Sec Check one – that is the list-type Prepcheck, you know where you do the Sec Check list, the Form 3 list, I can't give you the optimum time to get... Because I have a feeling like you could be too frequent. It's been suggested that it's every five or six, if they were flying along, see. If you were flying on down the road and you weren't actually getting much of a reaction on anything and so forth. But after a few of them you would use it. For sure, you would use it at that time, because the pc might have everything beautifully suppressed.

Now if I thought the pc was stringing me a long bend and had it just all suppressed and wasn't paying any attention to what was going on and that sort of thing, I would use it more frequently. But I would sure use it every five or six checklist type questions. And mandatory, that you clean the middle ruds whenever you have nulled a What question. That is absolutely mandatory. You mustn't go on to a new question, a new chain from your Zero, until you have knocked your middle ruds in.

You find out that they will be very, very productive. They will keep the pc flying. Now, the way you put those in, is to check the null of the What question. If you find it live, you of course look for the new chain. What did you miss? You must – couldn't possibly have found the basic. Something's wrong here. Well, you correct that. Now if you check the What question and find it null, you do the middle ruds and check the What question again. Don't do the middle ruds and move on to something else, because the middle ruds might have been out and that might have suppressed. You got the sequence? It's a relatively easy sequence.

It'd run something like this. You're doing a form type Sec Check, "Have you ever stolen everything? Have you ever raped a widow?" something like this. And, you've done six of these and you've gotten each one off with at least – with just one, see. Well, by that time you ought to put in your middle ruds.

All right. So you found one that repeated twice, then of course you've gone into a Prepcheck type activity. When you finish up your Prepcheck type activity just as the way you do, get back up there, that What's nice and null, put in your middle ruds and recheck your What. Of course if that What's still alive, why, there must be something more on the chain; you can fish that up and then of course, check your What question; if it's now null, once more do your middle ruds. Always the same action, do your middle ruds, check that What question, undoubtedly it'd be null by that time. And then you go on to your next form line.

In other words, you play that What question against the middle rud. That's what's important about Prepchecking, is make sure that you at least get your middle ruds in, after every What question has become null. And you'll find out this does not take long to do. Now, the middle rud standard response, or standard question for this is one of these package questions

and I – after the trouble we had getting people to read – getting – people were reading prior reads on the E-Meter and people doing that, I – these package questions make me a little bit nervous. Because they tend to give you the wrong impression. Because in a package question you're actually asking four rudiments in one breath. And it's just a very fast way of auditing. It's short-handing. And it possibly might not even be as accurate as asking each one all by itself and that sort of thing, but it does let you cover a lot of ground. And you do it in a package fashion and the package question of course is just, "In this session – " you see, that would – the way – that'd be – always the res – the beginning of it, "Is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" Watching each one.

Now, if one falls, like "invalidated" falls, you just stop right there. It makes a full sentence, even though your breath is left hanging in mid-breath. You have not dropped your proper tone at the end of the sentence, but just stop it. Now how do you proceed? Would, you just proceed by omitting the two that are now clean and then go on with, "In this session, have you failed to reveal – is there anything you have failed to reveal or been careful of?" You see how that would be?

In other words you don't repeat – keep repeating the things you have already cleaned up. Now if you just want to punish this thing to death, you can repeat the whole package after you've cleaned up all the parts of the package, just for the hell of it. But this looks to me like it's getting awfully – awfully picky. Almost to the point of annoyance to the pc.

You checked your middle ruds and you found "careful of" was out. Therefore the next question shortened down to, "In this session is there anything you have been careful of?" see. And whatever the pc had answered you, when you asked the question originally, you had cleaned it, so you say, "Well that's clean," and that's it. And you're out of there and the pc won't be getting all impatient to get going and getting onto something else. It's in the interest of rapid auditing.

Now, that is the auditing question you would use, that was what you would clean up, and how you clean it up I have already described to you, clean it up just as any other rudiment. And now, how do you use it in a Routine 3? In a Routine 3, we have much less definite answers. Much less definite answers. But this is mandatory, that between a shift, I mean after you've finished listing on a list and before shifting to another list, you do the middle rudiments just as a clean-up on a What question is done. Except you haven't got anything to check. You just take that opportunity to get the middle ruds in, that's all. You don't necessarily make him list longer or something like that.

This is not very definite beyond that one fact. When you shift from list A to list B, do some middle ruds between the – in the middle of the shift. And just finish listing one, put some middle ruds in and start listing the next one.

Now, this can be amplified enormously. This can be amplified *enormously*. And complicated *tremendously* when you start getting complicated steps into some Routine 3 process. Now I'm studying right now, listing against the needle. There seems to be some validity to this. It's an assessment of the four lines every time, instead of just going in rotation; you list to a condition of the needle, whatever that condition is, probably a still needle. I said "probably," you understand, this is all up in the air. List to a still needle on that list, then do an assessment

of all four lines. Find out which one is reacting the wildest and that's the next one you list. See, the complication is this: Where do you put any middle ruds in there? Well, I'd put the middle ruds in before I did the assessment. Complications can occur. The same general law, however, prevails.

Now there's another law in Routine 3 that you'll find out continues to be – in other words, when shifting processes or when shifting lists or when shifting some doingness, put a middle rud in between. That's Routine 3. You use it far more frequently in Routine 3 than you will in prepchecking, you'll find. You have to use it – and because it is capable of slowing up the session, you will have to be able to throw it in there with great glibness and speed and read it fast and get out of there. You see? Otherwise you'll be getting into the pc's hair most God-awfully. He'll think the session consisted of nothing but long, lugubrious middle ruds, you know? Well, learn how to do it fast and get out of there and he'll be very happy about your middle rudiments.

It's all with the speed and expertness with which you get them in. An auditor who gets rudiments in slowly, not carefully – pc likes to see you get in ruds carefully. But an auditor who gets in ruds so *carefully* and so *laboriously* actually gets the pc after a while so he's just practically spinning on the subject of rudiments, if at the same time the auditor despite all the care and labor doesn't get the rudiments in. And you can find out that this type of auditing exists: That the auditor is very *laborious* on the subject of getting the rudiments in, but never gets them in. And of course it'll blow the pc out of the water, every time.

But because middle ruds come into the body of the session where the pc's attention is terribly fixed on something else, you cannot afford a drag, a slowdown, a fumble, a dished-up stuff, you see. You check it as a package, you clean up the part of the package that was reacting, you get out of there, see. Don't go messing around, pushing the pc's attention around, "Now, well, did you do something?" and so forth and so on. Don't – don't bother with this.

Terribly important that the pc gives you overts and not motivators in the beginning and end ruds, but you don't be so critical in these middle ruds, see. Don't be so critical. Because actually when they throw one out they'll throw another out. You can generally get it on a repetition. Pc's driving too wild on this sort of thing, why, short-session the thing, just end the session and get your end rudiments and so forth. Start in, wind up on this thing, get it all straight again, because it's going to go up in a ball. Learn how to do middle rudiments easily and swiftly and with no great weight.

Remember you're doing in the body of the session what the pc's attention is absolutely *mandatory* on blowing. He's got to be able to blow masses and that sort of thing. You mustn't distract him too much. So get them in there, get them in, get out of there. You're actually throwing pebbles on the road when you're doing middle rudiments. That's why I didn't give you any middle rudiments until I was fairly sure that we had the perfect package on the thing. We haven't monkeyed with this very much, you've heard – you've heard about, "Get the withholds off and get the invalidations" and you've heard something about, "Get the suppressions," but you haven't been given any hard and fast packages or "got to's" on this thing and we haven't – I've been fooling with this for some days, starting a few days ago, talking to your Instructors about it and we've had it checked out and it works very nicely.

Now, where else would you use middle rudiments? Well, on listing of a goal, you will find you have a different proposition because you're not going to change lists, at least on Routine 3GA. You're not going to change lists but it's when your pc looks confounded and stops listing. Now of course you could be so quick that every time the pc took time to take a breath you threw the middle ruds at him. And this would very soon have the middle ruds just about as wildly out as you could imagine. No, I'm talking about the person says, "And catch, ah, catfish – yeah – I always wanted to catch catfish. And then ... Yeah, put that one down, catch catfish and then ... Ah, well ..."

Oh, man, his attention's gone out of session somehow or another, he's blown off something or other. Probably the next goal is "to go away," you know, and he's dramatizing it. A good way to get him right back in-session again and get him going with a minimum loss of time and so forth – you save a lot of time with minimum ruds if you use them right – is just feed him the middle ruds. Just feed him the middle rudiments at that point. "Oh, well, yes, I am in-session. What have I suppressed?" you know, so on, " – pressed, *bang-bang*. Yeah." He suppressed the next one. He thought it was discreditable. You'll always find there's some goofy answer about the thing or two back there was one he failed to reveal. Or, he's been very careful not to let his rudiments go out. You know? I mean there's something slowed him down. And you'll find every time that whatever his behavior was, the reason he slowed down or fouled up is contained in the middle rudiments. It's magical. The guy all of a sudden picks it up, he starts to run.

What kind of wording do you use? Well, let's say you've prepchecked this thing in and then your middle rudiments are sort of – you're having to put them in all the time – I think I'd take a short session and put in a Prepcheck set of middle rudiments again. I'd get – use the subject of listing. Now, you've done a lot of listing with the pc, you see. I'd get them in rapidly, but I'd make it an entirely separate session. Don't decide in the middle of a listing session or something like that, that you've got to get the middle ruds in with a Prepcheck. That's a gross auditing error, see? You're going to take the next session and do that.

You figure out, well, there's something gone wrong here and I don't know what it is and this pc is – just seems to be invalidating everything under the sun, moon and stars. What's going on here? There must have been some early invalidative action on listing. You'll find out that is the most prevalent thing to go out. There's something wrong with listing. Don't start throwing, "On listing – " and expect to pick up the whole subject of listing in one session or something like that. Now I'm talking – I'm being a purist, now, you understand? You understand that you could do this and get away with it, providing you did it in a rudiments fashion. You understand you could do this. But I would tend to handle it as itself. I would try to handle it that way.

Now this advice may not particularly hold good. It may be that you can get away with this, see? Maybe you can get away with it. Maybe you can say – pc's having an awful time listing see – maybe you can say, "On the subject of listing – " see. The whole subject of listing, you see, you're talking about various alterations, various changes, of wording and so forth, could take place or be in – and you could – might be able to get away with it. And I think you just did. You've been using it, found it very fruitful. Use something like, "On writing goals – " or something like this, " – is there anything you have been careful of?" was a

very hot rudiment. I don't know quite how you worded that or handled it. But he was handling more than one session on the thing and doing it quite successfully.

But before I did that, I would have middle rudiments pretty well in hand. You understand? I myself as an auditor would really have the grip on the subject of middle rudiments and their use before I start floundering around. Because you'll find out that they work in a finite state. They work within the one session you are doing. If I thought that this pc had a lot of suppressions on listing and was not eager to list and didn't want to tell me his goals, I certainly wouldn't think of trying to get it in with one slash of the middle rudiments. I would start a session, I would prepcheck a – Zero Questions, all about listing goals. "On listing goals, is there anything you have suppressed? On listing goals ..." one Zero, you see, "... is there anything you have invalidated? On listing goals is there anything you have failed to reveal? On listing goals is there anything you have been careful of?" And I would take those four and I'd prepcheck them. Really get to them. Really thrash this thing out. And after that my middle ruds would stay in. And I think you'd find it would probably save you time to do that.

However, I can't give you that as an absolute final statement, because there hasn't been – haven't been very many auditors using this and we haven't any broad auditor experience on it. We just merely know that the middle ruds themselves work like a hot bomb.

Now what corrections we have to make because of misuse and abuse of, that always follows later, doesn't it? Now, you'll find that you will be very happy with these things, normally used, because there are a lot of pcs around on this "careful of" button. Pc's almost sitting there self-auditing, you know. He's being so careful, he's being so careful not to withhold anything. And you have a pc popping up at odd intervals saying, "Uh – I – uh – I – I just thought, uh – I just thought the session was going pretty long. I didn't want to have a withhold. I didn't – didn't want to – " and they go on with this for a little while, you know and ... [laughter] "Who's running this session?" I very often will ask them that, you know. It's better to ask them the middle rudiment question. Not as a Q and A, because of their response, but just wait for the next favorable opportunity and ask them is there anything that they have "suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or *been careful of?*" [laughter, laughs]

"Uh – yes, I think I've been careful to keep you informed."

"All right, thank you very much. Thank you. Is there anything in the session you have been careful of? That reads."

"Well I've been careful not to have any withholds. Because I don't want you to get a dirty needle there and have trouble reading it."

"Thank you, thank you. All right. Is there anything in this session you have been careful of?"

All right, now, if it came to a case like that, I would slide the whole question in afterwards, if I was gunning for one thing and weighted it. Then I would say, "That's clean now," or whatever it was. "Now, let's check the whole question. Is there anything in this session – " you see, " – you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of? Yes, well, I have a read here on 'failed to reveal.'" Because it would almost inevitably follow. The pc who is being so revealing can be counted on to be not-revealing. These little laws you'll see work

out and you'll become accustomed to it and it's quite interesting the way you can juggle a middle rud against itself. Because actually it's asking the same question both ways. The "careful of" takes care of it, don't you see?

Now frankly, a suppression and a withhold are different. But they're quite similar. And they echo one against the other. And "been careful of" and a "suppression" are the same. "Been careful of" and "reveal" are quite often synonymous to the pc. In other words it plays a whole handful of cards at the same time. This shoots a lot of line.

You might be curious of where we got this "careful of," where that's been all this time. It might very well be "help," see, or something like that. But it isn't. "Careful of" is taken straight out of psychoanalysis. That's right. Because in my experience with psychoanalytic patients or inspecting and examining them, looking at records, doing that sort of thing, I have found out that there is one thing they all wind up being and that's careful. [laughter] That is the background music to that thing. And it's quite interesting. And we don't want that in Scientology, so let's take the opportunity of throwing it in with the middle rudiments. Not because of that but because it is quite embracive. Person starts tip-toeing around in sessions and tip-toeing around in life and "Let's see, I mustn't think of an item because I don't have a piece of paper to write it down and give it to the auditor." [laughter] That's all "careful of," don't you see. And it all gets a similar registry on that.

Some people are careful not to have withholds, see. Other people are careful not to commit overts so they won't have withholds, see. Other people are careful to find out – to make sure that other people don't find out they have not been careful. Any way you want to play the violin it'll make some interesting tunes. That is one of these embracive package words which doesn't really mean suppression. It means something else entirely different. Doesn't really mean help. I just hooked it out of thin air; I knew it was a common denominator to somebody having trouble.

The end product, the end product of all aberration is being very careful. And that goes hand in glove with some research I did the other day. I was reviewing the overt-motivator phenomena and I was getting it all kicked together and once more ran into the factor, this time with more weight than ever, that doingness is dangerous. And the people consider – the more people consider doingness dangerous, the less they do and that's a direct index to aberration. So of course "careful" fits right in there. Another method for asking for one of these near-center pins of aberration. Quite fascinating. You start using it into the middle ruds one way or the other, you'll find your pc will start coming up on this alone. You know?

Now, there's another question I must ask and answer and that is simply this: Do you ever use middle rudiments amongst the rudiments? I haven't answered the question yet. But supposing, supposing your rudiments were leading in a very deteriorated direction. That is to say you've got present time problem, a present time problem and you run, "What part of it could you be responsible for?" and "What part of it could you be responsible for?" and "What part – " and checked it and you still have present time problem, so on, I'd be awfully tempted, if I did that, to run middle ruds, end ruds and start the session. *Somewhere* in that body of thought-buttons, the like of which nobody's ever collected, we're going to have

the answer to this thing, you see. He's doing something in this session. He must be doing something in the session. He's probably lied to us about what the problem is or who the problem is with. He's probably told us an untruth concerning the problem. Or he is trying all the time he is sitting there to suppress the problem. He isn't running the command. He's trying to suppress the problem, so that he can get on being audited or something like that.

Or he's invalidated something about it or he's being *careful* to make sure that he doesn't get audited with a present time problem. You see, and you could run on down the middle ruds and straight on down to the end or may – usually present time problems have a "failed to reveal" connected with them. But you could run right on down from there and down into the end ruds and end your session.

And I'd say – I've not been hung up like this, as an auditor. And, well, I could imagine that somebody could get hung up like this as an auditor, get into some kind of a mucked up mess in the session, where what they were trying to clear wasn't clearing. They couldn't get it clear, see. Something was really goofed up. I'd take it at that point, run the middle ruds, run the end ruds and start a new session. That is the best way out of it, rather than beating your brains. Your brains don't have anything to do with your thinkingness anyway, what are you beating them for?

But, that is – now understand, I've not run into this problem, so therefore to that degree I'm giving you a synthetic solution. But I could see that the middle ruds might have some use. Might have some use. This pc's got a PTP and you can't clean this PTP, you've run something like twenty, thirty commands on this PTP. Looks the same as it did before. Not having any effect on it at all.

I would assume there's something wrong other than this PTP. And it would be contained in the middle ruds or the end ruds. And so I'd just go ahead and run it right straight on out; start the session all over again. I might even tell the pc we were going to do that. Let the pc run out the amount of groan that he groaned.

But it might be a very bad policy to give a hang-up PTP that much value. I myself have never had this problem, I don't know why I'm wishing the problem off on you, I myself never had it.

But I, once in awhile, hear you talking and say, "What do you do when the present time problem hangs up and you can't clear it?" I hear – occasionally hear this question asked. I should think it'd happen with every other rud out. I think that it must have something to do with that. It probably has very little to do with – something of the sort. If this present time problem's terribly severe, if this fellow's wife has just been taken to the hospital that morning, you're trying to audit him and he's waiting for the baby, why I don't know, you're pretty good, but you're not that good, man! To audit over a PTP of that magnitude. Where the phone's liable to ring at any moment and even bring the phone over alongside of the – of the chair so that he could answer it, you see, if the hospital called. Not when there's a big wait and expectancy and all this kind of thing on a – on a situation. You're trying to do auditing on something else, of course it violates the idea of the pc's concentration. He can't concentrate on anything else.

I'd be far more likely to run a session on him at that time that set him up where babies were concerned or something like that. His whole attention is on babies, whole attention is on his wife. Till it straightens up so he'll be nice to the baby when he comes and won't spit at him. See? I'd in other words, I'd recognize that existence was so grim or so interesting or so compelling that to yank the pc's attention directly and immediately off of it would be inviting catastrophe anyhow. Better solution of course is to make an appointment for next week. Sometimes you can't do that. Sometimes you're assigned to the session and that's it. You've had it. "Yours is not to question why" sort of a situation, you know.

Well, one of the best things to do is run an equivocal type session. You're running Routine 3, this happened, you're running the PTP, you see. You know you're going to run a PTP, it's going to go up the hill. It's going to go over the hills and far away. It is happening right now. You see, his brother's being executed, but may be given a stay at any moment. And remind him when he gets out of session to call the governor. See, we had one last night, didn't we? He had a present time problem, was still running at a high roar today. What could you do for it? You saw what I did for it. I just said, "Ah, women!" And we went into the body of the session, didn't we? Did you notice that? We dusted that one off lightly. In the first place the pc practically sent it on Morse, radio, telephone, every other means of communication plus neon lights, "This is what you're supposed to audit on me. Second dynamic. My problem. This is what you're supposed to audit on me."

If I'd audited that on him, man, that would have been a Q and A to end all Q and A's. He wouldn't have gotten anyplace in the session anyhow. Did you know it was a rule that what the pc gives you in the rudiments is seldom what should be run at a long – on a long-term Prepcheck basis on the pc? Did you know that? You can handle a chronic PTP, that's about as far as you can go. The pc says, "The trouble with my case is I hate cart horses. Always had trouble with cart horses. Cart horses are always stepping all over me. Me and cart horses do not agree. In fact just coming down here to the session today a cart horse ran away and dumped apples all over my Austin. And I have terrible problems with cart horses. You see, my mother looked like a cart horse ..." And all this has been explained to me. I'm afraid I would consider myself guilty of no session control of any kind whatsoever if I ever had anything more to do with cart horses. Not that the pc said it, pc's perfectly willing to say what he please and I'm perfectly at liberty to take it up. But if he knows that much about it, that isn't what's wrong with him.

And you know one of the – one of the ways your prepchecking goes astray, every now and then, is you take what the pc gives you in the rudiments and try to make that right on the pc. Well you can't make it right because it isn't wrong.

Somebody gives you a long involved PTP – now a PTP of chronic long duration. You saw me audit a pc one day and I said – one evening and I asked the pc, said well, "I understand you've got a PTP of long duration. What was it?" and so forth and we cleaned it up, because it'd been coming up session, session, session, session, session, see. It was getting a reaction. There was every reason to audit that. But you know – you know half the time they never get a reaction. It's marvelous. If you ever audit a PTP on somebody that doesn't have any reaction, you have just committed a blunder for which you will pay dearly. It isn't you should be shot. You'll just wish you had been before you get through. [laughter]

Didn't react as a PTP and then you're going to handle it? Oh, no, man. Yet the pcs will very often tell you they have a PTP when they don't have. The way to handle it is quite honestly. "Do you have a present time problem?" The pc, "Oh, yes, yes, my mother was a cart horse." [laughter] You say, "All right, I'll check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem?" You say, "It doesn't react now, either." [laughter] "Didn't react the first time, doesn't react now." And don't ever take them up.

And when a pc rudiment after rudiment gives you the whole background history of his case and it's all on the third dynamic, they've been kicked out of the communists and they've been kicked out of this and they've been kicked of that and it's all third dynamic, third dynamic, third dynamic, third dynamic, third dynamic, aw for Chri – please, do a dynamic assessment. It's generally on the seventh or the first. It is never on the third. I just absolutely guarantee you it's never on the third. If they know that much about it, that isn't what's wrong with them.

A lot of times your prepchecking goes totally astray, because you're sold this bill of goods. You understand? Well, similarly, I suppose you could get a bill of goods sold to you by middle rudiments. Pc starts riding a hobby horse on the subject of middle rudiments, but never correct a middle rudiment unless it's out. And always tell the pc what you find out. And always tell the pc what is now in. Say, "That doesn't read." Or, in asking a package question, you say, "That Fail to Reveal reads. What is that? I'll ask the question again. Is there anything you failed to reveal in this session? Ah, that's fine. Good, good – check it on the meter." Keep him informed. And never put anything in that doesn't register that it's out. That is a hell of a thing to do to the pc. And if you can't get something *in* and it's still *reacting* and you're going to *leave it*, tell the pc you're going to leave it and it is still reacting. Be honest, see. And you know, there's very little consequence of doing that in most cases.

There's less consequence in doing that than spending the next five sessions trying to clean up something you haven't got a grip on anyhow. A middle rudiment – you must never make a profession out of one middle rudiment. Don't start a whole Prepcheck on Fail to Reveal in the middle of a Routine 3 or a Prepcheck, see. Don't keep asking it and asking it and asking it, you'll get tired of asking the thing. Pc hasn't leveled with you, it's still reacting. If you're going to leave it, tell him so. "This is still reacting, however at this time I'm going to leave that and see if it won't develop, and come clear later, thank you very much." See, be honest about it. You don't necessarily have to cancel every rudiment that comes up and hits you in the face. You better had, but if you leave them, tell the pc you have done so. And never correct one that is not out.

You check, "Do you have a present time problem?" That's clean. Now don't ask the pc, "Well, how's this problem about your mother seem to you now?" *Clang!* It's going to read again. So you say, "You see, he was being audited with a present time problem." No, "he wasn't. A rudiment's just something you dust off lightly and get on with the business. And that applies to middle ruds and it applies to every other kind of rudiments. You don't make – don't make a whole session out of a rudiment or you get the pc rudiment-broke. And he'll be very upset. Okay?"

All right, well that's middle rudiments. Use them all you want to, get familiar with them and I think you'll have good luck with them.

Thank you very much.

Good night.

HOW TO DO A GOALS ASSESS- MENT

A lecture given on 12 June 1962

What is the date?

Audience: Twelfth.

Twelve June, AD 12. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture 1.

All right. Yeah, you're very fortunate to hear this lecture tonight for several reasons. There's (1) I'm very busy writing the basic text on these things now and (2) is, why, I feel lazy. But you need the material, so nothing is too great a sacrifice. [laughter] I will go on and give it to you.

But it's very, very fortunate for you to hear this lecture because I am – got a plateau and every once in a while, why, some piece of Scientology can be wrapped up and you say that's that. You've seen several such pieces wrapped up. You have Havingness, Prepchecking – these things are all wrapped up. Model Session is in its final version. I'm writing it now. It mostly consists of corrections that have already been published, but the material is simply being released in one concise bulletin, and of course, "In this session" precedes everything, you see, rather than ends it.

I am satisfied now that Model Session used with middle rudiments, and so on, is a very close to perfect auditing form from the viewpoint of a pc. That is, nothing goes wrong that doesn't get handled, providing the auditor does it and can read a meter.

We've got the meter pretty well wrapped up. I knew there was a bug in the meter on account of people weren't being successful here and there, so there must have been a meter bug. And sure enough there was. They didn't know that an instant read came after the thing – after the line was uttered. The instant read never occurs before the last consonant – I like to get in plugs about instant reads because some people have to be told it a lot of times. It's after the last consonant in the sentence or, if a vowel comes last, after the last vowel. [laughter]

I just had a couple of old-time auditors make a mistake on this – I mean a couple of very expert auditors make a mistake on this. They were checking out a goal that didn't check out on me. I didn't think it – it didn't look right. It didn't sound right. Didn't have enough track with it. Didn't sound like my goal so I got a subjective reality on it. It was "To conquer Earth." No difficulty with conquering Earth. Had it conquered for thousands of years. But couldn't be a goal. They were reading it "To conquer." See? "To conquer," instant read. And you look that over, "To conquer Earth," see, and an auditor can say, "To conquer Earth," and watching his needle, the "Earth" and the needle can coincidentally act, you see? So because

you can say "Earth" so fast, of course, it must have been an instant read for "To conquer Earth," except the needle was moving while he was saying "Earth."

For an instant read to have occurred and for that to have been a valid read, the instant read would have had to have begun at "h" of "Earth," not at "E" of "Earth," see. And that is how cotton-picking precise you've got to be in reading an E-Meter, see. Now that was a wrong goal. Couldn't have been wronger. And the word "conquer" had a little charge on it. But apparently what made it hang as a goal was that it was the wrong goal. That's simple. You know, pc's disagreement and all of this sort of thing and the pc invalidating and everything and it messed up into a wrong read. But that's a fascinating one, isn't it, that the needle starts moving with the "E" of the last word and we get an entirely wrong goal.

Now, a right goal is terribly important. And if you can read a meter, it – reading a meter is a very precise action. It's not a sloppy action. And if you can read a meter and if you can prepcheck and keep rudiments in and if the pc has been properly prepchecked and brought up to a point where he can be audited, you can do a Goals Assessment, providing you do all these other things. But this is the touchiest action in Scientology, bar none.

And the name of this lecture tonight is "How to Do a Goals Assessment." I've talked about the final version of Model Session. Well, this is, as far as I'm concerned, a final version of how to do a Goals Assessment.

I'm studying this thing for quite a long time, trying to find out what people were doing wrong. After this, if you do something wrong with it, I'm not going to learn a thing from it, so you might as well do it right. It'd just be a wasted wrongness. I won't pay any attention to it at all. I'll just tell the Instructor, "Make them do it right." You know. *Baah*.

Now, the method of doing a Goals Assessment – quite precise. You probably could do something else than how I'm telling you this and possibly get the right goal. And on some pcs could do it easier than this. You understand? But at no time would I be comfortable that you had gotten the right goal.

And getting a wrong goal is so appalling, listing a wrong goal is such a wrongness, that you'll wish to God you'd never begun it by the time you wind up on it because you're going to throw the pc into fits.

Now, if a psychologist or psychiatrist, God forbid, ever started fooling around with Routine 3 in the University of Illinois where they copy Scientology and release it to United Press – alter-ised – Dr. Hungt there reads our books and releases them to United Press quite often. He's now decided – don't think he's very bright, man – he's now decided that children's intelligence could be raised. And all these years afterwards, he has now learned out of all the burden of Scientology he has read that intelligence can change. I think that's a masterpiece. What intellect! Makes him one of the brightest psychologists in the world. He was able to misduplicate and come out with some sort of a minor fact.

But if a psychologist or psychiatrist ever started fooling around with Routine 3 at the University of Chicago, pulled another gag of trying to take Book One and read it for ten minutes and then audit some people and then find out they didn't go Clear that afternoon, you know – that's the way they tested it – now don't, don't underestimate what I'm saying: they

could probably kill or make insane a patient. Let's not underestimate Routine 3. It'd take as much wrongness as those jerks would be capable of to do this. A mere Book Auditor couldn't do it, see. That's right. He couldn't make that many professional mistakes. You know, Evaluate, evaluate, evaluate, evaluate. "Oh, that isn't right. No, I don't think you could there. You sure your mother doesn't have a different goal than that? Are you sure that doesn't trace back to a childhood deformity?" You can hear them now, you know.

A fellow says, "Well, I wanted to play a harmonica."

"That's an oral action. Are you sure you don't have some homosexual goals?" Then they choose one of their own choosing, don't you see. And then they would list it wrong, and then they would ARC break the whole list, you see. And if you did that to that clownish degree that only such characters would be capable of – I'm not just being sarcastic. Only they are capable of it. Ordinary citizen wouldn't be able to figure out this many twists – they could either kill or drive insane a person. So you're not fooling with something with Routine 3 – any of the Routine 3 processes.

You list a wrong goal and you've had it. That is to say, the pc isn't going to die or go insane, but – on your hands – but he's liable to get awful sick. And he's liable to get dizzy. He's liable to feel quite spinny. Listing a wrong goal is not just agin the doctrine of Scientology, but it's agin the mechanics of the pc's bank.

I'm not going to attempt in this lecture to give you a full parade of why Routine 3GA works and why you have to have a goal, beyond saying that the goal is the prime postulate. It is the prime intention. It is a basic purpose for any cycle of lives the pc has lived, see. And reference is *History of Man*, cycles of lives.

Now, you get a cycle GPM and then a whole track GPM or a track GPM, you see. You could get a cycle GPM. Now, actually, the smallest cycle that you will see a goal and a prime postulate operating in, is you ask the pc, "What was the most severe operation you've had in your life?" and he says so-and-so. You just ask him for an engram, see. And you say, "All right. What goal did you have immediately before the engram?" And he will give you his goal just before the engram and then – if you did it very lightly – because otherwise it's liable to restimulate the bank because, of course, it's not a basic goal – you could actually disintegrate, probably, the engram itself just by getting the four-flows mechanics against that goal. See? That is your tiniest Routine 3, see?

A guy has an engram. He was in an automobile accident. "What was your – what was your postulate? What were your – what was your goal, idea..." and so forth. Immediately at the beginning of that accident, that will be the goal for that period of time. And any way the goal is not executed will be an alter-isness which creates a solidity, and that *is* the mechanics of an engram. That is how an engram suspends in space. It is the alter-ised prime postulate. And any alter-isness of that goal, you could call it, brings about a suspension of mass. The only way you get mass is by alter-isness.

Now, there it applies to an engram. I don't – I don't invite you to take engrams apart that way, because you're going to miss here and there. You'd have to do a little Goals Assessment at the beginning of the engram, don't you see, and work it out. Possibly you'd get away with it, but it might be so far – he might have been so far out of valence at the time the

thing occurred, and it might have been such an automaticity of circuitry, that you might have a goal which, if it were the wrong goal... See, you might not be able to reach his actual postulate, and if you listed for that little engram – the wrong goal – if you listed the wrong one, you would get a further solidification of the engram.

Now, you can do this with a life. All right. Just before you picked up that body, you had a goal. Just before, see? Bang. You had a goal. Now, that goal may have been carried out to some degree through the life or it may not have been. But to every single point that the goal was not executed, the person was doing something else during that lifetime. And in doing something else during that lifetime, mass was created in the mind, in the bank. So the lifetime finally winds up to be the accumulation of that mass which takes on a spherical shape with a hole in the middle of it, and that is your basic item on the track. That is a basic item on the track.

In other words, it begins with a goal for that lifetime. Now, I don't say that you again could do this for one lifetime – easily. You'd have to make a little goals list for the goals just before assumption in this lifetime. And you'd have to make a little list and do an assessment and that sort of thing. And you might come up with something. You might run out this lifetime; you might not. But this lifetime may be in opposition – the whole lifetime and that goal – might be in opposition to the basic cycle goal the fellow was running on, at which moment you would just get a beefing up, a growing of the mass. All auditing then adds to the mass of the bank. The net result of auditing is to make the bank beefier. Now, this is the basis of the Step 6 phenomena.

The Step 6 phenomena never occurred because of creativeness. It only apparently occurred because of creatingness. When what you are asking the pc to do was at great variance with the basic goal of the pc, you've got an increase of mass in the bank by reason of mocking things up. That's why it didn't happen with everybody.

Well, let's give you a gross and improbable example: Supposing the basic purpose of the individual was "not to be audited," and you were auditing the person, you would then get an increase of the bank. You get the idea? All of this is that – is that idiotically simple. The mass which is contained in the bank depends upon the amount of alter-iveness of the basic purpose of the person.

Now, there is a basic purpose, as I've shown you, for each engram. It's always before. Just like the instant read is always all the way afterwards, so the basic purpose is always all the way before – *all* the way before. It doesn't occur five minutes after the accident begins. It occurs before the accident occurs. It'll be there. The guy decides to have an accident or something like that. Usual. It's hard to find. So it occurs before the engram. It occurs before the lifetime. And it occurs – a basic purpose occurs before a *cycle* of lifetimes. A cycle is a similar or related series of doingnesses.

You know. It all happened in Arcturus. A guy is sixty thousand years in the vicinity of Arcturus, see. Well, that's a cycle. Then he decides to hell with Arcturus. Can't stand it anymore. He's got so many overts on it, he exteriorizes and lives for the next hundred thousand years in the area of Venus. Well, that's a new cycle, see.

So you get a cycle of lives. They don't necessarily depend on ... The definition of cycle is imprecise. It is simply similar areas and doingsnesses. Even though in Babylon he might have been a priest, he might have been a temple dancer, he may have been mayor of the town, he may have been captain of the guard, he may have been the sewer emptier, see? Because it's surrounded... And he might even have been out on the frontier or something in one lifetime, see. All kinds of different lifetimes, but somewhat united loosely by area or purpose. Loosely united. And you call that *loosely* a cycle.

But it is a sufficient change and departure from the last cycle to make its basic purpose stand independent. And this is very important to you in doing Routine 3. Because you want the basic purpose which stood before the earliest cycle you can get hold of that will register on the E-Meter. That is what you are looking for. Now, we call them goals, and they're much better expressed technically as a basic purpose.

We are looking, actually, for the beginning-of-cycle basic purposes. Now, we don't have to guide the pc in his understanding of this because you will get one basic purpose ticking – is all you're going to get anyway. Why only one? Because there is only one idea that is in disagreement with all other ideas in that mass. And that is the pc's basic purpose. And by definition it's in disagreement with all other activities, masses, items and ideas in that whole cycle GPM. It is the odd man out, man. And it can't help but register.

Now, if you audit it, it is responsible for all the subsequent alter-ness which caused all the other masses. And you're all right because every time you list another item, you have less mass in the bank. Not because the item does anything – but because by directing the pc's attention – and the basic purpose then falls out as the thrust behind the item. You're auditing the basic purpose out and the alter-nesses are what hold it in. You're not auditing out items.

Now, where does all this go in Routine 3? What happens to all these GPMs and counterbalances and items and masses and ridges and God-help-us's? What happens to them all?

If audited properly, they go *whooooo*, and they are no more, with Routine 3GA. They don't go back on the track. They don't go two miles out to the left – as they did with Routine 3. They go *whooooo* because there's nothing can support them. And you can take off maybe the last three cycle GPMs off the whole GPM, the track GPM, see. The track GPM is composed of all these cycle GPMs and sometimes they have stood separate for a very long time, and then the fellow led a very forceful cycle of lives and got them all condensed in on each other. Now, he's got *the* GPM, cycle after cycle after cycle after cycle. Oddly enough a basic purpose can stand independent at the beginning of a cycle sufficient to be listed because it disenturbulates all the things which came after. But it has to be the only one, the only idea. It has to be the right idea.

Now, supposing you list some other goal. Remember, every lifetime had a goal. I've just shown you every engram has a goal at the beginning of it. How many goals do you think this pc might possibly have in just one cycle GPM twenty thousand years long? Ghastly to think of. They aren't principal ones, but if you listed them all, they'd probably amount to thousands. Actually, he covers the bulk of them in under a thousand. You'll get – all you're trying to do is get your crack at the basic purpose just before the cycle – this whole cycle of lives.

Now, if we list one of these other goals that occurs, it is in opposition to the basic goal of that cycle. And every item we list will increase the mass of that GPM. You maybe can get away with it for a hundred items on each of the four lists. Your next hundred items, your pc will start going a little bit dizzy occasionally, and if you persisted in your error, the pc would all of a sudden be sick in his stomach and the dizziness would be very acute and the pc couldn't walk in a straight line and the pains in the pc's stomach would be agonizing

And if we went another hundred, persisting along this line, and so forth, why, the pc would probably be so wogged up, that it'd take him weeks to disenturbulate. You could certainly audit him into oddball psychosomatics he'd never heard of before. You see how it'd be done? You haven't got the thing that's being alter-ised. You've got something else that's increasing the alter-issness.

The basic purpose ... I'll give you an idea. The person had a goal to eat ice cream cones. Let's be ridiculous. Had a goal to eat ice cream cones and everybody came along and said you have to eat beef. And every time he said, "I want to eat an ice cream cone," somebody else said you had to eat beef – he'd develop a little more mass and ridges in his mind because he's doing something else. He can't as-is what's happening, you see, because he's supposed to be eating ice cream cones and he's now having to fight these people that want him to eat beef.

All right. So eventually he surrenders and becomes a beefeater. So he goes along eating beef and about this time he'll have trouble with his stomach. This we're for sure. So he decides at that time to be a doctor. Now, he finds out that he can't be a doctor because he has to have a license. See? As lifetimes roll along, there it goes. But his basic purpose was to eat ice cream cones. So now you've got the continuous alter-issness of eating ice cream cones by eating beef. And then you've got the continuous alter-issness of being a doctor which increases the mass. The more he's a doctor, the more he increases the mass of eating beef, the more he increases the mass generating around eating ice cream cones. You see? See how serious this gets.

All right, let's remove it a thousand activities up the track. At the thousandth activity, activity one thousand will, in devious zigzags, increase the mass of every other activity back down to the basic purpose or multiplies it by a thousand times. This becomes utterly intolerable, so one day he's flying a spaceship along, and he says, "There's a nice juicy sun." He gets up out of his – out of his pilot's chair and accidentally stumbles over the automatic control, jamming it irrevocably. Well, that's one way of getting rid of a GPM that is not very satisfactory. Now, but he thinks he's all over this now, and he's left it all back there on Sun 12 and so forth, and he's exteriorized and he's now being a nymph in the court at Venus. And that is entirely different. And his basic purpose is to raise hell with this place, and he can go off on another thousand lives before it catches up with him. You see that?

However, his cycles tend to get shorter, as you can see why. It gets too grim to live. The mass is too great to stand. Because it's painful. Living is painful. That's all there is to it. This is the source of pain. These accumulative masses. There are only these masses and free track in the reactive mind, that is all. And the free track, so called, is only in its mass state because it's impinged on the masses that are already there. So that is the composition of the

reactive mind. There isn't anything else in the reactive mind except an alter-isness of basic purpose.

But you understand that you've got a basic purpose at the beginning of each cycle. This is theory. The rest is absolute fact, but this is theory. At the beginning of each cycle there is a basic purpose and the fellow takes off along that line. And, that we look back, we get several cycles. Twenty, thirty different cycles, and if we could get the one right at the beginning, it would disenturbulate the whole track from there to there. Actually, you'd only have to ... If you could get the basic one and it would register on the meter, which is to say be entirely real in its location and area to the pc, you would have to list four items, and there'd be a bright flash where the pc was sitting and there wouldn't be anything left of him but a smile. [laughter]

Now, this is the touching faith of everybody in Scientology. They know there is a single button. Well, that's the single button. Difficulty with the single button is it isn't real to the pc. Won't even register. So what you're looking for is the first goal that you can reach which will stay active, that can be listed. And by listing it, you, of course, are going to run out the *subsequent* track to that goal. Subsequent track. You aren't going to get any track earlier than that. So when you got that goal flat, you're going to get the next goal that you can reach. And that will stay in. And then you can list that one and so forth. And eventually you'll get back to goal one that'll disenturbulate all the rest of it anyhow.

Well, the weird part of it is, is that one of those cycle goals, one that precedes the cycle, will list. That's what's peculiar. You're just lucky, but they will. Before I released 3GA with any velocity and so forth and wrote it up in proper bulletins and put it in the book and all this sort of thing, I wanted to be absolutely sure that I had my fingers exactly on it, and I didn't know why it worked. I didn't know exactly why it worked. So I went ahead and had to work out the rest of it. I had a lazy weekend. All I did was write a few bulletins and work that out.

Well, anyhow, the basis of a Goals Assessment then, is the discovery of – and you never mention to the pc that you want an earlier goal because these goals are all persistent and he takes them as this life or something like that – we never have to urge him, but we want the earliest goal that we can get that will register. It's got to be a prime postulate.

Now, oddly enough, the test for prime postulate is simply under the rules of assessment. You do proper assessment and a proper checkout, and if the goal stays in, then it's a prime postulate. It's the basic purpose at the beginning of some cycle. So it's safe to list. That is all you have to know. It'll drop with a single tick. If it drops with a double tick, it's just a missed withhold. It isn't a goal.

But if you follow the mechanics of assessment, you will wind up with this rather easily. Now, the mechanics of assessment follow. The Routine 3 auditor – not the Prepcheck auditor – the one who is going to do the goals listing and so on, no matter if the pc ... Pcs very often list goals on their own and bring them into session, so we're perfectly all right.

But the first time the auditor has his paws on this pc as a Routine 3 activity, whether the pc has already listed some goals or not, we care not, we want to make sure that that auditor does a Prepcheck based on the middle rudiments. That is the first action undertaken in a

Goals Assessment. And every fifth session thereafter, a Prepcheck of the middle rudiments will occur.

You understand, you use your middle rudiments continuously just as middle rudiments, but now we're talking about a *Prepcheck* of them. And that is just a highly stylized activity. You start your session in Model Session and you use as Zero Questions the following: "On goals have you ever suggested anything?"

Ditto, had anything suggested. Ditto, suppress. Ditto, had suppressed. Ditto, invalidated. Ditto, had anything invalidated. Ditto, failed to reveal anything. Ditto, been careful of anything Ditto, told any half-truth. Ditto, told any untruth. Ditto, influenced an E-Meter. Ditto, tried not to influence an E-Meter.

I don't know why you're writing them in your notebook. It's just the – with one single addition – it's the middle ruds and the beginning of the end ruds. And that single addition is suggested because we have had auditors around who suggested things to the pc. You can get a goal stuck in by suggesting the goal to the pc and it will then consistently register thereafter. Or the auditor has suggested the goal be worded a little differently and that will stick the goal, too. And you will get a read on it and it won't be the read of the goal. Do you understand that?

So you prepcheck those Zero Questions which are just your middle rudiments and the first two, three questions of the end rudiments, see? Use each one as a Zero and you just check them out and if the thing is getting a *bang-bang-bang* reaction, you just prepcheck it back. You form a What and get it back to the original and run it up, just like you do Prepchecking.

You must also prepcheck the same endings with, "On listing – ," and you must do the same Prepcheck with the listing "On items – ," ditto, see. It gives you quite a long list. You'd be amazed. And then on the word "goal." And you might as also take the word "listing," and you just prepcheck it as a single word. Your Zero in that case is "goal" or "goals" or "lists" or "listing." And if you get a knock on the E-Meter, you track it down. You want these words to be clean.

You see, that's very simple, and it's on goals, on listing, your middle ruds, beginning of your end ruds. Each one of these things makes a very embracive Zero Question. That's the formula of how you work that out. It took me fifty-one minutes. I checked this out to see how well and facilely it worked the other evening just before I released the information, and it took me fifty-one minutes to get rid of the lot – on the first time it was done on this pc. And it was clean as a wolf's tooth.

So it doesn't necessarily take a session. So you've got the other part of the session. Let's say you've done – this is your fifth session on goals on the pc, so therefore you're going to have to do a Prepcheck. Maybe the first hour would be occupied with the Prepcheck and then you'd close it out and start up your session again and your second hour would be occupied with a Goals Assessment. You understand?

It isn't necessarily true that you would have to occupy the whole of a two-hour session or a five-and-a-half-hour session or something like that. It's just in the fifth session, each fifth session you're going to do this Prepcheck. And that keeps you from working the middle rudi-

ments to death all the time. See, that lets you pick up chain reaction on these things, because your middle ruds are always being asked, "In this session – ," you see. And it can get a little bit frantic after a few hours, so it's a good thing to go back and do ... Well, let's pick up the whole chain and it probably goes back to childhood with some interference with lists, you know. I mean, that's right. That's right.

We found a teacher that was – knew how to teach. She told each one of her pupils to go over to the library and list all the trees there were, all the animals there were, all the birds there were. The little kids didn't have any time to play. They were just over there opening up books. They didn't know anything about the trees or the flowers, the plants or anything. They were just writing down arborvorous, arborvicons. You know, trying to spell it – hour after hour after hour.

This was listing, so of course this pc was having a little bit of trouble listing. And then I... You always find grocery lists and things like that all stacked up on the track, too. Or the people wouldn't give you a list. They sent you to the store, said get some strawberries, cheese, kerosene, half a dozen limes, six eggs and some ham. That is the missingness of a list. You go down the street saying, "Half a dozen kerosenes ..." [laughter]

That's the kind of thing you want off here. You want it – and you won't get them off, of course, just asking middle ruds, because your middle ruds have no track. They have just the session. They don't even have the track of the auditing sessions you've been running. They only have the track of this session. So that's your middle rud. Now, the reason you get that out is that you won't have any – anything much getting in your road and your needle going wild on that sort of thing.

Now, of course, in checking out one, you do this Prepcheck before you check out the goal. I don't care if you just did it last session. You found the goal now and you got it there. Well, let's do a Prepcheck and then let's check out the goal.

Now, one of the reasons you keep doing this and you keep prepchecking these middle rud Zeros is because the pc keeps changing under a Goals Assessment. Not as much as under listing, but they change. New incidents come up, new ideas, that sort of thing.

All right. Your first action then of a Goals Assessment is to prepcheck the middle ruds as Zeros. Your next action is to start listing, in Model Session, keeping your rudiments in with your sensitivity set for a one-dial drop, with some kind of an eye on the tone arm so that you can whiz along and you all of a sudden see that the needle's motionless, the tone arm's motionless, and there's nothing much happening, and well, your rudiments are out.

Now, I don't particularly tell you that you should read anything extraordinary, marvelous or wonderful from your meter while you are listing. Tone arm action is relatively unimportant and so forth. But you need that meter there tuned up and in function because you will get accustomed to taking some information from the meter even as you list.

Now, the second that you get the pc slowed down, doped off or a bit out of session, having a hard time listing goals, having a hard time thinking of more goals, you get in the middle rudiments. And of course your middle rudiments contain just suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal and been careful of.

There is an additional middle rudiment that might apply to specialized pcs and you might like to use it. And the pc is actually suppressing suggestions and sometimes the pc doesn't rate it under the head of suppression. And it comes under "failed to suggest." "Did you fail to suggest something." The pc's sitting there madly out of session because they wanted to suggest that you do something, but they know that they're not supposed to and that you won't take it up anyhow, and all kinds of complications and so on. If you run into that kind of a situation, why, you can run "failed to suggest" into your middle rudiments. I'm not necessarily leaving it in there because I found out that it quite often comes up under the heading of suppressions. And you'll get a reaction on the thing if it's seriously out.

The middle ruds are never intended to be clean from a standpoint of the whole track. Rudiments are never intended to be clean from the standpoint of the whole track. Nothing is lasting about rudiments, you understand? Even when you prepcheck rudiments, don't expect it to be lasting. So just because you've gotten the rudiments in on listing five minutes before is no reason they're not now out.

Now, one of the things that you're sloppiest about is getting in – getting the rudiments in without knocking the pc out of session. You've got to get in, get your rudiments out – get in, get your rudiments in and then get back into session rapidly so that you don't make this thing a lifetime profession with tremendous weight on it so they're way out of session worrying about their rudiments. They're way, way out of session worrying about their rudiments when they should be thinking about their goals. You understand?

Giving middle rudiments the wrong weight, getting things very, very upset is one of the worst crimes that you can do under listing. Your rudiments can be used to throw the pc out of session as easily as to throw them in. But expert use of the rudiments and a refusal to Q-and-A with the pc, getting in, getting them in, getting them out again, leaving them clean every time, and so forth, is marvelous assistance on listing.

Now, your main idea in listing is to get something on the order of 850 goals listed before you do another thing. Eight hundred and fifty listed before you do another thing. Why? Very well the goal may be in the first 150 and most often is, but insufficient charge is off of the bank for you to isolate that goal easily. Insufficient charge.

The goals are so heavily charged up that you are not going to be able to separate one goal from another. You're going to come off with the goals remaining in very hard, going over it with many nullings, worrying, worrying, worrying, worrying, worrying, and it worries an auditor silly. You're not going to do 850 because the goal is not on the list until you've written the 850th goal, see. You're going to do it to discharge the goals list of charge, so that you can then find the goal.

You will very often find that it – the goal did appear in the first 150 goals listed. But don't worry the pc about this because the pc doesn't know it anyhow. The one thing the pc doesn't know is his own goal.

The pc who comes up and tells you that this is his goal and that is that and who tries to do a big sales talk even, you know, one pc out of five will monkey the meter. Did you know that? Oh, it's that prevalent. You know, shift the eyeball with the havingness down, you know. Start to sell the auditor the goal. Sometimes they sell it to the degree of lifting a little finger

off of the can. Fact. They want to have that goal. They know what goal they should have. They know better than the auditor or the E-Meter, and they get a wrong goal every time they do it.

Well, the goal is what the goal is. Not what the pc wants it to be and not what the auditor hopes it will be. The auditor can interject his hope on the thing to such a degree that he'll weight the session. And by suggestion, get the goal to continue to tick. And then if his middle ruds are badly cleaned up – see, the middle ruds'll get the tick off if it's ticking because of any other reason than it's the goal; don't worry about that. This goal can actually sit there and tick and respond every single time because the auditor suggested it to the pc.

So you come along and you find some pc who has – some auditor, and he had the goal "To shoot pigeons." And you'll find out that he tends to find on the pc the goal "To shoot woodcocks." That is very fascinating. How does he make it? He weights it. He actually can *suggest* to the pc one way or the other. It has to be quite overt. It's not esoteric at all. "Well, heh! Let's – let's – let's go in for this goal now. This – this – this one. Ha! This goal here. Ha! Ya! Ha! Yeah, we haven't been getting much excitement here. I'm glad we're to this goal now because I want to really check *this one out*: 'To – ' now, are you listening, huh?"

We've been running along at this rate, see, "To catch catfish, to run over poodles," so forth, you see. We get all of a sudden this burst of enthusiasm, you see. And then we get: "All right. *To shoot woodcocks.*" [laughter] For some reason or other the goal will continue to read. [laughter] Why? Well, it's just weighted to such a degree that it's gone over the border-line to a suggestion.

The auditor then, by being *sure* of what the pc's goal is, can actually weight the goal for the pc. And have done it. I've seen some of them checked out. Five goals found by one auditor. They were all alike on five different pcs. Quite similar. [laughter] It isn't anybody present.

I got a hurry-up despatch not so long ago that – auditor told me they finally found this pc's goal. They knew that everybody else had it wrong. Isn't it interesting there was only one word difference between the pc's goal and that auditor's goal. Well, I assure you of something – they're never that close together. Man in his infinite variety doesn't have standard goals because in the first place you're picking up beginning of cycle goals, and God knows what they'll be. What infinite variety occur in these things. And they're with their own wording and they're on their own subjects and so forth.

There is on the eighth dynamic a little more coincidence of goals than on any other dynamic. You'll find that God will come in more often. You know, if you've got – in any hundred cases you'll probably find all of them are different except maybe five, six, eight, something like this, will all have a goal that has something to do with gods or God, or something. It's the most incidence, and that's because there's the least subject matter in this civilization at this time on the subject of the eighth dynamic. We're still using Akhenaton's invisible big-thetan theory. And there's one God, don't you see? And you can't see him and it's only peculiar to this time and place, see. If you were doing this in pagan Rome, you wouldn't get that much coincidence. It's just for the lack of objects on the eighth dynamic. There is – some-

body's stuck on the eighth dynamic, you see, they tend to get the same object person after person.

All right. Your first action is the Prepcheck. Your next action is the listing. When the slowdown occurs on the listing, you get your middle rudiments in without making the case go z-z-z-z-z. You get them in smoothly, quickly and get out of there with no Q and A. No heavy weight. Get back on to your listing and go 850 before you null anything. I don't care if you go 1,000, but just don't stop south of 850. Much easier on the pc in the long run.

Now, it's true that very often you would be able to get away with it at 500. See? But you'd be getting away with something at 500 and you might wind up in a ball. The pc hasn't listed enough goals to get enough charge off the goals that you get easy nulling so you waste *all* of the time on nulling that you thought you saved on goals listing. And you even waste more time. In addition to that, if the goal isn't yet distinct, if charge enough isn't off of the case, then you're going to get this oddity. You're going to list the 500 and not have a goal for the pc. So you're going to list another hundred and not have a goal for the pc. And then you're going to list another hundred and not have a goal for the pc. Three loses in a row. Now, how do you think you're going to keep the middle rudiments in easily, huh? All right. Let's give him 4, 5, 6, you see, because now his rudiments are so far out that you can now start missing it. In other words, you're making it difficult. This is a difficult Goals Assessment to go by fits and starts. Some of you've got reality on that.

So just start right on out and list 850 and when you've got 850 or thereabouts, why, then bleed your meter down. "Are there any more goals?" "What about goals?" something like this. And "Are there any goals that should be on this list?" You get a reaction. Well, get some more.

Now, do a Prepcheck. Remember that you can get a reaction because the pc is ARC broke. You kept asking him for more goals and he didn't have more goals. And you didn't have your – you know and the pc couldn't tell you this. So the fact that there aren't no more come – becomes a missed withhold with the pc and you get fantastic needle reaction on goals, on asking for more goals, when in actual fact the pc is simply ARC broken. The thing you want to do is ask the pc if he has an ARC break and if you get a reaction, clean it up and then ask if he has any more goals, and you'll find out he doesn't have.

All that comes under the heading of simply keeping your rudiments in.

All right. In other words, you bleed down the situation. You bleed down the meter on the list. You try to get all the goals that the meter is calling for. Now, you start in at the top and you null and this is the way in which you null. You null, of course, with your rudiments in and you should be getting needle reaction on goals as you null. If you're getting no needle reaction of any kind, your pc is out of session. Your rudiments are out.

But if you're getting the occasional tick and tock as you go along, your rudiments aren't out. So it's at... If you suddenly notice that you're not getting any ticks or tocks or anything of the sort as you go along, well, your rudiments are out and you better get your rudiments in in a hurry. You see what makes it ... Actually you can tell if the rudiments are out by whether or not the goals you read one after the other are each one reading because they'll all

read to some degree. They got some action on the needle. You can tell a live needle and a dead one.

All right. Now, this is the way you call a goal out. You read the goal three times. You "okay" the pc after every time you read it. "To catch catfish. Thank you. To catch catfish. Thank you. To catch catfish. Thank you. That's out."

There is your most favorable patter. The pc hasn't said a word now, you know. The pc is just sitting there in a glorious state of irresponsibility about this.

Now, if the goal is null on the last two reads, you take it out. And if either one of the last two reads are live, you leave it in. The symbol to take it out is an X. The symbol to leave it in is a slant. You put an additional slant or an X every time you read a goal. In other words, it's cumulative. If you've read this goal five times, you will have five slants after it. If you read it five times, and then on the sixth read it went out, it'll be five slants and one X.

All right. Now, "To catch catfish. Thank you. To catch catfish. Thank you. To catch catfish. Thank you. That is out."

Now, that first nulling, the whole nulling of the whole list is done at a one-dial drop on the cans, please. One-dial drop.

When you put your rudiments in, you have to get over there and shift your sensitivity up to 16, of course. Rudiments are always put in at 16. And then they're cut back to the one-dial drop setting before you go on nulling. And don't make a mistake on that because you make a fool out of yourself. All of a sudden, everything is in. Everything is in, you see. And you don't want that.

All right. If the last two reads of that three, either one of the last two read, you leave it in. But if the last two are null, you take it out. That is at a one-dial drop. And that is how you call them in or out. Relatively simple.

All right. Now, you go over this list. If you've listed 850, by the way, you may only find one goal per column staying in. Very slight. But you'll be getting – that first one will tick. You'll see some reaction on the first one and then no action on the next two on almost every goal. There are very few of those goals will be completely flat on the first mention.

All right. Now, having read this list through to a point where you have 30 or 40 in, I don't know how many times you'll have to go over it to only have 30 or 40 in, maybe over the whole list twice, something like that. But you've got 30 or 40 left in. You reduce the list to that many left in.

Copy those goals onto a separate sheet of paper. Mark it a copied list. Be very careful that your middle rudiments are very beautifully in and crank your sensitivity up to 16 and don't leave one of those goals with any charge on it at all. There must be no charge on any part of that final list at sensitivity 16, when you finally announce "I have the goal."

In other words, the fifth one down from the top on that final list: that's got charge on it and the eighth one's got a little tick on it and the tenth one's got a tick on it and the twelfth one is reading like mad and you say, "All right. That twelfth one is it." No, that twelfth one isn't it

because you have not checked it out. You couldn't have checked it out because there are two or three other goals on that list that had ticks left in them.

So after you have gotten it all ground down to a fine powder and there's only one goal on that final list ticking, you say, "All right. This looks like it. We're going to check it out."

And now you do a nice, complete Prepcheck. Polish it all up beautifully, do a nice, complete Prepcheck. Get the pc's havingness in good shape. Shouldn't take you long to do either one of those things. Roll up your sleeves and read that goal against every other goal on the 30 to 40 list. Something like playing a game with a knife whereby you – you've always got to touch this X and touch a number of other X's at the same time and your knife touches the random mark and then it always touches the single X. Your goal is the single X, so you say – let's say the goal was: "To catch catfish." It's "To catch catfish. To shoot opera singers. To catch catfish. To drown pleasantly. To catch catfish. To join the navy. To catch catfish. To commit suicide," see?

And every one of those random ones must be flat and that last centerpin goal must be ticking every time for you to say, "I have a goal on the pc." Then you say, "I have a goal on the pc."

Now, cleaning up this goal with the middle ruds – it is understood that after you've prepchecked all the stuff in general, you're going to have middle ruds running. Well, your middle rudiments will run against this goal. I must mark this. Middle ruds could be run against lists, goals, a goal. "Has the goal 'to catch catfish' been invalidated?" See? Any one of your middle ruds. You ask them all. "Is there anything about the goal 'to catch catfish' that you have failed to reveal?" "What's that? That. That."

The very funny part of it is that your goal can stay in because the middle ruds are out and can be out because the middle ruds are out. You pays your money and you takes your chance. But if the middle ruds are completely flat on that goal and it reads, that is the goal.

Now, it should read every time tick, tick, tick, "To catch catfish. Tick. To catch catfish. Tick. To catch catfish. Tick. To catch cat-" See? But you may have a pc who breathes or something and you'll get a sudden upswing of the needle, which is too fast or too violent for the impulse to check. And your eye does not detect the infinitesimal slowdown of the upward throw. So as the needle is flying around, you say, "To catch catfish. To catch catfish." Those are in, see. "To catch catfish." And that one, there was a ... You said that on a violent upward swing of the needle. The pc would say *hrrrrrr* or something, you know. And a needle has weight and its inertial swing, as it's coming up with great rapidity or going down with great rapidity, can sometimes overcome the motion of a goal. So that would be the exception – the exception. Your needle would have to be moving quite speedily before you would get that exception, and actually if your eye was very sharp, you'd even tick – you'd even detect the tick in the middle of it even that time.

Now, that is a goal. That is a goal listed, found and checked out. There is actually no more to a Goals Assessment than that. And there isn't actually anything else to a Goals Assessment than that. Nothing mysterious about it, because that makes a very easy assessment.

That's carefully plotted to get you around an innumerable complexity of troubles that have existed in the past.

That it appears to be very simple is quite deceptive. Don't think of it as being terribly simple, so therefore it doesn't much matter what we do with it. We can make it a little more complicated, can't we?

For instance, let's ask for the goal in peculiar ways. How do you ask for a goal? Well, you just simply say, "Well, what goal have you had? Have you ever had a goal?" I don't care what. The only categories that you ask for particularly – you could ask for middle rud categories of goals. Goals that you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of. Now, there's – you could use your middle ruds to get you more goals. Under failed to reveal, of course, you could get such a subdivisional heading as secret goals, antisocial goals, goals you withheld from other people. So you could make various classifications, but don't go beyond that in terms of classifying goals.

You got your middle ruds and you could discuss those angles, but just ask for goals. Don't ask for a list of goals you shouldn't have had, see. Don't ask for a lot of offbeat type of things because you'll wind up with some other part of the track, see. You'll wind up with oppgoals. And God's sakes, don't get an oppgoal on the list.

Now, put anything on the list the pc wants on the list. Put it on the list as many times as the pc says it, in as many different ways as the pc says it. We don't care if he puts the goal down fifty times, "To catch catfish," and it turns out to be the wrong goal after all. We don't do any guidance on what he can have on the list or not on the list and we never advise him to reword something. We never try to build a goal out of the numerous parts of goals we have seen come in. Nothing tricky. We just write it down and that's the way it is from there on out.

Now, if the pc wants to add goals, we will add goals to the list at any time. We'll always add goals to the list. But if a pc wants to change the goal, we leave the goal in and we put the new wording down. We never eradicate a goal just because the pc wants to change his wording. We just put the new wording down. Get the idea?

When you get the second goal, you follow almost exactly the same procedure except the numerousness of the original list is not required. You don't have to list that many. You've already got 850 you're going to have to null all over again.

Okay. That is how you do a Goals Assessment. Fairly simple, huh? There will be bulletins and other materials out on it, but I have given you this lecture so that you would actually have it well in advance of its publication because you're using this material all the time and therefore need it. Okay?

Thank you.

MORE ON MIDDLE RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on 12 June 1962

All right, this is the second lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. June 12, AD 12. All right, this is going to concern nothing but middle rudiments which you haven't had very much information on. I'll give you how to do mid rudiments plus a few comments on fish and fumble. It's getting to be one of my favorite activities and you use them in conjunction with middle rudiments. You can.

Now first a remark on Q and A. When you ask a second question or double question the pc, you of course are omitting your TR 2 gorgeously. That's one of the weakest points in the broad body of auditors. TR 2, you wouldn't think so. Two Central Orgs have recently asked me for a new TR 4. It isn't TR 4 that is at fault. It is TR 2. An adequate acknowledgment is worth a very great deal in auditing. Now one of the ways of not acknowledging is to ask again. And that of course is the stinkiest TR 2 there is. "Do you have a present time problem?" "I had a fight with my wife last night." "What about?"

Now, if you get one of those things going you're going to spend the rest of the session, as an auditor did today, cleaning up the PTP. Now, I don't claim that auditor particularly didn't throw the TR 2 in. But certainly there must have been something going on there that didn't have too much to do with the price of oysters in Australia. Something. Otherwise this would have come off. Now frankly the auditor ran, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for," worded like that, not having isolated the problem the pc had. Which of course gave the rest of the session, as an auditing action.

Now, in trying to handle a Q and A, trying not to Q and A, you're liable to pull all sorts of oddball things, like not get the answer to the auditing question. You're liable to use the Q and A, you see. You mustn't Q and A so therefore you don't get the answer to the auditing question. "Do you have a present time problem?" "I feel all right."

Now of course it's not a double question, because the comm lag is the length of time between the auditor's asking of the question and the pc's reply to that exact question. There are fewer fundamentals missing today than you might think and that ...

"Do you have a present time problem?" "I feel fine" is just part of the comm lag. The pc has now begun a comm lag. That isn't an answer to the auditing question. So therefore you have to ask the question again. So you say, "Well, I'll repe-" You can say, "Uh-huh" or something and say, "I'll repeat the auditing question: Do you have a present time problem?" Well, that's not a Q-and-A. But it requires that the auditor hear what the pc said. So frankly TR 2 should include understand and acknowledge.

Now, more auditors go out of ARC with pcs by pretending to understand, I think, than any other single reason.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" and the pc says, "*Wah fi fooel.*" And you say, "Thank you." And at that moment a great black miasma settles down over all like Pittsburgh smoke. You know? There it is. You've now got a missed withhold. See? The auditor now has a withhold. He didn't understand what the pc said.

Now if you're so diffident about answering up and talking to your pc you of course can do this often. But if you have – didn't understand what the pc said, then for God's sakes say so. Not, "You mumbled" see, but "I didn't get it." you always put the onus on the auditor. You'll find the pc, after he's been questioned five or six times, answering perhaps with some asperity. But oddly enough he doesn't have an ARC break. He only gets the ARC break when the missed withhold accumulates in the auditor. "Do you have a present time problem?" "*Slaf wof whoove.*" "Oh, thank you!" For what, man? See, there's nothing there. You say, "I didn't get that."

A lot of you don't make old TR 10 function because you don't know what the pc is pointing at. "Point out something, thank you. Point out something, thank you." You know, the pc says, "*Wwhm, hmm.*" You don't know what he's pointing at. So of course you have to salt it down with two-way comm. If you're running such a general process that can't be usually understood, you have to say, "What'd you point at?" He says, "The wall." Well, just because he says it somewhat acidly is no reason he's got an ARC break. It's when he doesn't talk that he has ARC breaks. A pc who's screaming by the way is less ARC broken than a pc who won't talk.

Now, therefore all rudiments questions, not just the middle rud, have to obtain an answer, have to obtain an answer to the question asked. And if the question is answered, the auditor simply understands and acknowledges it. And that is all that happens. It is only when it becomes manifestly, gargantuanly impossible to clean it with single questions, repeated over and over, that you finally resort to a rudiments process.

Now, if a pc gets the auditor's question and answers the auditor's question and the meter is cleaned on that exact question, you'll find out, if your TRs are any good at all, that the number of rudiments processes you need are zero. The rudiments are now that good, if you're really putting it through and checking it on the meter and cleaning it up.

All right. Now, what happens in using a rudiment? You say – I'm using by the way an old rudiment so they won't get in your road here – "Do you have a present time problem?" See? And the pc said, "I have – yes, I have a headache" or something like that. You say, "Thank you. I will check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? That still reads. Do you have a present time problem?" The pc isn't talking.

"Oh, yes, I have another, I've got an appointment right after the – right after the session."

"Thank you. I will check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? That is clean. Thank you very much."

Now, doesn't matter how many times you go through that evolution, go through it forty times if you have to. It is more effective than a process.

What was peculiar about this auditing mistake today – just to not stress anything – was that frankly the one thing that will clean up on a repetitive request *is* a present time problem.

"Do you have a present time problem?"

"I have a headache."

"Thank you. I will check it on the meter. Still reads. Do you have a present time problem?"

"Uh – see. *Ooooh-oo ah umm*, got an appointment right after the session."

"Thank you. I will check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? It still reads."

"Well I – uh – I'm sunburned. Uh – it's a little uncomfortable sitting in the chair."

"All right. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. I will check it on the meter." See. "Do you have a present time problem? That still reads."

"Aaaa-hm."

"Well, do you have a present time problem?"

"Well, yes, I do. Actually I don't feel good being audited – uh – uh – uh – uh, here – it's so nice outside. Now the present time problem is being – ins – yeah, it's being inside when I should be outside."

"All right. Thank you. Thank you very much. I will check that on the meter. Do you *have* a present time problem? Thank you. That is clean."

There is an old process: Tell me a problem you have had or tell me a problem you have. You know. Pc's always different, always different, always different. It's practically running the same process. See?

So, each one of these things actually converts into a direct process. It's just like you're running a direct process so the rudiment in that wise is used as *the* process. So why do you need a process? See, that's the question. Why do you need a process? You've got one.

"Since the last session have you done anything you are withholding?" Clank. "That reads. What was that? What was that you were thinking of? Yeah, that right there."

"Oh, well, I – I – I kissed one of the fellow students last night. I – hmmm."

"All right, thank you. Good. Thank you very much. Since the last session have you done anything that you are withholding?" See? It's an auditing question, isn't it? So you're just checking the answer every time to find out if you should go on running the process, that's all you're doing. And if you look at an anti-Q-and-A activity of getting a rudiment in in this fashion it all of a sudden will make marvelous sense to you. You will be able to make it work. You won't be sitting there in a tremendous impatience to have this run out. All you want to do is have the pc answer it and have the meter not read then. See? That's the only thing. And

every – actually every one of them is an auditing question. So you run the process till the meter doesn't read. On the needle of course. See there?

So there goes your – the – your session gets very smooth. You can understand that an old repetitive process would go something on the basis of, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Thank you. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Thank you. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Thank you." See. Or whatever it is. And you know that sooner or later the guy is going to run out of steam. He's going to run out of answers. When he runs out of answers, you don't get no further reaction, that's the time you leave it.

So it's sort of auditing something against the needle, not against the tone arm. If you look at it in that wise, why you will become very, very clever at getting your rudiments in.

Now, don't go asking a rudiment *after* a rudiment is clean. "Do you have a present time problem?"

Pc says, "No." You say, "I'll check it on the meter, here." Now look, when you said do you have a present time problem, you got no read at all. What are you doing hanging around waiting for the pc to answer it? You answer for the pc. This doesn't leave an unanswered auditing question. I mean, that's another little trick you can do. You know you can sit back and repeat a phrase out of the pc's bank, you know. You can take a phrase and repeat it and repeat it and repeat it and repeat it and it will eventually go null in the pc's mind. Did you know that?

You know the auditor can do that on his own responsibility. He can also answer for the pc to this degree. He finally says, "Do you have a present time problem? Oh, that's null. Thank you. That's clean. Ha, ha, good. All right." Pc hasn't said a word.

And he says, "Well, I don't have to worry about that."

It's not a trick, it's just a fact. Why hang around waiting for the pc to dig one up? Let's take it while it's clean, man.

Now, this is – this is pure cruelty. "Do you have a present time problem?" No reaction at all on the meter, you see.

Pc says, "God, he's looking at me. It must be that I have a present time problem." So help me Pete he gets the problem of having to find a problem. Now, you ask it again and he's got a problem. So a double question goes about the meter as well as the pc. If you've asked the question and got it clear, get out of there, man. Don't ask it twice. The only time you ask it twice is when you get an equivocal read. Well, we don't have to use this high school word "equivocal" but I normally do. I couldn't tell. You know. Well, there's several ways that you can't tell, as a pc is coming on and being audited at sensitivity 16, you sometimes start your question with the needle on the dial and by the time you have gotten the question out of your mouth the needle is off the dial. And you sometimes have to run against the dodge of really throwing the needle with the tone arm down against the pin starting a long rudiments question and end it as the pc bounces back on the meter and shows that you have no read. Did you know you could do that? You have to be pretty sharp with a meter not to be wiggling it at the time the actual end of the question occurs. That requires very smart thumb action. But you

sometimes have to do it, you get your needle so floppy. That's all in the tools of the trade, however. And there's nothing unusual about that.

But your needle's null, it's null. Don't leave anybody in suspense about it. You've watched me audit there. You ever see any pcs I've been auditing in these demonstrations complain about any of this? No. You've seen me do this in demonstrations.

"Do you have a present time problem?" "That's null. Thank you." We're out of there and away and gone into the next one, see. Now if it's equivocal, "Do you have a present time problem?" And at that moment it's off the pin and you say, "I didn't get that read. I'm going to have to ask it again," see. Jack it around. "Do you have a present time problem? All right. That's null." Merely looks to the pc as though you were being careful, which you are. But don't leave him in suspense. Sometimes on a goal or something like this you can get an equivocal read. You don't know whether it read after the "h" at the end of the sentence, see, "... to conquer Earth." Or whether it read at the "E" or something. You just weren't sharp enough at that moment to tell exactly where that thing read. See, the pc's got some bugs. Pc's doing a think-think about something else and there's an occasional tick-tick here and there occurring on the meter. Well, the tick might have occurred at that point and if it's important at all, you say, "Well it's an equivocal read." You know. And ask it again. Because that's the onus on you. You couldn't read the meter. You didn't read the meter, that's why you're asking again. And that's the only time when you check a clean read.

Don't – it – say, "Do you have a present time problem? That's clean. All right. Now I'm going to make sure. Do you have a present time problem? That's clean." Hell, you've weighted the rudiments now to a point where the pc will stagger under their burden. And the pc's case will stagger. Also, it seems kind of stupid. Can you read a meter or can't you? Is the meter reading or isn't it? See? You're questioning the meter, now. And that's a double question. This is as destructive to the use of rudiments as anything else.

So a rudiment is basically a process. Being a process it of course is run until it doesn't react on the needle. In view of the fact that we're not trying to run it flat on the case, we can only run it flat on the needle. The second it is flat we don't give the pc any chance to cognite or stretch or tell you that it's flat, we tell him it's flat and we get out of there.

That is not evaluative because the pc knew before you did.

He gets a feeling that it's all right.

Now, if you go reverse end to and call one clean that isn't clean, through some misguided expediency on your part, of course you've set up the session for an ARC break from Hell to Halifax.

You always call a meter right. Don't ever call a meter with expediency. If you have a meter that you can't call and you don't know, say so. And if you're going to leave something live without cleaning it, say so. *Be informative*, auditor, be informative. Otherwise your R-factor flies out the window. You have to be informative consistently and continuously. You have to tell the pc this is what is going on. Let's not have the pc sit there in the dark worrying, worrying, worrying, worrying, see. You have to tell the pc what you're going to do and why you're doing it.

All right. The pc is going along the line and he's been – he says, "To catch catfish, to chase waterbucks, to kill tigers, uh – uh – to uh – to catch big catfish, *ummmm* – to catch big catfish – yah." What are you going to do? You going to sit there, wait for a holiday? This is something like painting a wall and leaving half of it unpainted, you know. It is the same thing. You're not going to sit there and let the pc go on and on and on, on auto in the first place. The way for calling for a goal or a list item is you call a stylized question. All right.

"What other goal have you had?" Something like that, see. "Tell me another goal you've had." And he gives you one and, "All right. You got another goal?" (it's rather informal type of question) and he says, "Yes!" He says, "To catch catfish, to drown waterbuck, to shoot tigers, uh – to paint battleships, to go down chutes, to murder little children, *ummm* – uh ..."

What are you going to do at that time? Are you going to sit there and wait? He's already given you about six answers beyond the answer you asked for – which is perfectly all right. Don't say to the pc, "No, now you've given me one. You've given me one. Now, just wait for a moment till I ask the auditing question again, you see." Hell, you'll throw him out, if his interest is put on the auditor and that sort of thing. So he gave you six. All right. And you have a hell of a time writing them down. Well, calmly catch up with writing them and the time you are halfway through the last one that you're writing, why give him the question again. See?

Now, he says, "*Hhh-hh.*"

You say, "Yes, yes. Any other goal you've had."

"Aaahh-hm."

You say, "All right. Now we're going to do a few middle rudiments if that's all right with you." He looks at you kind of dumbly and says, "Why?"

"Well we just don't seem to be listing as easily as we can, maybe something has gone out here." Tell him anything you want to, see? "And we're just going to do them just to be sure. Just to be sure." And you rattle off your middle rudiments question.

"In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of" is the question, but of course it runs like this in actual use:

"In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Yes. What was that?"

"Oh ..."

"Yeah, suppressed. That. That there."

"Oh, well that. I've just been trying not to tell you that uh – I find it very, very, very hard to – to confide in you these – these – these various goals about murdering children. I – I – actually had – had – had a couple more of them and I didn't tell you."

You say, "Thank you. All right, I will check that. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? That's clean."

Now we go: "In this session is there anything you have invalidated? Failed to reveal? Yes. What's that? Failed to reveal. What is it?"

"Oh! It's just, these two goals about the – killing children. Ha-ha, yeah."

Say, "Good. Thank you very much. I'll check that. In this session is there anything that you have failed to reveal? That's clean. All right. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? Thank you. That is clean. All right. Tell me another goal you've had."

See? That's the way you handle them. You'll find out you'll win every time if you handle them that particular way. In other words you cut in at it as though you're going to take care of it in the shortest possible fashion. And if you've got one clean you sure don't repeat it. See? You leave that one alone.

Now you go on and list goals again and oddly enough you will find that your person is perfectly willing now to list goals. Perfectly willing to list goals. Every time the listing slows down, *bloombo!*

Well, about every fifth session they've gotten enough residual out-of-session nonsense kicked around that had been – invalidating enough and monkeying around enough that it's worth a Prepcheck. But supposing the pc came into session – we're going to do it every fifth session anyhow – and supposing the pc came into session and you got the beginning rudiments in all right and then you said, "All right, now on this goal list...."

"Well, I don't know that I want to list any more today. Can't we do something else because I just *assssar-bisar-hmm-berar-rrarrwow-rrorrowow.*"

Well, you got your beginning rudiments in so it can't be them. See? It must be the middle rudiments. So just go ahead and prepcheck your Zeros. Because now you're going to catch it. All the invalidations of listing as a subject, invalidation of goals as a subject, you see. That would call for a Prepcheck rather than do something else weird. You'll pick it up. They've been invalidating listing. That's the commonest source of stopping listing is they invalidate listing.

"I don't see how this is getting me any place." You know. Now the reasons they suppress and fail to reveal and all that sort of thing may be something odd but you will catch it in these four questions.

Now, you use this "suggest" and "failed to suggest" or anything of that character on a pc who is sort of on the verge of telling you what to do all the time. It's a critical pc that this is the most useful on because the pc is suppressing suggestions about your auditing continuously. So you can just run that into the lineup and certainly run it into the Prepcheck. I don't care whether you ask it as a middle rudiment or not. I wouldn't, but I would certainly fix it up as a Prepcheck. When Prepcheck time came around I would ask them if there was anything they had failed to suggest and we would get the *all* – all of the latent withholds on the subject of our auditing off and all kinds of things. You see. But the time to take that up is on a Prepcheck.

So in your middle ruds you're only interested in the immediate session. You're interested in the immediate session that you're running. That is because we're going to prepcheck them and that's going to take in all the – all the middle areas on the whole subject. The accumulations. And the reason you're going to run the middle ruds is to keep their needle relatively clean, so it is readable – that's your best reason – keep them in-session and part of keep-

ing the needle readable is of course making sure the needle is reading on the goal, not an invalidation of the goal or something of that sort.

So that's middle rudiments in their use on goals.

Now, they're used exactly the same way in – when you are listing a goal, the four lists of 3GA used in a goals list. Used exactly the same way except there's now a better pattern. Every time you stop listing on a line you get the middle rudiments in. And then go to your next line. So the middle rudiments all live between lines and they're just used as a bridge. You do line one, middle rudiments, line two, middle rudiments, line three, middle rudiments, line four, middle rudiments. See? Line one. Round and round and round but always the middle rudiments. Because he may have just run out of steam and that line might have been exhausted or he might have stopped listing on that thing because the middle rudiments were out.

So we don't question this or fool with it. It's too easy to get them back in again. So we just take it more or less that we better smooth it up and go on to the next line. And he'll accept this generally; after you've done it a few times he just accepts it as a matter of course and that's very easy and he never pays more – any more attention to it. It's not heavily weighted, in other words.

All right. Now in Prepchecking, in Prepchecking – now there's of course – prepchecking the middle rudiments is this – this thing I've been giving you here about goals and so on and mentioned in the first lecture this evening – but in Prepchecking you use middle rudiments. You use it after every What question is null. Whatever the What question is you use it after it is null. You've run the chain and come back and checked the What question and now you found it null. So, you do the middle ruds. "In this session have you ... ?" or "Is there anything you have ... ?" And get your middle rudiments in and then check the What question again. *Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh.*

Now, you'll notice that this is being put in as a broader look at failed – on a – on a missed withhold. You see, before you were supposed to ask consistently for missed withholds. Well, this is just a fancier, broader way of asking for a missed withhold. So you don't also ask for missed withholds. You just do your middle ruds. And then you go back and check the What question again. If your pc is sort of running down on havingness, is consistently down, there'd be two ways you could go about it. You could get your middle ruds in, check the What question again, find it null, then do some Havingness and go on to your next question, or if this needle was so agitated that you couldn't read well and were suspicious of your reads on the What question you would do your middle ruds and run the Havingness and then check that What question. See?

I don't care which way it is because Havingness can be put in any place. It's not necessarily a tailor-made adjunct to the middle ruds but it is something that can be run with the middle rudiments if a pc's havingness tends to go out easily.

So there is always a middle rud between What questions. Always. And then you're not going to miss any withholds on this pc and you're not going to miss straightening out chains and so forth.

Now, what if you did the middle ruds, found them wildly out, straightened that up and went back and checked the What question and found it now as live as a pistol? You'd go on prepchecking it. And when you've reached a new fundamental on it and checked the What question as null you would again do the middle ruds and go through the same action again. You'd always complete the cycle in that same way.

Now supposing you were running down a pat list, a Form Three, 1, 2, 3, 4 and you were asking, "Have you ever stolen anything? Have you ever raped anybody?" You're going on down the line, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark and you had about five or six of them and with one answer they have been cleaned up. I would also do the middle ruds. So that you would say any consecutive number of five or six What questions – I – five or six Zero Questions gone over and cleaned up with just one or less answers, do your middle ruds. Get them in. Because he may be suppressing something. And you, all of a sudden, find that the third one was *not* flat, it was simply gorgeously suppressed and you have to go back and clean that one up again and of course you'd follow through and ask the next one and do your middle ruds again. Same way.

If your middle ruds are found to be out you go back and do the thing you were doing except in listing of course and in that case you just go on to the next list. That's doing what you were doing anyhow.

All right. The use of middle rudiments can be extended. You can extend the use of middle rudiments to a specific subject, object or activity. This pc – we're checking out a goal, so we say, "Has the goal to catch catfish been suppressed? Invalidated? Is there anything about the goal to catch catfish that you have failed to reveal? Or been careful of? Thank you."

Now, there you can check – you can check, just bang, on the subject of a single goal, do you see and you can make sure that that's the goal that's reading, not an invalidation or something like that.

Now, there's another way to use a middle rudiment and that's just whatever you're doing. Put it in there at – as the headline of the middle rudiment. But if you get this thing too broad you're going to go into a prepcheck activity before you get out of it. So there is a limited area between how far you could extend the middle rudiment and before it has to be prepchecked and that's not very far. You can ask almost anything. "Auditor" is out. This would be a very unusual use of the middle rudiment. "Auditor" is out in some fashion, so we adapt the word "auditor" to the middle rudiments, see.

"In this session have I..." You see? "Is there – is there – in this session is there anything about me you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" See? That is an odd use.

Now I'm not telling you to do this. I'm not advising you and I don't expect you ever will, but I'm just showing you as how far this could actually go. You could probably put in every other rudiment with the middle ruds. I'm just trying to give you a flexibility of thinking about the thing. Person says he has a present time problem, you ask him the second time he has a present time problem, he tells you the same present time problem. It's still reacting, so you say, "Well, is there anything about this problem, *blah, blah, blah*" – you announce

the problem you see – "Is there anything about this problem *blah, blah, blah*, that you have suppressed?"

"Yes, what's that?" You know. And invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of, you know. Get those things cleaned up, each one in its time. Come back and you could ask about the problem, you'd probably find it null. I do not advise that use of the middle rud. That would be very freaky and that'd be very tricky auditing. But, I'm just showing you that anything can be put in relating to this with the middle rud following it.

But sometimes your wording has to be shifted around, because of the peculiar phraseology of "failed to reveal" and "been careful of." You have to break it down into two questions because you can't have them both asked in the same line because you've put some odd-ball thing and you every once in a while will find yourself tripping into the fact – oh-oh. You can't ask "failed to reveal" now, so you're sort of in mid-flight with your voice at the proper intone in the sentence and ask it some other way so that you can get "failed to reveal" and "been careful of" on there, see, because your grammar would be all upset. You'll get used to doing that.

Now, this is a marvelous thing, the middle rudiments, because if you feel called upon to suggest a goal to the pc – God forbid – it'll be only because you're so anxious to have the pc find a goal. See? You're urging the pc, you see. You're trying to – you're pressing. You're pushing. That's because the pc isn't moving in some fashion, you see. You're anxious; you're impatient about the thing and so on. It'll only be because the pc doesn't appear to be getting anyplace. And he isn't getting anyplace because the middle rudiments are out. See? So if you've got this answer and you finally realize that the middle ruds will start the pc up again, you get very happy about middle ruds and you get very expert in their use because you say, "Looky-here, every time the pc slows down or stops, we get the middle ruds in and he'll start going again."

So ideas of evaluation, ideas of chopping up the pc, getting the pc – withholding from the pc that we'd like to knock his block off if he sits there just ten more minutes without saying anything, you see, well, that disappears, because you'll find out consistently that the reason he has stopped giving you answers lies in those four categories, not because there are no more answers.

You see that's the easiest one for you to say. There are no more answers. "Ho-ho, no more answers obviously. Obviously there are no more items on the list, he's already given me twelve hundred." Well, that he's given you twelve hundred does not mean there are no more answers. If he can't give you any more it's because his middle rudiments are out. And if you get a good reality on that you'll say, "Wow!" You talk about – you talk about the proper – the proper coin to drop into the electric piano, it's the middle rudiments. Slugs don't work. Middle rudiments: *Cling! Da-da da-di-da da-di-da* right away. It's marvelous.

I held off for a long time putting middle rudiments in because they were insufficiently formed. I wasn't sure that we had all these. But now I've been using these things, been working out fine. Now you wonder why we add on to the end of middle rudiments half-truths, untruths and meter and maybe command or question. Well actually, in middle rudiments you ordinarily wouldn't have to. You ordinarily wouldn't have to. And I would say offhand if your

pc has gone so far adrift that he's telling you half-truths and is hanging up the meter madly and has gone on in some different direction and offbeat and oddball, I'd say the pc was in the kind of condition where he should be short-sessioned anyhow, so go on and get your middle ruds in and then end your session with the end rudiments. Start your session, give the pc a break, you'll have already gotten this thing straightened out, get a new crack at the beginning rudiments and carry on. See?

That's smarter than to use these things. But of course you have to – you have to use some of those end rudiments – and you can use as many as you please when doing a Prep-check – you can... It all depends on your pc. You could weight this thing too heavily by asking everybody, "In listing have you damaged anyone?" – if you ask everybody, see, this. But you would know this pc – this is where you have to be a little clever, you know, you're in your Prepcheck, you know this pc and he's been saying, "Joe: *Groowrr*." You know? "Auditors: *Rowrrrrrr!* Instructors: *Hrroarrrrr*."

I think the next time you prepchecked him it might be a very good idea, if you didn't catch it on the end ruds, it might be a very good idea to ask him, "In listing have you tried to damage anyone?" you see and it falls off the pin. That's why he stopped listing. Listing was getting to be an overt act. See? He was considering listing critical or something.

But that would very definitely depend on your preclear and be a rather freak method of using it.

I don't want to introduce the idea now that there are a great many middle rudiments that you would or would not use or don't know anything about or something of this sort. I don't want to introduce that idea at all. Actually middle rudiments are simply, just and only, "suppressed, invalidate, failed to reveal and been careful of." That's middle rudiments. Now if you want to ask a pc something else, why, that's fine. And you'll find in the ordinary run-of-the-mill auditing the less something elses you ask the pc, the happier you're going to be. But I can't say that a pc – well, a pc had a – had a cough and didn't consider it suppression and the auditor had to include in the middle rudiments, "In this session, have you tried not to cough?" to get the meter reading again. See, I mean – so all right. So all right. You notice something like that's going on, if you think you need it go ahead and do it. But the less dress-parade patness you do, the better off you are in these middle ruds, because those four will take care of almost anything.

So he was trying to damage somebody in listing, the probability is that you're going to get it as you do the end rudiments, you see.

So there are a lot of – a lot of angles to this.

Those are your middle rudiments.

The – the best method of using them is simply a very straightforward method of using them and they make an excellent bridge from one type of activity to another similar activity or to a different activity. There are many ways to use them.

Now, a pc who has a rather dirty needle and who has to have medium – middle rudiments done three-minutes' worth for every minute of auditing.

There's something wrong with the middle ruds Prepcheck. See? Prepchecking the middle ruds is what's indicated there, you'll save time by doing so. And supposing prepchecking the middle ruds didn't do it, well then I'd say just general Prepcheck and the CCHs should have been done much more thoroughly. You understand you can often find a goal on a pc and so forth, in spite of the hedgehog character of the needle, but it's sometimes almost impossible and it can get so weird and so impossible and so forth that you have no other choice than do something else.

Actually getting a goal on a pc with a rather clean needle is a joy.

So, I have been specializing lately in fish and fumble. And I could be expected, if I was starting to have trouble that had developed since the beginning of the session – that is to say, you know – or was evident in the beginning of the session, with a dirtied-up needle and I didn't hit it on the beginning rudiments and the needle was still dirtied up, I would very – be very likely to start my session with a fish and fumble. No matter what else I was doing. Because I found out it only takes me from three to nine minutes to clean up a needle. I'm not saying I'm so good and you're so bad. You'll learn how. You should expect to clean up a dirty needle in three to nine minutes. Most of the time.

Now we're talking about the needle that goes *bzzzzt*, tick, tick, *bzzzzt*, tick. "Have you eaten any ..." *Bzzzt*. "... cucum ..." *Bzzzzt*, tick, tick, "... lately?" Clang. You're saying, "What am I going to do? Sit here the rest of this session, watch this thing go *bzzzzt*?" and so forth. Let's find out what the hell it is. So before I do anything else, why, I'd do a little fish and fumble and do it rather rapidly and get out of there. I'll put the beginning rudiments in and then say, "All right. Now I want you to carefully consider your auditing." Nothing happened, see. "And now carefully consider your life." *Heh-heh*. "What's that? Yeah, that." Needle's going *bzzzzt*, *bzzzt*, *bzzzt*, *bzzt*. You say, "What's that? What did you think of just then? What are you thinking of now?"

"Oh, well, I was thinking of that disk on the top of the E-Meter. It's red."*

"All right. Good enough. All right. What have you done to HCO?" [laughter]

Bzzzt, *bzzzt*, *chp-chp*, *dzzzt*.

What do you know! "All right. When's the first time you did that?" See? I got a What question: What have you done to HCO? I hit it lucky. Funny part of it is, I've been hitting these things 100 percent lucky. One pc said, "I can't stand the electricity in the cans." And I said, I said something about, "Have you ever shocked anybody?" As a Zero. Sounded more like that, you know. And *bzzzt!* *bzzzt!* *bzzzzt*. And it ran right back and we found a bunch of double entendres on the subject of shock. Shock means several things apparently. We got this all out and the needle suddenly went limp. I've been – I've been sorry ever since because the needle travels around so easily it's almost impossible to check anything at sensitivity 16. [laughter] I shouldn't have done that one.

* Editor's note: Refers to the old Mark IV meters that had (like the Mark Vs) on their lid, which in session faces toward the pc, a red, round plate with the HCO insignia on it. A picture can be found in "The book introducing the E-Meter".

But been having very good luck doing things like this. Do a little tiny fish and fumble. Not making any profession out of it. You just get the person to think or consider or look things over. Say, "Well, I'm going to sit here and watch – watch this needle and see what you are doing." That's good enough, you know. There's no stylized question, then *bz bzzzt!* Tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, tick. What the hell! You know. What's that? And by the way, if you're doing fish and fumble, just as a little side comment, trace only one pattern down at a time. Don't try to trace four. Trace the *bzzzt!* You know, and then it goes tick, tick, tick, tick. Don't pay any attention to those tick, tick, ticks. Then it goes *bzzzt!* "What did you think of just then?"

Then it's going clang, tick, clang, tick. Don't pay any attention to that. *Bzzzt!* "What did you just think of just then?"

"Oh! I've been thinking about my baby."

"Oh? Good. Done anything to your baby lately? Something happen to your baby lately? What about your baby?" *Bzzzt!* "All right. What are you thinking of?"

"I was thinking about she doesn't have any shoes."

"What about your baby's shoes?" *Bzzzt! bzzzt, bzzzt, bzzzt, bzzt, bzz-bzz.* Now fish and fumble takes a brighter auditor. I will tell you that. You have to say, "What have you denied your baby lately?" *Bzzzt! bzzzt, bzzzt, bzzzt, bzzzt.* Ah-ha. That's it, right there. "What have you denied your baby lately?" That's the test What question.

"Well, I did. I took her milk away from her last night."

"Good. Anything earlier than that?" *Heh-heh-heh-heh.*

"Took all her clothes out and burned them up because they smell bad."

You know, I mean horrible things been going on here. We get the chain pulled up. *Bzzzt.* All of a sudden you just got these ticks left. So you say, "All right, now. Just think things over now." Person's very relieved. They think life's wonderful. Tick, tick – those ticks. That one peculiar tick. You say, "What're you thinking over there? Then. Then. Then."

"Oh, I just think all the time – I just keep wondering why you're so inquisitive."

"Oh? There. Yeah, that. Is that what you keep thinking about?" So on.

"Well, is there some question I sh – I should have asked you? Something like that?"

"Well ..." Tick, tick, tick, tick, tick.

"What's that? What's that?"

"... well, have I been critical of you outside of session. *Heh-heh hehheh.*"

"Well, good. Good. All right. Well, (Let me see – see if this works here.) What have you said about me outside of session?" Tick, tick, tick, tick. "That's very good. That's fine. That's it. All right."

And you say, "Now what – what about criticizing an auditor? Have you done something like that, have you lied about me or done something I don't know about? What about criticizing me?" Tick, tick, tick, tick. "Oh, that's right." We'll just knock off the session here,

"What about criticizing me? Excellent." Tick, tick, tick, tick, tick. "Now can you think of an actual incident?" Because if you can't get an actual incident, you haven't got a What question, you've just got a test What, see.

"Oh, well, yes, I said something at dinner the other night, critical of you." "Yeah? All right. That's good." A specific incident. Let's work it. Let's get it back. Let's pull up the chain. Three, four minutes later this needle is clean as a whistle. It's just going....

You say – you say, "All right. We're going to do some listing now," whatever it is, "going to do some Prepchecking," I don't care what it is. But you can frankly clean up a needle just as it is. And you know it doesn't get dirty again easily. You really have to goof to get a needle dirty after you've cleaned it up like that. In fact I haven't seen these needles I've cleaned up go dirty again. I think there must have to be something going on with a bunch of missed withholds and all kinds of wild things being stirred up and so forth for the needle to be made dirty again. I don't quite understand how the needle is made dirty by poor auditing but it's basically on the mechanic that the auditor's TR 2 is so bad that when the pc says something it's automatically a missed withhold. Do you see how that could be? You don't see how that is?

Pc said, "I shot a dog" and the auditor said, "*Mowwwm.*" And you get to the end of the session, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" *Clank!* "What's that?" "Oh, about shooting dogs."

You're bewildered. You say, "But I acknowledged it, you know." you say. He didn't hear you. So it's a missed withhold. It's an inadvertent withhold. See? He said it but nobody heard it. And I think then double questioning and oh, running pcs on the wrong things. You'd have to be busy to dirty up a needle but I've been having very good luck cleaning them up and I should mention at this time that little technique of fish and fumble.

Now, one of the virtues of fish and fumble, it could be overused, of course, I suppose, but I haven't seen much reason to use it on a pc more than a couple of times, two or three times on the same pc and it hasn't taken very long on that pc either. It's just a fast method of cleaning up the needle. The needle must be banging against something and every different pattern that the needle is reacting with is a different subject so you only follow one pattern at a time. Don't get clumsy and follow a – a double tick and a single tick and a stick and make the mistake of, "What was that? What was that? What was that?" Calling off the double tick, the single tick and a stick. No, man, because he's thought of three different things in a row. No, you've got to just abandon all the ticks and sticks. Take the most vital of them first, which is the double tick. If you can get that you're best off because it's always the missed withhold. There's something wrong with it. The double tick you would choose up. You can actually clean that thing off the needle without too much worry or upset or take much time about it. That's why I'm quite surprised that a pc's needle stayed dirty during Prepchecking. It must be that they're going on a stylized basis of approach and it isn't the pc in front of them. See?

And you certainly are taking up the pc in front of you if you're picking up just that tick. The tick that goes, "*loollk, loollk.*" You say, "That's the one. That's the one. I'm going to find out what he thinks about." You'll find out it's something very innocent in present time

like this: "Well, the windows of this room are always big. You know, every time I think of the windows or look at the windows or something like that I get this."

Well, did it clean up? That's the test.

And it didn't clean up, all right, so you've got to do something more about the thing. And then you find out that it's a – he was a professional window breaker when he was a little boy, he used to haul off and break windows in all directions and you just pick this up and get the disentanglement off the thing and you won't get that tick any more.

Cleaning up a needle appears to me, at least in my recent activities in auditing, as a relatively easy action if approached with a fish and fumble, without any more intention than just to clean up the needle. And you will make one slick and floppy in practically no time. I'm beginning to believe that there's no excuse for a dirty needle now. It's getting that bad. Because they're very hard to read, dirty needles are. And you certainly can't do Goals Assessment with a needle that's dirty. Drive you mad. You don't know whether it's reading on the goal you are reading or what the pc is at that moment noticing *or – or –* if the rudiments have gone out *or – or – or ...* Well, you see it's a dead giveaway. You've missed this one. If you haven't cleaned up a needle and you're doing a Goals Assessment, why, you haven't any clue as to whether the middle ruds are out, because you only started going tick and flop and so forth and *bap-bap*, when the middle ruds are out.

So you know, you just stop right then, put them in. Well, if your needle was just sporadically *always* operating in this particular fashion, why, how would you know?

So I recommend fish and fumble to you. I recommend you setting up a little project for yourself just simply cleaning up somebody's needle. Not to do anything for the case but just to clean the needle and clean one pattern off at a time and see how good you are. It requires a faster auditor. He's got to be faster on his feet than routine Prepchecking because he has to do a lot of guessing. Because he's got to guess the overt ordinarily. It goes tick. And finally the pc says, "Well, I'm thinking of hollyhocks." Where does that leave you, man? It leaves you up the garden walk someplace.

You can always say, "Well, what about hollyhocks?" or something, you know. And he'll say, "Well, hollyhocks, they're beautiful." Man, you're still up the garden walk and it's still ticking. Hollyhocks are ... Actually it's foxglove that he's thinking of and it contains digitalis and he poisoned his grandmother but otherwise... You've got to short-circuit that line of thought. Well, the pc will help you out if you'll help him out. But it's something like, "Well, the current going through these cans worries me." See? "Did you ever shock anybody?"

Well, that's a one-two. Of course the pc must have an overt with electricity if the pc minds electricity now. That's the kind of think pattern that you have to develop. See? And you do that think pattern and you usually come out with, what the hell has he ever done with hollyhocks? You know? Must be an overt that connects with hollyhocks. It's either to or with. See?

Then you can stir it around a little bit and all of a sudden it will fall out.

But that's fish and fumble and it's a mile – it's a marvelous way of cleaning up needles and I don't know any faster way than to shape it all up, polish it all off, dust it all off beauti-

fully and carry on with what you're doing. I don't think you'd have to do it very often. And if you're doing Prepchecking on a pc you of course have the horizon wide open. This is the time to clean up the pc's needle.

But it's a rather easy thing to do and I should think you'd learn how to do it. And I don't know how well it will work in your hands or not work in your hands. It's not as well worked out of course as Prepchecking, to which it is a crude barbaric cousin. It is done exactly the same way as Prepchecking plus infinite intuition on the part of the auditor. You furnish the intuition. I've already furnished the stylized line of Prepchecking, it will do a lot of things all by itself. It takes – it's not that this supplants Prepchecking, this is to clean up a needle so you can Prepcheck.

See? It's pretty good. So try it. Try it. Next time you see this haunting tick that always goes off, get curious about it. What is that tick? It is something. It's related to present time. It will run back on a direct chain. It will clean up in from three to nine minutes if you're smart and fast on your feet. So I recommend it to your doing it.

All right. Well, that's middle ruds and the way they're used and that's actually how you can clean up a needle thrown into the bargain, so if you master that, why you're all set.

Thank you very much.

TV DEMO: CHECKING OUT A GOAL, PART I

An auditing demonstration given on 13 June 1962

[part missing]

LRH: You thought it would happen and then uh ...

PC: *I sort of thought, Oh, I hope it doesn't.*

LRH: All right. Hope it doesn't!

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Oh, that's rough. We're not going to do anything very desperate here, honey. All we're going to do is check out your goal. But we're going to prepcheck. Now, I don't know whether you've been prepchecked on this or not.

PC: *No.*

LRH: And I thought it might be a good opportunity for you to get a little subjective reality on this.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: We've got plenty of people whose goals I could check out. But I sort of wanted when you came down calling me – I actually wanted to check out your goal. So, I'm going to shoot two factors with one session.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: All right. This sort of thing won't bother you anyway.

PC: *No.*

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

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Here it is. Start of session.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Has the session started for you?

PC: *Yes, thank you.*

LRH: All right. Very good. What goals would you like to set for this session?

PC: *Well, to do whatever it is we are going to do, successfully.*

LRH: To do ...

PC: *...whatever we are going to do, successfully ...*

LRH: ...whatever we're going to do. And what's the last ...

PC: *successfully.*

LRH: ...successfully. Oh, well that is a goal. All right. Very good. Any other goal?

PC: *No. That will be fine.*

LRH: All right. Is there any goal you would like to set for life and livingness?

PC: *To use the knowledge and the gain that I get here, at London HASI.*

LRH: All right. Any other?

PC: *No. That will be fine.*

LRH: All right honey. You look a little bit nervous. Do you feel nervous?

PC: *No, not nervous, just – just cornered.*

LRH: Do you feel you've been betrayed?

PC: *Yes. I've been caught.*

LRH: Oh, too bad.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Too bad.

PC: *Doesn't – this system doesn't worry me. I was surprised. It's so separate here.*

LRH: Well, all right. All right. Now, uh – look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: *Yes, it's fine.*

LRH: All right. Look around again.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. What's your Havingness Process lately?

PC: *Look around here and find something you can agree with.*

LRH: All right. Squeeze the cans. Thank you. My goodness! Out the bottom. All right. Here's the first command. Look around here and find something you can agree with.

PC: *That picture.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you can agree with.

PC: *Curtain.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you can agree with.

PC: *Couch.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you can agree with.

PC: *Green vase.*

LRH: Good enough. Squeeze the cans. All right. Squeeze them again. All right. Has this Havingness Process been suppressed?

PC: *Sometimes it works and sometimes it doesn't. Sometimes "point out something" does and sometimes "tactile" does.*

LRH: All right. Has this Havingness Process been suppressed, invalidated? Is there something about this Havingness Process you failed to reveal? Yes, what have you failed to reveal about this Havingness Process?

PC: *Something I failed to reveal, but it wasn't the Havingness Process that I know of. It was the fact that I've seen that picture in several different people's houses and I thought of it before you started running it.*

LRH: All right. All right, thank you. Now, is there something about this Havingness Process you failed to reveal?

PC: *Not that I know of. Didn't get anything.*

LRH: Well, all right. I'll check it on the meter.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Is there anything about this Havingness Process you have

failed to reveal? All right. That's clean. Thank you. All right. Is there anything about this Havingness Process that you have been careful of?

PC: *Not that I know of.*

LRH: All right. We're going to run a different Havingness Process. Okay?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Squeeze the cans. Boy! You're just getting that much drop.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Put the cans down. All right. Here we go. Feel that table.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel that chair.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel that sign.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel that ash-tray.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel that table.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Pick up the cans.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Squeeze the cans. Squeeze them again. I think we've got a little broadening of it here.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Put them down.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Just feel those cans without picking them up.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Feel that chair.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Oh, all right. How does it feel?

PC: *Feels slightly sticky and leatherish.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Feel that cloth.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Feel your skirt.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Feel your shoulders.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. How do they feel?

PC: *Solid.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. Feel that cloth.

PC: *This one?*

LRH: Yeah. All right. Pick up the cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. Ah – that's good. Try it again. Squeeze the cans. Yeah, that's your Havingness Process. Okay. Put them back down. We'll do it a few more. All right. Feel the can cord.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Okay. Thank you. Feel the arm of your chair.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Just that one.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Just that one there.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. How does that feel?

PC: *Smooth. Solid.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Feel the table under there.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Okay. Feel this paper.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Feel the back of the E-Meter.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Feel that ashtray.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Good. Good. Feel your skirt.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Good. Feel both arms of your chair.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Feel the tablecloth in front of you.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Now feel the table under the tablecloth.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you very much. Pick up the cans. Okay, squeeze the cans. That's good. Fine. Thank you. That was the last command.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. I'll check this on the meter. Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Anything particular you're running into as you do that?

PC: *Just at that moment, I noticed that camera over there.*

LRH: That was a big surprise?

PC: *No, it reminded me of a camera I once saw in my bedroom about three Christmases ago at the same time up in the corner of the room. It was a picture I saw and I got tummy upset for a whole day.*

LRH: So, all right. Good enough. Okay. Let me check this on the meter now. Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. You still get a flick on something here.

PC: *Oh, I noticed the – a metallic object of some sort up there.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Let me check it on the meter again. Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

That's clean. Thank you.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. It was actually clean before, but I took a latent read. Okay?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: You feel all right about these cameras?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Really?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Do you feel all right about these cameras?

PC: *The only thing I can think of is that just – I just remember being a student down there and how they – how we all used to laugh at different occasions and I – I keep expecting to hear people laugh when I say something and I don't.*

LRH: Oh, really. Oh, all right. All right. All right. We shoot them when they do that now.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. We'll let it go at that. Okay?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Do you feel – you feel – you sure you feel all right about ...?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. I get a very wide fall here when I say to you, "you sure you feel all right?" But it's not a – it's not an instant read.

PC: *It's not these cameras ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... I don't think.*

LRH: Well. Tell me what you think it might be.

PC: *I think it's being watched. But it isn't them down there watching.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It's a sort of – there's a something watching. It's – it's this thing, I don't like being watched over my shoulder.*

LRH: Oh. Okay. You think there's something over your shoulder, turn around and look.

PC: *No, only me.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, you feel all right about this?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Yes, you do now. Thank you. All right. Now, are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Let me check that. That was equivocal. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. It's got a latent read on it. But that's otherwise fine. All right. Since the last time ...

PC: *[laughs] Yes.*

LRH: ...you were audited at Saint Hill ...

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: ... have you done anything that you are withholding?

PC: *Heavens! Thousands of things.*

LRH: All right. Happens to be clean on the meter.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Okay. We'll let it go at that. All right?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Okay. Do you have a present time problem?

PC: *No.*

LRH: I got a reaction on that.

PC: *Well, the only thing that occurred to me was that I really didn't want to get stuck with my early goal again. I'd much rather have the other one I've got.*

LRH: Oh. I see. All right. All right. All right. Very good. Let me check

this on the meter. Do you have a present time problem?

PC: *Nothing I can think of.*

LRH: That is clean. Thank you. Thank you. Very good. All right. Now, what we're going to do here now ... Your rudiments are in. That's fine. What we're going to do here now is we're going to do a very fast Prepcheck with the middle rudiments on the subject of goals and so forth.

All right, the first thing we're going to check – we're going to start in right now. You came down to 2.6...

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: ...with all that, by the way. And the first thing here is your – just the subject – just the word – I'm going to just check the word. I'm going to see it – say it and see if we get a reaction. Goal. Thank you. Fine.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Now, I'm going to check one other word.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Listing. All right. That's clean. All right?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Here we go. The first question here is: On goals have you ever suggested anything?

PC: *I think so, once.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *On a person at HASI, there was a prior read on a goal and I asked her, could her goal possibly be that?*

LRH: All right. Okay. I'll check that on the meter now. On goals have you

ever suggested anything All right. That's clean.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Now, on goals have you ever had anything suggested?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Doesn't read. What would you like?

PC: *I just – what I told you earlier today, the thing that I said.*

LRH: Go ahead and say it. It's all right.

PC: *Well, you suggested that my goal might be antisocial singer.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Okay. Okay. Now, on – on goals ...

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: ... have you ever suppressed anything?

PC: *Anger sometimes, when I was being run on that one.*

LRH: All right. That's an equivocal read.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: But I'll check it now.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: On goals have you ever suppressed anything? I've got an action here that's just a little tiny bit late, but I'll have to take it into account.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Can you think of anything else you suppressed on goals?

PC: *Well, I thought – I was wondering whether I had suppressed anything else. I suppressed speaking to you sooner about it.*

LRH: All right. All right. Thank you. I'll check that on the meter.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: On goals have you ever suppressed anything? Ah, that's clean.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: You don't think it is? There's an upswing here. There was an upswing. I'll call it an equivocal read.

PC: *Well, the only feeling I get is that I always get suspicious if I sort of get a bit cagey about something, in myself*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And the thought of having to be run on that goal again, I sort of get a sort of "eek!" about it.*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay.

PC: *However, but if I'm being run on the other one, I'm sort of going smoothly. But that one I think "ooh, not into that mess again."*

LRH: All right. Okay. Here we go. I'll check that again, just to be absolutely sure. On goals have you ever suppressed anything? Ah, that's a sudden speeded rise.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Can you think of anything else you've suppressed on goals?

PC: *Well, I suppose I just suppress that feeling I get, at the thought of that other goal.*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right. Good.

PC: *I got a lot of sort of pain with it when I was being run on it down here. Not physical pain, mental pain.*

LRH: All right. Very good. I'll check it on the meter again. On goals have you ever suppressed anything? That is clean.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you very much. All right, we've got this one, and we've got this one, and we've got this one. Now, let's take the next one. On goals is there anything you have suppressed?

PC: *I don't think so. I told you as far as I know.*

LRH: Yes. I got a reaction on it, too. Why does that give a reaction?

PC: *Well, I suppressed the pain, and I suppressed the uncomfortable, and I suppressed the anger. Oh, I know what I thought. I had it on the telex, have I ever suppressed anything and – and I think it's on my telex it says had – had anything been suppressed, and I was puzzled.*

LRH: Well, all right. Okay. I'll check that on the meter now. On goals is there anything you have suppressed? That is clean. Thank you. Thank you. There's a tiny latent. I'm not going to bother with it. All right. On goals is there anything you have invalidated?

PC: *Well, I invalidated you.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Very good.

PC: *At the time of that goal.*

LRH: All right. Excellent. I'll check that on the meter now. On goals is there anything you have invalidated? Equivocal read.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: On goals is there anything you have invalidated? That is clean. Thank you. All right. Now, on goals have you

ever invalidated anyone else's? That's clean.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: You thought of something latently.

PC: *I thought of something else.*

LRH: What did you think of?

PC: *Well, I thought of – um – I was given – I was told something about a person's goal that was found down here by one person and I invalidated that person's speed in doing it.*

LRH: The person's speed?

PC: *In doing it, because I said that I reckoned that we could do it faster.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And then you told me more about it today. And I felt guilty about it.*

LRH: I'm not quite with you there.

PC: *Oh, well, it – it was um – the goal Mary Sue found – found recently.*

LRH: Oh, yeah?

PC: *Somebody – somebody told me how long it took her and I said, "Oh goodness, I'm sure we could – we could do it faster than that. "And then you told me certain other information about it today and I felt very guilty of having thought that and said it.*

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. Let me check that then. On goals is there anything you have invalidated? I got a slowdown. Think of something else?

PC: *Well, only – only that other – um – the one of – the goal I said to you that I suggested to that person when the – when the goal came up as the whole thing it was – it was, I think, "to seduce every*

man I want," from this particular person. I said, "Oh good heavens, it won't – it won't be that. I'm sure it will be something else." And when I checked it there was only a prior read when it came to the seduce part. And I actually invalidated it before it came up to me to check it.

LRH: Oh. All right. Very good. All right. Now, I'll check it on the meter now. All right. On goals is there anything you have invalidated? Equivocal read. I'll have to ask you again. On goals is there anything you have invalidated? That's clean as a wolf's tooth. Thank you very much. All right. On goals is there anything you have failed to reveal? It's clean. Thank you. On goals is there anything you have been careful of? A-ha! Now, what have you been careful of?

PC: *Been careful of?*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Of that feeling that I get. That sort of "eek!" feeling at the thought of that antisocial thing, singer thing. "Oaaah!"*

LRH: Yeah! All right. All right.

PC: *I sort of have to catch myself on the big withdraw out.*

LRH: Okay. All right. On goals is there anything you have been careful of? All right. There's a latent you might want to tell me about.

PC: *I was thinking about that again actually. I know – I know what I thought. I thought, oh, this will save Jenny having to do this.*

LRH: Um?

PC: *I said this – doing this will save Jenny having to do it.*

LRH: Oh, she could do it easily. All right. Okay. I'll ask you again here. On goals is there anything you have been careful of? And that is clean. Thank you very much. All right. On goals have you told any half-truths? Thank you. That is clean. On goals have you told any untruths? Thank you. That is clean. On goals have you ever influenced an E-Meter?

PC: *Not consciously or deliberately that I know of.*

LRH: All right. We'll check that again. It was a little bit of a late read. Well, on goals have you ever influenced an E-Meter? No. Clean.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: On goals have you tried not to influence an E-Meter? Clean.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. That appears to be okay.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: Now, we're going to take up the subject of listing. We've got that straight and we didn't run into any real trouble there. We're getting your tone arm down here, ma'am.

PC: *Good. I've been seven running that other goal.*

LRH: Yeah?

PC: *About six times a session.*

LRH: Yeah?

PC: *It's true. It's on the end rudiments. And he says it – during that session, and I go up to seven again.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, we're going to start in on listing. All right. On listing – on listing is there anything you have suggested?

PC: *I seem to remember in one session that I was giving Norman that he asked me a word and I told it to him. He asked me a word for something. I couldn't swear to it totally and wholly. But, I seem to think there's something like that there.*

LRH: All right. Very good. On goals is there anything you have suggested? That's clean. It wasn't really there in the first time, it was a latent.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. You don't think I'm cleaning off latent reads. I'm calling it – if it falls after a quarter of a second. All right. On listing is there anything you have failed to suggest? That's clean. Thank you. On listing is there anything you have suppressed? Thank you. That is clean. On listing is there anything you have invalidated? Equivocal read. On listing is there anything you have invalidated?

PC: *I'm thinking of one session which one of the auditors was giving in London, that I was supervising in the staff training. And – um – an item was got and there was something wrong with it.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And I said to the auditor, no, that won't be it. We'll have to go on for that. The – tha – that invalidated it at that stage.*

LRH: All right. I'm getting a fall on "on listing is there anything you have ..."

PC: *I beg your pardon.*

LRH: Yes. I don't know why.

PC: *Is there anything I'd what?*

LRH: I don't know. I – I'm not trying to foul you up or anything like that, but the read is equivocal because on listing is

there anything you have? You just thought of something, what's on ...

PC: *Well, this is the same thing. This is – this incident that this – this chappy came up with. But I don't quite know what you mean by an equivocal read.*

LRH: Neither do I.

PC: *... an equivocal read.*

LRH: Oh, it means that it's not on the button.

PC: *I see. Hm-hm.*

LRH: It means it's just – I couldn't tell if it is clean or not clean.

PC: *I see.*

LRH: See. There's a hunted read around it some place.

PC: *Oh. Well, I've been puzzled what this equivocal read has been.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Okay. Very good. All right. On listing is there anything you have invalidated? That's clean.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. On listing is there anything you have failed to reveal? Yes. Yes.

PC: *Well, I get two things there. All the items on my list that I haven't sted – yet said.*

LRH: Yes.

PC: *And the fact that I – the way I was holding my cans pressing against my legs, I wondered if there was any reaction there. I've got those two things at the same time.*

LRH: All right. Now, did that answer the question?

PC: *Well, when you said was there – on listing was there anything I'd*

failed to reveal, I just thought of all the items that I yet hadn't revealed on lists.

LRH: Attaboy. All right. Thank you very much. All right. On listing – I'll check it here ...

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: On listing is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. Thank you. That's clean. All right. On listing is there anything you have been careful of? And that is clean. Thank you.

Now, on listing have you told any half-truths? And that is active.

PC: *Something sort of shot by.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I haven't sort of got it.*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *It's a sort of something here.*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *I can't quite see what it is.*

LRH: There it is. There it is.

PC: *I can't think if I told any half-truths.*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *I don't get anything. I'm conscious of something around, but I can't see what it is.*

LRH: All right. I'll repeat the question.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Maybe it will occur to you.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: On listing have you told any half-truths?

PC: *Well, the only thing I can think of that came to the surface then, was*

that um – on doing Routine 3D Criss Cross lists down here on my preclear um – on looking back now for what we know now, the lists weren't complete although at the time, of course, I said they were.

LRH: Hm-hm. All right.

PC: *So, it's a half-truth.*

LRH: Excellent. Okay. Let me check that on the meter now. On listing have you told any half-truths? And that is clean. All right. Here's the next one, on listing have you told any untruths? That is clean. Thank you.

On listing have you deliberately tried to influence an E-Meter? And I got a reaction.

PC: *Well, as an auditor I was hoping th – tha – that one item would be the one it was for the pc but it wasn't.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That's about the nearest I can get to it.*

LRH: All right. Well, we'll see if that's it.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: On listing have you ever deliberately tried to influence an E-Meter? And that is clean. Thank you. On listing have you ever tried not to influence an E-Meter?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Thank you. All right. Very good, madam. I am going to ask you one more ...

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: ... on goals.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: On goals have you ever tried to damage anyone? Thank you. That's clean. On listing have you ever – on listing have you ever tried to damage someone? Thank you. That is clean. On goals have you ever failed to answer a question or command? Clang! Reaction. There it is. There it is.

PC: *Well, it seems to be something to do with one of the sessions that Maryann gave me. But I can't think of failing to answer a question or command there. She was running me on – when we were doing those sort of group mores ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... thing. But I don't remember failing to answer the question or command there. Unless I didn't run a – didn't answer a havingness command.*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Oh! There was one day I think um – when there was some confusion as whether she'd given me a havingness command or not or whether I'd answered two of them or one of them or three instead of two or one instead of three or something like that.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me check it. On goals have you ever failed to answer a question or command? And that is clean. Thank you. Okay. On listing have you ever failed to answer a question or command? And that is clean. Thank you. All right. We are all set here. Now, I'm going to get my middle ruds in.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. In this session have you suppressed, invalidated? And what have you invalidated in this session?

PC: *I invalidated you at the beginning.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But I didn't intend to.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I said I hoped this wouldn't happen and it was very rude of me.*

LRH: Okay. Thank you. All right. In this session have you invalidated anything? That's clean. Thank you. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? And that is clean. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? Thank you. And that is clean. All right. Very good. All right. Now, just for a moment here I am going to do a little operation known as Fish and Fumble. Okay? Because we've got an occasional tick wandering around here and I am just wondering what that is all about. And there it is right there. What were you thinking of? There it is.

PC: *I was thinking of the camera.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Now think of the camera.

PC: *It's not that one.*

LRH: Which one?

PC: *It's this one I saw in the – as a picture in this bedroom in the Christmas of either 1959 or 1960.*

LRH: Oh, yeah?

PC: *It was just a picture up on the wall, not on the wall. It was a picture that I saw ...*

LRH: Uh-uh.

PC: *... You know, in my bank. It was pressed against the wall.*

LRH: All right. Good enough.

PC: *Hm-hm. And it reminded me of the thing on the Paramount thing – they twist the movie camera around and say the eyes and the ears of the world. But I often wondered whether it was a Fac One thing or something because I felt so sick for the rest of the day.*

LRH: All right. All right. Why don't we just fumble around with this for a minute here.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Camera. Picture.

PC: *I don't like having my photograph taken.*

LRH: All right. Something there – you thinking of something right there? What's that?

PC: *Well, that's the feeling I get when somebody wants to take my photograph.*

LRH: Oh yeah, yeah.

PC: *Hm. I have the same feeling.*

LRH: All right. Well, you ever taken people's photographs?

PC: *Oh, a few times, not all that much.*

LRH: Yeah. That's deader than a mackerel.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Have you ever hidden any photographs? Heh-heh-heh-heh, here we got it, here we got it. What about hiding photographs?

PC: *Well, I don't know. I remember having a f – a – a – a fascination when somebody told me that Eugene Goosens, a famous musician in Australia, brought pornographic literature in and he hid it, underneath his clothes and his bags*

and got thrown out of Australia for me – for it. And this sort of fascinated me.

LRH: Yes, yes, yes. We've got something here. Thank you. All right. Did you yourself ever hide any photographs? There it is.

PC: *I don't think I ever hid that one, that's a pict ...*

LRH: Pang! Pang!

PC: *... that's a picture of me when I was – that's a picture of me when I was about one.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *I don't think I ever hid it.*

LRH: All right. Well, did you ever hide any photographs?

PC: *I used to play with photographs. Mother used to have tins full of them. I used to play and look – look them over and put them in and out of photograph albums and I don't think I ever hid any. I remember doing this at a very early age.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I don't recall hiding any of them. But I get an odd feeling in the diaphragm.*

LRH: All right, well ...

PC: *I think it's this life.*

LRH: All right. Well, let's fish around a little bit and see if you got anything earlier than that, about hiding photographs. That's it. We got our little ping-pang here just as nice as you ever saw.

PC: *Hiding photographs?*

LRH: Yes, hiding photographs.

PC: *I wanted to hide photographs.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I couldn't stand them all over on the mantelpiece and I couldn't – I – I couldn't bear the family photographs on all the mantelpieces, and I would have liked to and I never did. Mother wouldn't put any of them away.*

LRH: All right. All right. Now have you ever hidden any? There it is.

PC: *I've hidden from having one taken.*

LRH: All right. All right. All right. But have you yourself, ever hidden any photographs? There it is.

PC: *I get a sort of odd concept of a – of some pictures in a pile ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *...you know. But I don't - I don't know anything more about it than that. This is a bit of a mess in the picture of – of these in a pile there.*

LRH: What kind of pictures?

PC: *Well, black photographic plates.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Oh! I have a feeling its me photographs, yes, in my bank.*

LRH: Umm?

PC: *In my bank. My bank has got all these photographs in – in long, long photographic plates.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *They're all compressed. They're hidden in the bank.*

LRH: Oh yeah?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right.

PC: *I've hidden photographs, of that sort!*

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

PC: [laughs] *Oh, what a question to ask. Millions of times.*

LRH: Hm. All right. Spot me just one.

PC: *Um?*

LRH: Just one. One time.

PC: *Well, I hid that picture of the camera I suppose, in that – in the bedroom in 1959. I've blotted it out again.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Thank you. Is that all there was to it at that time? No?

PC: *No. Except feeling sick, that was all there was to it.*

LRH: Very good. And what might have appeared?

PC: *Oh, Fac One stuff.*

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

PC: *Well, there were about six people who did. Nobody else did. Nobody at all except those six people who were there on that Christmas day that I went to visit these people.*

LRH: All right. Well, who didn't find out about it?

PC: *Well, my mother didn't. You didn't. I never told an auditor before.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I just thought.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. Now, let me check this question. What about hiding photographs? All right. There is a speeded rise here on it now.

Now, is there any early period in your life when you tucked one out of sight? There's something.

PC: *I've trimmed one, chopped one.*

LRH: You did what?

PC: *Cut one you know, trimmed it. Oh, wait a minute! What a – what a nutty thing, of course! If you like to look at it that way, I had some picture frames at home in which sometimes I used to – it was – there would be one photograph and when I got sick of that, I'd put another one on top of it, so the one underneath got hidden.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. All right. When was that?

PC: *Ah, gosh. That must have been about 1938, or a little earlier.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And is there any more to that?

PC: *There was this particular photograph of myself that I didn't like.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And I think that was one I hid.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And what might have appeared there?

PC: *Oh, people saying, "Oh dear, what a lovely photograph."*

LRH: All right. Very good. And who should have found out about it?

PC: *The person who gave me the photograph. I think it was my Aunt May.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Thank you. Let me check this question.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: What about hiding photographs? There's a tiny tick as we go by.

PC: *Hm-hm. Well, I could never make out why I had this absolute extraordinary puzzlement over this – this man who'd brought this pornographic literature into Australia. And I remember Father talking to me about pornographic literature, but I've never even seen any.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And I could never make it out and this always puzzled me.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *That's – that's – that's what's came back to that time.*

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

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: What about hiding photographs? This is – this is looking cleanish.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: But, let me ask you now – there's a couple of times ... All right. What about hiding photographs? I get a slow-down.

PC: *Well, I've got the feeling that there must be still something there, because I'm quite puzzled on this and I feel that there is something around that's hidden, but I haven't a clue myself what it is.*

LRH: Well, is there any earlier incident? Is there any earlier incident on this? Did you hide some of those photographs that were in the trunk?

PC: *I took some of them. I didn't hide them. I told Mother I wanted some and some I didn't want and could I – I took them and put them in my own photograph album. Some of them are still there.*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *Don't think they are particularly hidden as such.*

LRH: Good. All right. Let me check this now. What about hiding photographs? Man, there it is, in full bloom. There it is. There it is.

PC: *Well, that's the picture of the um ...*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *That's the picture of the machine room – our printing office in Australia ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... where we do our printing. I didn't hide any photographs there that I know of.*

LRH: All right. All right. There's something ...

PC: *Funny feeling in my head.*

LRH: There's something right there. You just thought of something.

PC: *I got a picture of the machinery and this funny feeling in my head and I thought of machines.*

LRH: Did you do anything to that machine?

PC: *Well, there's lots of machines. There are probably about fifteen. I don't think I did anything to the machines.*

LRH: All right. Did you do anything to the photographs?

PC: *There were a whole lot of rather outdated posters on the wall that had photographs in it that I would liked to have pulled off. But, I just suddenly thought of some lithography – um – big lithography stones that we had, that had*

photographs on the inside. And I wasn't supposed to touch them and I turned them over and looked at them and I was told I mustn't – I must be very careful because they shouldn't be broken.

LRH: Hm-hm. All right.

PC: *And we used to do some color printing.*

LRH: All right. Did you ever hide any of those?

PC: *There's lots of things with – to do with blocks and things.*

LRH: All right. Did you ever hide any of those?

PC: *No. I played with them when I shouldn't.*

LRH: All right. *Pang! Pang!* What did you just think of? *Pang!*

PC: *I thought of a block, a printing block. You know, the um – um – the ones that you do with acid.*

LRH: Well, all right. Let's see if we can pick up something earlier than this. What about hiding photographs?

PC: *Well, the thing that came to mind very early when you were talking to me about this was – I was over in an auditing session in 1950 – 53, 54 and I ran into that thing with the photograph within the photograph within the photograph.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And, I ran into that a bit and he asked – he talked about cameras ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... and um – and I thought of that when you – when you started – at the beginning of that – that passed through my mind. But there was nothing about stealing*

photographs there. There might have been doing things to people with photographs.

LRH: Hm-hm. All right.

PC: *I'm sorry, hiding photographs. Hm-hm. Hm-hm.*

LRH: Let me look this over. Let me look this over. Let's look over this exact question now.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: What about hiding photographs? All right. As far as I am concerned that's null.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Now let's take up uh ... Think around about something or other.

PC: *I don't know. I thought the thing wasn't null.*

LRH: Uh?

PC: *I thought it hadn't been null actually. And I kept thinking about the photographs now, because I'm very intrigued to know what was making it react.*

LRH: All right. I get a stick now. Well, you've taken the double stick off of it. I don't know how, but we've taken it off. But it'll doing something else with photographs that we're interested in here, I think. Doing something else with photographs. Have you done something else with photographs? All right. Or have you done something else with pictures? Ah – pictures.

PC: *Well, I've blotted them out.*

LRH: Pictures. Mental image pictures.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Clang!

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Clang! Mental image pictures.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Yeah. We got a reaction here.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: We got another reaction here.

PC: *It's sort of like my mental image pictures are all – are like great big – in patches I get them in, like photographic plates ...*

LRH: Yeah, yeah.

PC: *... and they all get compressed up. And I see them occasionally like that. Sometimes they're little ones, but sometimes they're great long ones and I can see halls and halls and halls of them.*

LRH: All right. Well, let me fumble around here, for a minute here. What about mental image pictures? What about doing things to mental image pictures? There is our reaction. Can you answer that question? What about doing things to mental image pictures?

PC: *Oh! I can think of about three possibilities. Not-ising people's sort of mock-ups that they put up to – as ideas to – that they think are good and you sort of say uhh-huh. And um – sort of squeezing them up. And I also thought when I first came into Scientology that um – a mental image picture was quite different from what it turned out to be. I thought they had to be as solid as this room.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And it took me about three years to discover, that at first of all they weren't.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *And um – I always wanted to paint. And then I suddenly had a – I thought at the time – that period – that until my mental image pictures got better...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... I-I wouldn't be able to paint or draw.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, have you ever done anything to a mental image picture? Pang-pang. There we are. There it is. Bang-bang

PC: *Well, that's a mental image picture of mine, of a whole big filing cabinet of what I call one junky piece of my bank that had all cobwebs over it ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... and I cleaned it up.*

LRH: You cleaned this up?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. When was that?

PC: *That would have been September of 1959.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. All right. Is that all there is to that?

PC: *I think I whitewashed it.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It was my reactive bank filing cabinets and I didn't like it very much.*

LRH: All right. And who failed to find out about this?

PC: *Well, you did. Any other auditor except the auditor who audited me at the time.*

LRH: All right. Did that auditor find out about it?

PC: *Yes. As far as I know. I told her I whitewashed it. I sort of got the con-*

cept of painting the outside to make it look clean.

LRH: All right. Thank you. And uh ...

PC: *The inside wasn't clean though unfortunately ...*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right.

PC: *... that still contained the junk.*

LRH: All right. Now, let's take a – take a look at this now, this question here. What about doing things to mental image pictures? I got the double reaction here. Very nice. Can you think of an earlier instance where you've done something to a mental image picture? There, you're right on something there.

PC: *Well, that was an auditing session in 1953 when I had some mental image picture of a procession of monks going to throw bodies into a volcano and I never got it back again and I blotted it out I suppose. I've never seen it again.*

LRH: All right. All right. Thank you. Let me check this question now. What about doing things to mental image pictures? All right. I got a slightly speeded rise there. Can you think of another thing you have done to mental image pictures?

PC: *Well, sometimes I have seen pictures and I didn't really like them very much, so I sort of said "Oh, goodness," and put a screen up or put a bit of blackness up or something like that.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, let me check this question. What about doing things to mental image pictures? There's the double reaction. A tiny double reaction. There's two reactions here. One is a wide one and this is a tiny one. We're getting

them both on this subject. There it is right there.

PC: *I was thinking of mental images.*

LRH: It's what?

PC: *I was thinking of mental images and images.*

LRH: All right. Well, have you done something to them?

PC: *Images? Not ...*

LRH: Mental image pictures.

PC: *Well, the only other thing I can think of, other than the fact I was thinking about mental images or images, was that I've not-ised them.*

LRH: All right. Very good. When's the first time you recall doing this? There it is.

PC: *I think it's this 1953 thing.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And uh ...

PC: *I didn't know anything about it before that.*

LRH: Well, is that all there is to that?

PC: *As far as I know. We never got the incident moving or anything.*

LRH: All right. What is this? A failed incident?

PC: *There was a couple of failed ones with that auditor. Was the first auditor I ever had in 1953.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And what didn't appear there?

PC: *Whether I had poked somebody's eyes out or got my own poked out.*

LRH: All right. All right. And who didn't find out about this?

PC: *Me and the auditor.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Now this is just a little test question here. Was there a missed withhold in that session? I don't find so particularly.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: You do think of one?

PC: *No, I think there was a missed withhold with him in another question – in another session. But I think that was got to.*

LRH: Well, what was the missed withhold in the other session?

PC: *Well, he told me to go to the beginning of an incident. And – but that equated to me "cry". So, for years I thought that every auditor who wanted to audit me, was going to get me to cry. And until this was pulled off me, I always had that consideration.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Now, let me check this question again. What about doing things to mental image pictures? It looks clean. All right. What do you think about all this now?

PC: *It seems so innocent.*

LRH: It does seem innocent doesn't it?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Your tone arm is down here to 2.25. Needle's a little floppier.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. We're gonna check out a goal. Okay?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: I just took a random read off here, that kept banging. You may have some more, but we're not terribly interested, I'm just trying to get – get the thing going. Now, this goal that you had ...

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: ... was "to go to war."

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Correct?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: To go to war. All right. Now, very rapidly, we're going to get in middle ruds again. All right. In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated? And what's that?

PC: *I didn't think of invalidated, I thought of suppressed. I sort of was comm lagging a little bit.*

LRH: You got an instant read on invalidated.

PC: *Um.*

LRH: What did you invalidate in this session? There it is.

PC: *Well, I thought then, I hope it checks out all right. I'd hate my auditor to be – to be invalidated.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Thank you very much. All right. All right. I'm going to check the whole middle rud. In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of? Thank you very much. It's all clean. Now, on the goal "to go to war," has anything been suppressed? That's clean. On the goal "to go to war," has anything been invalidated? That is clean. On the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have failed to reveal? There's a tiny slowdown there. Almost imperceptible.

PC: *There's a withhold I've – have got from the auditor ...*

LRH: Yes, what is it?

PC: *... that she hasn't had a chance to get yet because I haven't had another session.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But I wondered, whether she'd be able to get me through it.*

LRH: Very good. All right. Thank you. On the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. That's apparently okay. On the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have been careful of? All right. Got an odd reaction there. I couldn't tell whether that was a read or not a read. What's this that's just happened here?

PC: *I was wondering whether it was reacting and I thought of that goal you found on me and wondered why you weren't checking it, too.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. On the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have been careful of? All right. That is clean. All right.

Now, we're going to say the goal a few times. To go to war. Thank you. To go to war. It read the first time.

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: To go to war. To go to war. To go to war. All right. How much listing has been done on this goal?

PC: *About five sessions.*

LRH: Five sessions worth of listing?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. How do you feel after five sessions worth of listing?

PC: *Oh, tremendously much better.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It's made an enormous difference.*

LRH: All right. Let me check it again.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: On the goal "to go to war," is there anything that has been suppressed? All right. On the goal "to go to war," is there anything that has been invalidated? All right. That's okay. On the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have been careful of? All right. You got reaction on that. Probably my question fault.

PC: *No, I thought of, that I ran into a picture last time that I couldn't break through a barrier. And I'm – I've as if I've failed to reveal what's behind that.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Couldn't get cracking on it.*

LRH: Very good. On the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. I've still got a reaction here. Can you think of anything else you failed to reveal on this goal? There it is.

PC: *No, that was um – to do with what I said to you before. Um – when I had to check Jenny's goal ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *...I had to pull some withholds off on her and she had some on me.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *One of them was jammed up on a withhold of the sort of stuff that I had to give her and I felt a slight sense of perhaps having to pull my punches with her,*

just in case I restimulated – restimulated her with that type of withhold.

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *Second dynamic sort of stuff.*

LRH: Okay. On the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have failed to reveal? There might have been a tiny slowdown there, I'll ask it again.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: On the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have failed ... on the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. That's clean. Okay.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: On the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have been careful of? All right. That's okay.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. To go to war. To go to war. To go to war. To go to war. How much listing would you say five sessions had amounted to? How long are these sessions?

PC: *Um – about two – two to two and a half, except one at one and three quarters.*

LRH: Yeah, all right.

PC: *We have it – have it up at seven a lot of the time.*

LRH: All right. And how much listing do you think had taken place there?

PC: *I don't know how many items. I should say there's probably about – at a rough guess about four hundred on each.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Thank you.

PC: *Maybe more, maybe less. I don't know.*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Now, on listing the goal "to go to war," has anything been invalidated? On listing the goal "to go to war," has anything been suppressed? Okay. You thought of something late. You care to say anything about it?

PC: *Well, there's one set of terminals that I get that I call my gracious lady. And they get joked about rather a bit. I suppose you could say they get invalidated, but it's out of session. Not in session.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And I invalidate the nice side of this. There's an opposition side that I also feel really friendly and affable and I don't approve of myself being friendly and affable, see, so I invalidate that side of the listing.*

LRH: Okay. All right. On the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have suppressed? All right. That is clean. On the goal – on listing the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have suppressed? Halt. I'm sorry I gave that to you wrong the first time, but on listing it, there is something that has been suppressed. What is it?

PC: *Grief*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. Good enough. I'll check it again.

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: On listing the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have suppressed? Okay. That is clean. On the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have invalidated? All right. That is clean.

On listing the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have invalidated? I got a reaction here. A little bit latent, but I had better get it.

PC: *I was thinking about the grief again. I always suppress grief.*

LRH: All right. You invalidated the grief? Is that it?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: ... what you're telling me?

PC: *I suppose so.*

LRH: All right. Let me check it again. On listing the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have invalidated? Yes ma'am.

PC: *I was thinking I always invalidate grief in myself. I don't approve of being grieved.*

LRH: All right. How about this listing?

PC: *Well, I got grieved one day doing listing and I invalidated it.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. We'll check it out. On listing the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have invalidated? All right. That's clean. Thank you. On listing the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right.

On listing the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have been careful of? All right. That's clean.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: I'm going to repeat one of these middle ruds here. On listing the goal "to go to war" is there anything you have failed to reveal? That needle just tends to stagger just a little bit on that.

PC: *Well, I got a picture of this great – this meteorite-size piece of lump of mest that I saw the other night and I didn't find out the whole story about it.*

LRH: All right. All right. So, here we go. On listing the goal "to go to war," is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. That's clean I think, I think.

PC: *Can't think of anything else I've failed to reveal, except I've failed to reveal the whole of my bank to myself yet.*

LRH: Oh, all right. I'm going to check this again. On listing the goal "to go to war" is there anything you have failed to reveal? That's clean. Thank you. Sorry to give you one as thin as that but uh ...

PC: *That's all right.*

LRH: All right. All right. Here we go. To go to war. To go to war. To go to war. To go to war. All right. To go to war. All right. That goal must be either just about listed out or something.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Something. It isn't reading now.

PC: *Was it reading before?*

LRH: Well, it bangs once in a while when I use it in the middle of a context or something like that. But if it's been listed that far, why it wouldn't necessarily be alive.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Now, I'm going to check the other goal ...

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: ... the old one.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: All right. To be an antisocial singer. Okay. That read. To be an antisocial singer. That read.

PC: *It would.*

LRH: All right. To be an antisocial singer. That didn't read. To be an antisocial singer. Okay. To be an antisocial singer. All right. That is not getting a reaction now.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Is there anything about the goal "to be an antisocial singer" that you have suppressed? That's clean. Is there anything about the goal "to be an antisocial singer" that you have invalidated? That is clean. Is there anything about the goal "to be an antisocial sinner – singer" that you – I beg your pardon.

PC: *I'd be too pleased.*

LRH: All right. Is there anything about the goal "to be an antisocial singer" that you have failed to reveal? Doesn't react.

PC: *Um.*

LRH: Is there anything about the goal "to be an antisocial singer" that you have been careful of? Now, I got a tiny slowdown there. It's hardly detectable.

PC: *Well, it's this slight little wince about it again you know, wahh.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I withdraw from it slightly.*

LRH: Very good. I'll check that again. Is there anything about the goal "to be an antisocial singer" that you have been careful of? All right. I'm getting a slowdown instead, as an instant read on it. You got another one?

PC: *There was something I thought of. When I was in communication with you on the telex ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... a couple of times about this I was careful of what I said just in case you landed me with it again.*

LRH: If we learned what?

PC: *I wa – in case you landed me with it again. I was careful of what I said.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *I told you the whole truth but I was careful.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Okay. All right. Let me check that last one. Is there anything about the goal "to be an antisocial singer" that you have been careful of? All right. That is clean.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Let's check the goal again. To be an antisocial singer. Okay. To be an antisocial singer. Okay. To be an antisocial singer. Okay. To be an antisocial singer. All right. It is not reading.

PC: *Um. It doesn't feel like it.*

LRH: It makes you nervous though when I ...

PC: *Oh, you're not kidding it does. Terribly nervous!*

LRH: It's not reading. It's not in.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Now, either the goal to go to war has been listed out ...

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: ... and so forth ... And your next test on a goal to go to war, if it lists to a free needle fine, if it doesn't, well, that's it. All right. To go to war. To go to war. To go to war. This thing is really ...

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: I get nothing on it. That's all. All right honey, that's all I'm going to do, except the end rudiments.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: All right. Here we go. In this session have you told me any half-truth, untruth, said something only to impress me?

PC: *I said a few minutes ago that you landed me with it and I didn't mean to impress you, but it sounded rude again.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Didn't read anyway.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: And in this session have you tried to damage anyone?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. They're all clean. In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?

PC: *No.*

LRH: No. Good. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Now, there's a fall of some kind or another and I'm not sure on what so I'm going to repeat the auditing command. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you? All right. That's clean.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: That's clean. You had a sudden spurt of thinkingness in the middle of that.

PC: *Did I?*

LRH: Yeah. It's all right.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. In this session have you withheld anything from me? Thank you. That is clean. And are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. That's clean. And now, look around here and tell me if you can have anything

PC: *Hm-hm, the picture.*

LRH: All right. Okay. That was clean. All right. Have you made any part of your goals for this session?

PC: *Yes. Thank you.*

LRH: All right. Any gains you'd care to mention?

PC: *Well, I do feel now totally happy about the earlier goal. And I'm not hiding anything from you about it at all and I feel relieved.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Um.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *And I wasn't sure whether you said the goal ought to be carried on being listed or not.*

LRH: All right. Anything else you'd care to say about this? Gains?

PC: *Um? Well, I wondered how I'd feel with these things here, what's its name, but they didn't bother me.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Okay.

PC: *I feel, you know, brighter and more cheerful.*

LRH: All right. Oh, I'm not asking for applause.

PC: *But I do.*

LRH: All right. Now, is there anything you would care to say or ask before I end this session?

PC: *Yes. I didn't get whether you said that that goal should go on, on to being listed on or not.*

LRH: Oh, yes. It has to go on listed. Go ahead, that's all right.

PC: *I just wasn't sure about that.*

LRH: All right, 2 – line fourteen, sixteen – it's actually down to 2 here ma'am, back and forth. You're a little above 2 right now.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Anything you care to ask or say before I end this session?

PC: *Just, thank you very much.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Here it is: End of session.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: All right. Session ended for you?

PC: *Yes. Thank you.*

LRH: All right. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC: *You're no longer auditing me.*

LRH: Good. Okay.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: Ten minute break.

PC: *Thank you.*

TV DEMO: CHECKING OUT A GOAL, PART II

An auditing demonstration given on 13 June 1962

LRH: Is it all right to audit in this room?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Now, look around here.

PC: Okay.

LRH: All right. All right, and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. I get a little disturbance on that. What is it?

PC: *Well, I wanted to get through the rudiment and didn't want to mess around with it. I thought you were going to say then no, it's not – it's not in. I was rather surprised when you gave me the question, "Have a look around here."*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I had looked around, but I hadn't actually moved my head. I had a quick twist of my eyes.*

LRH: Yes, yes, yes. All right. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right. Your havingness is all right. All right. I'll check that one more time. Look around here and tell me if it is all right to audit in this room.

PC: Yes.

LRH: I got a reaction on that. That's it.

PC: *Camera, a camera, that camera isn't working properly and it should be, and I wondered just before you asked. And I thought on that one and I'd seen it switched to the other camera so, that was all right. Well, I think it was a little disturbing that the camera wasn't working properly.*

LRH: All right, thank you. All right. Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: Yes.

LRH: There's still a reaction.

PC: *It's warm.*

LRH: Warm. Okay, thank you. Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. That was clean, as far as I'm concerned. All right. Now, are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: Yes.

LRH: I got a reaction there.

PC: *Well, I just thought it might be a bit embarrassing, as the goal we're*

going to look at is a domestic second dynamic goal and I just thought it might be a bit difficult with the people downstairs. First time I thought of that. But uh ...

LRH: Okay.

PC: *It's all right.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me check it out on the meter here. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. I haven't got no reaction there. That's clean though. Now, since the last time I audited you ...

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: ... have you done anything you are withholding?

PC: *No.*

LRH: I've got a *clank* here. There we are.

PC: *Uh – sexual relationships since last time, I suppose, and I was withholding it. I've had sexual relationships since last time.*

LRH: Yeah. Yeah. That's quite all right. Okay. All right. Let me check it out on the meter. Since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding? All right, that's ... I'm not quite sure of this read. Let me ask it again. Since the last time I audited you have you done anything that you are withholding? I've got a reaction.

PC: *Photography.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I've got some prints back today, some film and know you are interested, and I didn't know whether they were really good enough to show you. So I sort*

of hadn't said anything about those. I sort of thought them – thought about them.

LRH: Okay. All right. Since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding? Got a reaction. Something else, it's not the same. There it is. There it is. There it is right there.

PC: *Well it seems to do with students leaving course, am ...*

LRH: Anything else on that?

PC: *Well, I suppose I've tried to explain the – um – explain the – um – policy on students leaving course, and – um – not too sure whether I've explained it completely.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *There's a doubt there, so of course I've withheld something.*

LRH: All right. Let me check that on the meter now. Since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding? It reacts.

PC: *Yes this is, yes, I've been beaten. I – before I came up here, I knew I was coming up, I went to the bathroom, washed my hands.*

LRH: Right.

PC: *As I have a theory. It's been knocked out time and time again – that if you wash your hands when – before you come up, the read is different. It isn't, you see, I'm still reading 2.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Very good. Let me check this out on the meter now. Since the last time I audited you have you done anything that you are withholding? It reacts. It's a different reaction.

PC: *Um-mm. Didn't know I was such a withholder. Um.*

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

PC: *Oh, this is to do – this is – oh, we're going back a bit. This is to do with the bungalow I'm thinking of renting now.*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *In East Grinstead.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Since the last time I audited you have you done anything that you are withholding? All right, I don't get a reaction on that now.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: Okay? All right. Do you have a present time problem? All right. There's no reaction on that. Okay. Now, I would like to do a rapid Prepcheck ...

PC: *Hu-huh.*

LRH: ... on the middle rudiments if that's all right with you.

PC: *That's fine.*

LRH: All right, and here is the first question: On goals have you ever suggested anything? I have to ask that again.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: I'm going to do a little piece of fish and fumble here if that's all right with you.

PC: *Hu-huh.*

LRH: Because I've got a little tiny bounce which is interfering with a read or a checkout.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: It's a sporadic bounce here. First thing I'm going to do is check the middle ruds. Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Yes, what?

PC: *Um – well bringing up the subject of Jenny and myself.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Let me check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? All right. That seems to be clean. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? Got a reaction.

PC: *Well, I felt it was an invalidation when I said about washing my hands and the cans and so on.*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. Thank you. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? Got a reaction.

PC: *Yes, when – when you said the um – rudiment was clean, the withhold rudiment, I thought – glory, I thought, I must have done much more than that and I've got away with it lightly. So I invalidated the check to that extent.*

LRH: Very good. Thank you. All right. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? It's very equivocal here. Let me check it again. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? I got a reaction. There it is. There it is – right there. Right there. There. There. There.

PC: *Well, I suppose the meter to some extent here on um – when you asked me whether I was willing to talk to you about difficulties, again I felt I got away with a rudiment – an answer very lightly.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Thank you. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? All right, it's an equivocal read. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? All right. That is still reading.

PC: *Invalidated myself when I heard that you got a – a difficult needle to read. I felt there must be something wrong with me that ...*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *... it should be reading badly.*

LRH: Okay. All right. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? All right that is clean now. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Yes. What?

PC: *Names.*

LRH: All right. Okay. I'll check it on the meter. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. That is cleaner, let me see if it's totally clean. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, that's clean. All right. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? Equivocal read.

PC: *Uh-huh.*

LRH: I'll check it again. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? It's not reading as an instant read.

PC: *Um.*

LRH: I'm still getting a – a weird runaround here, so we're now going to do this little bit of fish and fumble. Okay?

PC: *Right.*

LRH: As far as rudiments, middle ruds are concerned, that – that's clean, but let me see something else here. What are you thinking of right that minute?

PC: *What do I – I feel I hadn't, um – if you'd asked me if the meter had reacted on some of these rudiments, I*

would have told you that when you first told me I was coming up here tonight, I was quite all right. But then sitting down-stairs I gradually got a nervous feeling turned on, which is – was still present when I sat down in session. Now I don't know.

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, needle's gliding around here beautifully now.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: But I'm still getting a little bit of odds and ends. Let's think over our present circumstances here. What did you just think of right there?

PC: *Well, the situation as far as my wife and my other relationships are concerned.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Now we're getting a bing, bing, as we go on this thing All right. What are you thinking of *right* there?

PC: *Well, that the goal we're going to check out has so much to do with all this, you see.*

LRH: All right. All right. All right. We've got an action here.

PC: *It's apprehension from me – in here. It's apprehension I think, on what this will dig up, and so on.*

LRH: Uh-huh. Uh – there's a tiny little dirty needle sort of a bounce as you think about this particularity, and you say it's something about the goal.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Um. All right. I'm going to try to free the goal reaction on this. But I'm getting a failed to reveal type of action. Is there anything you failed to reveal about this? Is there anything you failed to reveal about this? Yes. Yes.

PC: *About what?*

LRH: Yeah, well, just about what I don't ...

PC: *Ah, yes, right. Well, it's about Jenny and I.*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. Bing, no, there we got that same reaction. There is the little dance, bing, bing, there it is.

PC: *This is – what is it – in the officer's mess you never mention the lady's name – you see.*

LRH: I see. I see. Is that what it is? Is this something about the mention of this name?

PC: *Suppression of the name, and uh – uh – well, suppression of anything that might embarrass Jenny.*

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. All right. Good enough. Now, I'm not going to go further with this ...

PC: *All right.*

LRH: ... because I have done a little something here and it's apparently definitely associated with the goal ...

PC: *Hm-mm.*

LRH: ... something like this. So I'm not going to do anything further with it, unless I find it impossible to read through this thing

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *Uh-huh.*

LRH: All right. Here's the first question. On goals have you ever suggested anything? Equivocal. On goals have you ever suggested anything? Probably null. On goals is there anything you have

suggested? All right. We get a reaction on goals. But uh ...

PC: *This is to do with – what I was thinking of then ...*

LRH: Yeah, go ahead.

PC: *... was my daughter's goal who – when she wanted to start a career, and so on, I was sort of suggesting things to her then.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *That's what came up.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. Good enough. All right. I'll check it again. On goals is there anything you have suggested? No reading on that. All right. On goals is there anything you *had* suggested? That reacts. You had something suggested to you on goals?

PC: *Well, people have always suggested what I should do, but this does not – not as applicable to goals in Scientology – goals in – in life, people always had to suggest things to me.*

LRH: Good enough. On goals is there anything you've had suggested? All right. That's clean. On goals is there anything you have suppressed? Yes.

PC: *Well I think I've suppressed any doubts about – or tried to suppress anyway – doubts about this goal of mine being my goal or being the goal. I've sort of batted for the side on that.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Let me check that now. On goals is there anything you have suppressed? Reacts. Anything else?

PC: *Oh, this has to do with a student's goal that I checked out, and I wasn't too sure about it. And I think I suppressed my uncertainty on the – on the checkout.*

Something that proved all right, by the way, but to be honest I wasn't really sure.

LRH: Okay. All right. On goals is there anything you have suppressed? All right. That is clean. Thank you. On goals is there anything you have invalidated? All right, there's no read there. Thank you. Now, on goals is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, let me check that again. On goals is there anything you have failed to reveal? I got a reaction.

PC: *Well, what I think of is, more or less – yes, failed to reveal – was that at one time this goal was checked out by an auditor and was said to be clear. Thought it was clean, we'd finished it when we were running the old type processes on it, and we did start to list again for a new goal.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *And I don't know if I've ever really got this over to anybody.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Thank you. All right. On goals is there anything you have failed to reveal? I've got a reaction there, a slowdown and then a knock. There. There. Right there.

PC: *Oh, this is the – that's the uncertainty that I had when I – the first goals that I found when on the course here. And I'd get them to read, and then you sort of doubt, and then you'd be wheeled down to Mary Sue or somebody to check them out and they would check out. And then I think I failed to reveal at the time my surprise. I wished to be very nonchalant about it and say, well of course, and so on.*

LRH: Yes.

PC: *But I think I failed to reveal that I wasn't all that certain at the time.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Okay. On goals is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, that's probably clean. On goals is there anything you have failed to reveal? It's very, very hard to tell whether or not this – this did that. Let me check it one more time. On goals is there anything you have failed to reveal? That's clean. Thank you. It was your deep breath that did it. Now, on goals is there anything you have been careful of? I got a reaction.

PC: *Been very careful not to invalidate anybody's goal, or the method of finding it, or anything like that.*

LRH: Good. Thank you. On goals is there anything you have been careful of? I'm going to check that one more time. On goals is there anything you have been careful of? Can you think of another answer to that?

PC: *Well, what I was thinking was that that wasn't – that was a good answer, and I think when I'd given you one, previous one, that I'd been careful and I'd been very good, and I thought well that shouldn't be reacting. There should be something else there, and that's as far as I'd got then. Um ...*

LRH: Something right there. There. There.

PC: *Well, this is being too careful, being too careful in checking out goals and probably taking too long over it and keeping – this is, this is it – keeping in goals on a list that you are suspicious of, but – but really if you knew your job, they would be out. Being too careful in assessing.*

LRH: All right. Very good. On goals is there anything you have been careful of? I've still got a reaction here. There it is.

PC: *Well, that's all it was. I've always been careful to let everybody know what my goal was.*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. All right, let me check it. On goals is there anything you have been careful of? All right. This is apparently flat. Okay?

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: All right. Now, on goals have you ever told a half-truth? Yes.

PC: *Oh dear, this is sad. Um ...*

LRH: There it is. Right there.

PC: *Oh yes, this is something Mary Sue asked me one day. Yes, I checked out a Goals Assessment one day, and I did it at sensitivity 16, which I thought was right. Then I went down and Mary Sue said, "You checked this with a full-dial drop?" So I said, "Oh yes, "you see, and knowing I was lying, or half lying, lying as it was, but I – I did this at the time and I couldn't quite – couldn't quite make out why because it would be quite all right to tell Mary Sue I'd done it at 16. But I – the way she put it, it was the right thing to do, the full-dial drop, but this, at that time, was news to me, do you see? That had to be right, so to that degree there was a half-truth there.*

LRH: All right. Very good. On goals have you ever told a half-truth? I've got to ask that again. On goals have you ever turned a – told a half-truth? Something's going on here. On goals have you ever told a half-truth? Well frankly ...

PC: *Uh-huh?*

LRH: ... it's firing at half.

PC: *At half?*

LRH: And it's not firing at half-truth. So we're going to consider that null. Okay?

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Now, on goals have you ever told an untruth? There's no reaction there. Okay? Now, on goals have you ever influenced an E-Meter? Oh, there's something, something on that. On goals have you ever influenced an E-Meter? I'll ask it again, it's latent. On goals have you ever influenced an E-Meter? No, there's no reaction on that. Thank you. All right. On goals have you ever tried to damage someone? Something there.

PC: *Well, my goal is to damage someone.*

LRH: All right. All right. All right. Let me check that again. On goals have you ever tried to damage someone? All right. No read. All right. On goals have you ever failed to answer a question or command? It dances on that one.

PC: *Well, I thought of all the times when Mike was auditing me on the goal itself, and we sat out there for hours and he did a good job of it, but we didn't have the rudiments we have now, but I think some of those questions and commands must have gone unanswered.*

LRH: All right. Very good. On goals have you ever failed to answer a question or command? All right, there's a reaction there on command... There it is.

PC: *This was the session I've got that was given by Robin. I think it was that session that I sort of doped off for a while, and I'm not sure that I'd answered all the – I can't say that I answered the command then.*

LRH: Hm-hm. All right. On goals have you ever failed to answer a question or command? All right. That's clean. All right. Now, I'm going to do the middle ruds for this session.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Okay. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Invalidated? What have you invalidated in this session? There it is.

PC: *Well, myself again. I've done it again, I've thought about this – your difficulty in reading the needle. This isn't – is something I shouldn't have, and I'm not proud of it, and I'm invalidating myself on that.*

LRH: Okay. Very good. Let me check this on the meter now. In this session have you – is there anything you have invalidated? Yes.

PC: *Well, there is a tendency, I suppose, to try not to, as well – that was Mike when he was – Mike's auditing of me.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And also Robin, Robin of course.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Um-hm.*

LRH: All right. Okay. I'll check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? All right. Very equivocal. Let me ask it again. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? I don't get a read on that. All right. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, that's clean.

In this session is there anything you have been careful of? All right, that is clean. Thank you.

Now, we're going to ask this goal. Now, the goal, if I remember rightly, was "To leave my wife," right?

PC: *That's right.*

LRH: Very good. Now, let's just check it just on the face of it. All right. To leave my wife. Okay. No reaction. To leave my wife. Okay. To leave my wife. Okay. To leave my wife. All right. There's the tiniest, im- almost imperceptible slow-down when we get into that, but otherwise no reaction. So let's do the middle ruds on this.

PC: *Hm, good.*

LRH: All right. On this goal, to leave my wife, is there anything you have suppressed? Yes. There. There. There.

PC: *Well, I've suppressed, um – suppressed carrying it out.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Good enough. On this goal, to leave my wife, is there anything you have suppressed? All right, that's clean. On this goal, to leave my wife, is there anything you have invalidated? All right. I'll ask that question again. On this goal, to leave my wife, is there anything you have invalidated? There's a slowdown there.

PC: *Um – I've invalidated its correctness on the grounds that it's possibly – um – too present time-ish to be of any real value on that ground. Although I've also realized it can be quite a long-term – long-track goal, but that's what I have tended to do.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Good. On this goal, to leave my wife, is there anything you have invalidated? All right, the read is quite latent. We'll ask it again, however. On this goal, to leave my wife, is there anything you have invalidated? No.

That's it. On this goal, to leave my wife, is there anything you have failed to reveal? There's a reaction.

PC: *Failed to reveal I've almost done it.*

LRH: All right. Very good. On this goal, to leave my wife, is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right; that is clean. On this goal, to leave my wife, is there anything you have been careful of? Equivocal read, can you think of anything offhand?

PC: *Well, I've been careful not to upset my wife anymore than I can possibly help.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. On this goal, to leave my wife, is there anything you have been careful of? I got a reaction.

PC: *Children.*

LRH: All right. Very good. On this goal, to leave my wife, is there anything you have been careful of? That is clean. Thank you. All right. To leave my wife. All right.

I'm going to check a line. Who or what would oppose the goal to leave my wife? Who or what would oppose the goal to leave my wife? Who or what would not oppose the goal to leave my wife? Okay. Who or what would want the goal to leave my wife? I'll ask that again. Who or what would want the goal to leave my wife? Who or what would want the goal to leave my wife? Is there anything you failed to reveal about listing this goal?

PC: *Only that the – um – it was done from a short list. Found out it wasn't a short list really, I mean, I think it was*

two or three hundred goals. Um ...

LRH: There's something.

PC: *Well, there I was thinking of when Mary Sue was checking it out, that a – there was one or two embarrassing goals at the time. Since I've seen some others, it wasn't so, but I always remember this particular goal that Mary Sue read out and it rather shook me when Mary Sue read it to me, you see, with her perfect TR 0, or something.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Well, let me read that on the meter. All right. On listing this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, that's clean enough.

PC: *Um-hm.*

LRH: All right. Now, on writing the items down for this goal, is there anything you have failed to reveal? There's a little bit of a something here.

PC: *I wasn't quite sure, because I couldn't recall writing any items down ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *...for this goal.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Then I'll change the question.

PC: *Um-hm.*

LRH: On listing a line for this goal, is there anything you have failed to reveal? There's nothing there. All right. On the original terminals list for this goal, is there anything you have failed to reveal?

PC: *Well, that – well, that terminals ... Now, I can recall your – you listed these terminals for me in the – in your office downstairs.*

LRH: Um-mm.

PC: *That was a short list.*

LRH: Um-hm.

PC: *Um – but – um – don't think there was anything else I failed to reveal there.*

LRH: All right. Very good, very good. All right. On listing on this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? Doesn't read. Okay. All right. Now, let's take up a little bit more about this. On listing for goals, have you suggested anything. Yes. What?

PC: *Suggested that people shouldn't do them out of session.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Good. All right. On listing for goals have you suggested anything? That's clean. Thank you.

On listing is there anything you have suggested? A little halt.

PC: *Well, only a silly little thing comes up.*

LRH: What's that?

PC: *That people, when they list them, leave a margin for the checkout for the auditor to tick them off.*

LRH: Okay. All right. On listing have you suggested anything? All right, that's clean. All right.

On listing have you suppressed anything? All right, that's clean.

On listing have you invalidated anything? There's a reaction. Have you invalidated anything on listing?

PC: *I invalidated, I suppose to some extent, whether my lists – um – was long enough. That was – I did that today when I saw downstairs you'd put a notice on the board – well I did that today.*

LRH: All right. On listing have you invalidated anything? All right, that's clean.

On listing is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. It's probably clean, but I'll check it again. On listing is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, that's clean.

All right. On listing is there anything you have been careful of? Yes. What have you been careful of?

PC: *Careful to make my pen writing legible, which it always isn't.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. On listing is there anything you have been careful of? Still a reaction. Different reaction. There it is. There it is. Right there.

PC: *This is – um – outside of Scientology altogether, and it is listing items in a book which was a false postage book. Names of people, you see, and you make a long list out and all these people are supposed to have letters. This wasn't an overt against the firm or anything, it was an overt against the government, you see.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It was a way of getting some expenses. But I remember laboriously doing this. Yes.*

LRH: Okay. All right. On listing, on listing is there anything you have failed to reveal? Yes. What?

PC: *Well, I – what I failed to reveal is right just now, that I felt quite a sense of relief when I told you that about that postage book.*

LRH: All right. Very good, very good. All right. Let me backtrack one.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: On listing is there anything you have invalidated? All right, that's good. On listing is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, that's clean. All right. On listing is there anything you have been careful of? Now, there's a slowdown there again.

PC: *I was careful to do that list – so careful that I used different pens, and so the color – if anybody was checking this, you see, they wouldn't say this was all done on the same day with the ink. The ink was all different color. It was clever.*

LRH: All right. Very, very good. All right. On listing is there anything you have been careful of? That is clean. Thank you. I'm sorry to backtrack on this. All right, that's all right though. Very good. Now, on listing have you told any half-truths? All right, that's clean. On listing have you told any untruths? All right, that's clean. On listing have you deliberately tried to influence an E-Meter? I got a reaction of some sort, but just riding through that so I'll ask again. On listing have you deliberately tried to influence an E-Meter? No, all right, that's clean. On listing have you failed to answer a question or command? All right, that's clean. All right. Thank you. Now, on listing have you tried to damage someone? Yes. Who did you try to damage on listing? There it is. There it is.

PC: *Bobby comes to mind, but I can't get any time I did it.*

LRH: Who?

PC: *Bobby. McPherson.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Okay, well, let's check it. What are you puzzled about?

PC: *I can't say.*

LRH: All right. All right. On listing have you tried to damage someone? All right, that's clean.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Just to clarify your own mind about it, what were you – what were you worrying about there?

PC: *Well, I couldn't get the time when I had tried to damage Bobby. She came to mind when you asked the question, which I told you basically and I couldn't – anyhow, I wanted to find out the time when I'd actually done this.*

LRH: Well, does this leave you hung up on it?

PC: *No, no, no, I'm quite happy.*

LRH: Are you sure?

PC: *Oh, no, I'm quite happy if the needle is clean on it. Relieved in fact that I haven't got to go around digging and delving.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Needle's clean.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: Just didn't want to leave you hung up.

PC: *That's okay.*

LRH: All right. On listing have you failed to answer a question or command? Question. You failed to answer a question on this?

PC: *I tried to answer that question just now.*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *Thank you for listening.*

LRH: Okay. On listing have you failed to answer a question or command? That is clean. Very, very good. All right,

that being clean, we will now put in our middle ruds for the session. All right. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? In this session is there anything you have invalidated? Yes.

PC: *I just invalidated – I – while you were reading the suppressed I had the thought, well, I've got it so mocked up there's a filthy needle over there.*

LRH: There's not a filthy needle now.

PC: *No, I thought, well that's what it is. It will give the students a good chance to show how to read through one. So there was some – I was invalidating that thought.*

LRH: All right. Very good, very good. It isn't too bad. It cleans up as I go here.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: In this session is there anything you have invalidated? All right. Thank you. That's all right. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Yes.

PC: *Failed to reveal the fact that just as I was coming up here, bashed into Jenny and she says, "Good luck." And I thought "Will you shut up," you know, and stir everything up.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. There was a change of pace in the needle. Let me make sure that is clean. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? I got a change of pace of the needle. Is there any little other thing you failed to reveal in the session? There's something right there.

PC: *That my hands were sweating at one time.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Or still are, for that matter.*

LRH: Okay. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? No read. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? That's all right, that's all right. That's fine. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? Yes. What have you been careful of?

PC: *Careful to do what you told me.*

LRH: All right. Okay. All right. Let me check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? That. More.

PC: *More? Um ...*

LRH: What else have you been careful of?

PC: *Oh yes, been careful to try and find um – the – an overt rather than the motivator, or anything like that.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. Thank you. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? All right, that's clean. Okay. All right, now here's this goal again.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. To leave my wife. To leave my wife. To leave my wife. To leave my wife. All right. I'm going to try one more thing. Is there anyone to whom you have not revealed this goal?

PC: *My wife.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Thank you. To leave my wife. To leave my wife. To leave my wife. I get a little slowdown. You might tell me if there's anyone else that you failed to reveal this goal to.

PC: *My brother, my children.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *Relatives.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. Is there anyone that you failed to reveal this goal to? Is there anyone you failed to reveal this goal to? I get action here. Who else?

PC: *Oh, my father.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *Guy named Jack Dickey.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *The – um – my employees.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *Business associates.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *Um – anybody outside Scientology circles. I'm not saying any Scientologists, but anybody outside I haven't revealed it to.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Okay. Now, is there anyone that you have failed to reveal this goal to? There's still a little slowdown there.

PC: *I thought of my children, particularly then.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Let's just hit this the easy way. What's the first time you failed to reveal this to anybody? Can you spot that? There it is.

PC: *Well, it'd be the uh ...*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Just after Mary Sue found it. The next time I went home to see – the next time I went home I failed to reveal it to my wife then.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. On this goal is there anyone you

have failed to reveal it to? I've got no reaction on that now. Good. All right. To leave my wife. Slows – stops the needle. To leave my wife. Stops the needle. To leave my wife. All right. Let me try this goal, half of it. To leave. To leave. To leave. All right, that isn't reacting. It reacted just once. To leave my wife. To leave my wife. It reacted that time. To leave my wife. Reacts on to and leave and ... To leave my wife. To leave my wife. To leave my wife. It's not reacting, uh – occasionally, occasionally get a reaction on this thing. How much have you listed this now?

PC: *Well, this is several pages of the who would want to, and some on oppose.*

LRH: Any TA action?

PC: *Yes, quite a lot. Getting quite a lot of TA action on that.*

LRH: I'm going to say it a few more times here. To leave my wife. To leave my wife. To leave my wife. To leave my wife. It's not now reacting. Lot of TA action. What do you feel about listing it? How do you feel when you list?

PC: *Well, I've one stage I went through quite a dopiness, felt as if I had flu, and so on. Then I came through that.*

LRH: Yes.

PC: *And that was fine. It's when we started listing the other side that uh – the opp – the opposition to the goal.*

LRH: Um-mm.

PC: *And that felt all right. I've never had any – well some somatics did turn on – um – legs, and so on.*

LRH: You did – have not had any?

PC: *I did have some somatics, in the legs ...*

LRH: All right. Did they get worse or better?

PC: *Well, we went through them, and they went out.*

LRH: All right. Let me say this goal again. To leave my wife. All right. Who or what would not want to leave my wife? Who or what would want to leave my wife? You think that is amusing to read the goal that way, don't you?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: That's the only charge I got on it, too. All right, all right. Who or what would want the goal "to leave my wife?" Thank you. Who or what would want – would not want the goal "to leave my wife?" All right, Who or what would oppose the goal "to leave my wife?" Thank you. Who or what would not oppose the goal "to leave my wife?" All right, I'll say it one more time. Who or what would not oppose the goal "to leave my wife?" Thank you. Interesting. I don't get any – any needle reaction on the lists lines ...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: ... beyond your trying to suppress laughter. Now, we're going to look into this just a little bit more here just for a second, and then we're going to let you off the hook. Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Goal, goal, goal. All right, let me get in the middle rudiments. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Invalidated? Failed to reveal? Something there? Anything you failed to reveal?

PC: *Failed to reveal that I felt you might have said a wife instead of my wife when you were reading the line.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *You might want to read a wife instead of my wife.*

LRH: Thank you. Thank you. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? Thank you, that doesn't read. All right.

Who or what would oppose the goal "to leave my wife?" Who or what would not oppose the goal "to leave my wife?" Who or what would want the goal "to leave my wife?" Who or what would not want the goal "to leave my wife?" Okay. Goal, goal, goals, goals, goals, goals, goals. Now what are you thinking of?

PC: *I was thinking of Dick sitting down here because he's checked this goal so many times. That's what I was thinking of then.*

LRH: All right. Is this an invalidation? Yeah?

PC: *What, for Dick?*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *No, I didn't look on it as an invalidation. I thought he'd be rather interested to see this.*

LRH: All right. Goals, goals, goals. All right, thank you very much. As far as we're concerned that goal is deader than a flounder, and so are all of its lines. Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Right. All right. Here we are and we're going into the end ruds. Okay?

PC: *Fine.*

LRH: All right. In this session have you told me any half-truth? Untruth? Said something only to impress me? Or

tried to damage anyone? What's the damage?

PC: *Just thought of Dick. I didn't try to damage him, but might have done with what I said.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. In this session have you tried to damage anyone? Thank you. That is clear. In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? I got a slowdown there.

PC: *Oh, I just realized my hands are sort of tightened up and are hot on the cans.*

LRH: All right. In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? All right. Thank you, that is clean. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command? Thank you, that is clean.

In this session have you failed to reveal anything? I've got a reaction on that. Is that because I used a different rudiment?

PC: *No, well, I realized it was different, and I just thought that it didn't worry me. It seemed real.*

LRH: There's something right there. Bing-bing, bing-bing, bing-bing, bing-bing. What are you thinking about there?

PC: *Uh – well – um this should – you found this goal isn't in. It isn't the goal, and so you found it isn't the goal. Um – well, I feel it – I feel in one way it should have answered something, and in another way, well, it shouldn't. I mean nothing is – oh, I don't know, I was a bit confused about that. But that's ...*

LRH: Do you want me to say – to tell you more? I'll check this rudiment first.

PC: *Fair enough.*

LRH: All right. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? I got a rest ...

PC: *Yes it's a – I've failed to reveal the fact that I'm not surprised that it's no longer alive. And um – there's something that keeps hitting me here. Well, I'll leave it at that, that I – I'm not surprised. I found that I'm not surprised that it's not reacting anymore.*

LRH: Very good. I'll repeat the question. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. There's the tiniest ghost of a slowdown. You might care – it's – most of it's gone, but there might be a little more ghost or something, little something.

PC: *I'm rather pleased it's gone. I feel I'll get my teeth into something else better.*

LRH: All right. That's okay. All right. Thank you. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, that's flat. Okay. Now, are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Sure.*

LRH: All right. I'm going to have to check that again. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? All right. There's no reaction there. Thank you. Now look around here and tell me if you can have anything.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Something kicking you. Notice anything wrong with the room?

PC: *I notice the plug out there, but it doesn't seem to be anything wrong.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *A camera missing up there.*

LRH: All right. Now, tell me if you can have anything.

PC: *Yes, the carpet.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: I've still got a little bang now, there's a little bang here. Tell me something.

PC: *The settee, the door knob, the window plate on the door.*

LRH: All right. Thank you, that's better. All right. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right, that's good enough. Squeeze the cans. All right. That's what I thought. What was I running on you the last time? Reach or Feel?

PC: *Feel was it.*

LRH: All right. Put the cans down. All right. Feel that table. All right. Feel the arm of the chair there. Thank you. Feel that side. Okay. Feel the cloth. Thank you. Feel your lapel. Thank you. Feel the top of your head. Thank you. Feel the cuffs of your coat. Thank you. All right. Pick up the cans. Squeeze the cans. That's much better, that's good enough. That was the last of it. All right. Have you made any part of your goals for this session?

PC: *Not certain if we sorted that goal out or not.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I certainly feel quite a lot better than I did when I came in.*

LRH: Okay. Any other gains you'd care to mention?

PC: *Yes, the – uh, looking at the various aspects that come up, and although you apparently had some difficulty with them, there's nothing really serious it seemed to me. I'm rather pleased about that, and it's helped to know you're not – you haven't got a lot of overts that are still buried, and so on.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *That's quite a gain.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. Is there anything you'd care to say or ask before I end this session?

PC: *Well, you were going to tell me something, but...*

LRH: All right I will, I'll tell you something.

PC: *Uh-huh.*

LRH: If that was your goal ...

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: ... it's perfectly safe to do something else. It won't get in your road.

PC: *Thank you. Yes.*

LRH: You understand?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. You've either listed it to a null or something. I don't want to say that that would be good policy, but where a goal is equivocal ...

PC: *Um-mm.*

LRH: ... or what might or might not be, and where you did develop somatics and some flu on it, and so forth, the discussion of this goal has not shifted the tone arm.

PC: *I see. Yes.*

LRH: Clearing it up has not shifted the tone arm.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: The lines that I've read that should be listed ...

PC: *Um-mm.*

LRH: ... have not shifted the needle.

PC: *I see, yes.*

LRH: So obviously there is no disturbance because of it, and there's no invalidations or suppressions on it. So what would you think?

PC: *It's dead.*

LRH: Uh...

PC: *Obviously cleaned up I would say.*

LRH: Well, there's obviously, there's obviously. And I always looked at this goal – that's so I won't have a withhold from you ...

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: ... as something that was awful close to PT.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: It always made me nervous.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: So I'm perfectly willing for you to find another goal. And what do you know? This goal goes on the list, and you find it again, why fine.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: That answer the question?

PC: *Thank you very much.*

LRH: Give you all the data?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. That wasn't an evaluation, was it?

PC: *Not at all.*

LRH: All right. You didn't think of that as an evaluation, did you?

PC: *No.*

LRH: No, that's fine. All right. All right. Is it all right with you if I end this session?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Here it is. End of session.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: All right. Session ended for you?

PC: *Yes, thank you.*

LRH: All right. Tell me I am no longer auditing you.

PC: *You are no longer auditing me.*

LRH: Good enough.

FUTURE TECHNOLOGY

A lecture given on 14 June 1962

Well, you will have to tell me the date.

Audience: 14th June.

Fourteenth! What planet? I've got so many calls to make these days, you know!
[laughs] 14 June, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

You know, there was a great many students came in the first part of the year and that has sort of peaked the attendance here for awhile. When they arrived, they didn't know whether they'd be classified or not and when they leave, they sometimes are and they sometimes aren't. I'm going to talk to you about training a little bit more in this lecture.

Now, you think you are traveling fast now. *Heh-heh-heh!* You will think you were traveling so slow that your footprints are in front of you! Because this is the kind of a schedule that has to be met. can I give you a short rundown on same, what this is all about?

Training, as you noticed, changed recently into three sections. Now, the three sections of training were Theory, Practical and the Auditing Section.

Definition of the three sections are simply, in Theory, they have to be able to duplicate the information in bulletins and tapes, texts.

In Practical – have to do, the doingness angle of the thing.

Now, Practical actually used to be the Auditing Section. You know, used to fog around in it and that sort of thing. But the Practical now is the supervision of doingness, just as doingness.

The Auditing Section is the *fait accompli*. When you get into the Auditing Section you're not supposed to be practicing, you're supposed to be auditing. Because frankly, the only thing that is looked at in the Auditing Section will be the results that you obtain. In Practical it's how you do it and in the Auditing Section, the results.

But of course, results are now dependent on the textbook solution, which is rather unique. It's unique in any science, for any result to be obtained by the textbook solution. They teach nuclear physics today and they still tickle the tiger's tail, see. They give you formulas – endless formulas – you know. And you're supposed to be able to figure it all out – and, they do – they figure it all out, but it doesn't have anything to do with nuclear physics. They still get in there and shove bars of plutonium in and out of this and that, see. It's quite remarkable. They even run their submarines this way. The chief engineer of an atomic submarine has to know all of the Theory in the world, see. He has to be in mathematics galore, and so on. When he wants the submarine to go faster, he goes down and shoves on a rod and adjusts it to

a point where the water boils quicker. Crazy, you see. There's no textbook solution there at all.

In medicine the textbook solution is more often violated than otherwise and if you use psychiatric textbook solutions everybody'd be dead. As far as psychology is concerned, it hasn't ever pretended to have a solution for human beings – it only has solutions for animals. Oh, I didn't – I didn't mean that as a dirty crack, because, frankly, we are burying them and their future. I invite you in the next decade to the funeral of both of those activities. Of psychiatry and psychology. It'll be a very sad funeral.

But, they haven't got any textbook solutions. And right now we've moved up into the level of textbook solution.

All right, last night you saw a couple of auditing demonstrations. These were simply goal checkouts. I wanted you to see how you checked out a goal. That was the only reason I gave them. I didn't even particularly pick up goals that I wanted to check out or didn't want to check out. I thought I might learn something about it myself. How about a partly worded goal? How did it check out?

The first case that you saw had four hundred listed on each list of that particular goal. Now, if I'd tested it, you probably would have found the transfer of the goal reaction to one of the levels. Had I read the four lists off on the thing – you probably would have seen one of those lists ticking. If one of those list lines had been ticking, then of course it tended to prove out the goal. Time was going on, I didn't want to upset anything and I particularly didn't have any pat solution to it. Didn't want to say anything much more about it, because I wanted you to concentrate on just this other idea of how did you prepcheck a pc so as to prove up a goal.

Now, there was a tick on the second pc's line reads. I don't know if you saw it or not. One of the lines ticked. Well there's a high probability – is, that that goal could now be continued to be listed with profit. See, you could continue to list the goal with profit. Before I did anything more about this goal, I would read the lines off to it again and I would ascertain what was cooking here and test whether or not we could go onto a new goal, because I've already said I could always consider this goal a bit of a late one, that might list longly. And so you might profitably transfer over to another goal. But that would only be if one of those lines wasn't ticking too hard, you see.

In other words, the read that you get on a goal – I'm indebted for this term, to Charles, here. He said it very well. He said the read "transfers." That's exactly correct. That well describes it. The read transfers from the goal to one of the lines that you're listing. You see, "Who or what would not oppose going to war?" you see – *clank!* All right, well the goal, "to go to war" wouldn't read, but the line would read, if it's partially listed. Do you see that? There's more to be learned about this, there's more to be observed about this. But, there were some partially listed goals and I was simply checking them out. Giving you a Prepcheck example.

Now, if you notice, on the second pc we had a lousy dirty needle. Now, you probably wondered why I didn't finish up my fish and fumble. I'd better tell you something about that, because, there were two things that happened in that session that you might have missed. One of them is I didn't finish the fish and fumble. Every time the pc said "goal" I got a dirty nee-

dle. So I found out I was fishing and fumbling for the goal. So I got out of there. I backed the fire engine right back into the stall. And we parked it right there and went on about our business. And I thought you might possibly have missed that.

It'd been on, already. And when I started to run it down to find out if we had a missed withhold or something of the sort, why, the pc discussing it, every time he came near the subject of goal, we had a missed withhold. We were prepchecking – we were prepchecking the goal, so it was no time to fish and fumble for it because we were about to run into the line very shortly as, "On goals, is there anything you failed to reveal?" you see. And sure enough, we had it. And I finally had to ask him a slightly altered question, "Who didn't find out about the goal?" You see?

Now, the auditor had already picked up one person that had not found out about this goal – and maybe some mention of the other people – I don't know if there was mention of the other people, too. But we got a bit of a change the second that we ran through that. But on the subject of listing we got a considerable reaction. Remember?

Now, on neither of these sessions would you have seen any reason to have called this a Prepcheck. There was no Who – there was no When, All, Appear or Who. So where was the Prepcheck? Well, I didn't run into anything that needed to be prepchecked. You see? Everything cleared up on a couple of questions, see? So we're talking about a terribly short track, see. We're talking about the short track of auditing or at best this life's listing. So if we're talking about such a short track and you can just knock it out, why cheers! See? We'll do so. And the reason we call it Prepchecking is because we're always prepared to prepcheck – form up the What question, go on sailing back on the line and do a stylized job on it. But on neither case did I run into any necessity to do so. See?

These middle rudiments prepchecked out gave us an interesting reaction on the part of the first pc. The first pc was very defensive. Been talking to the pc earlier – was actually very dismayed. We invited her – we invited her, by the way, to stay over, to see the demonstration tonight. And then as a complete beast, you see, why, I suddenly realized I'd like a look at that goal and I'd like a look at the pc and see how the pc was operating. Because the pc was a bit defensive about things, you see. So I put the pc in-session. It really took her by a storm. And, when she started into that session she was really boggled. The rudiments were all out and crisscrossed, you know. But, that was all right. Got a telex from her this morning. She felt wonderful, surprised her half to death, you see. She felt wonderful and she was sawing into all the goals in the shop and had gotten another Saint Hill graduate all straightened out on his goal. So she'd instantly put it all to use at a high degree of velocity.

But before she was getting that Prepcheck, she was pretty queasy about the whole thing. And she went away feeling fine.

All right. What you saw in the Prepcheck was all textbook solution. Did you notice that? There's no variation from the textbook. There was one blunder, I don't know if you noticed it. It was the second session, it was getting late and I had not been crossing my list off and I didn't know what I'd gotten the reaction on. I have a guilty conscious every time I make a pc expose something discreditable on a TV demonstration. I don't particularly like to do that to somebody, you know? *Bang!* You know? Catch them and drive them into a corner, and so

on. He came up with a discreditable one on "careful of," you know? And he exploded with it and I looked down at my check sheet to ask the second question and I had neglected to mark it up to that point. So I had to take the safe route out. I checked the ones I knew bridged into the ones that I had gotten a reaction. See, that was pure and simple a blunder. See, I didn't remember that it was "careful of" at the moment I asked it, see.

He suddenly came up with this revelation – *bang*, you see. Well, was it on "Invalidate?" "Fail to reveal?" or "Careful of?" Which? And there I sat, see. I don't know if you might not have noticed that.

But notice that – you might not have noticed it because it was a fairly smooth recovery. I just went simply back over to the last one I knew I had covered, took the next one, checked it – checked it and finally of course had it and it was "Careful of." Meantime the pc was sitting there almost exploding with the final – with the next answer. But you notice, it didn't disturb the pc.

Now, those demonstrations you're seeing are textbook solutions. That is to say that's textbook auditing. There isn't any departure from that. The only envisaged – and I should mention this to particularly those leaving – the only envisaged change in Model Session, is to pull, "In this session ... " to the head of all end rudiments. You precede them with "In this session." You've already had the change of the withhold question in beginning rudiments and end rudiments.

But there is an additional change in Model Session and I can't tell you its absolute final form, but it runs something like this – because it's ragged. There's a raggedness to saying to somebody, "Do you have a present time problem?" He says, "Yes." Well, where are you at? See? It's an understood question. So, you could consider your rudiments question, this is the – this is the solution that I am researching right now. Consider your rudiments question this way: That the needle acknowledges for the pc so therefore you acknowledge for the pc. You an– pardon me – you answer for the pc.

Now, you see that that's going on all the time, with this anti-Q and A anyhow. You answer for the pc. You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" *Clank!*

Well, you notice that you never wait to have the pc says he does or doesn't. You notice that you say he does or doesn't, see? You say, "All right, yes, what's that? That read." You see?

After a fellow's been audited for a very short period of time he begins to expect this to happen, you see – and it is not disturbing at all. So that you've got a second question, on all rudiments questions, which is simply, "What is it?"

It's just your – your second question. That's to keep the thing from hanging in the air. And that's what I'm testing out at this particular time. So you say, "Do you have a present time problem? That read. What is it?"

And the pc says, belatedly, "Oh, well, *uh – oohh – hmmm ...* "

And you say, "Well, I'll repeat the question. What is it?"

Now, you might run into a snag that way, but that is – that is, after a considerable amount of study, the only way I can see out of this particular dilemma that is smooth. It's just recover with a "What is it?" Don't use it every time, perhaps. But certainly, if your pc does not come up with the information instantly, after you've answered for the pc. See, you've already said yes – you say, "It read." And the pc – so on. You just say, "What is it?" Don't leave the pc sitting there in a long comm lag. Got the idea? Now, there will be some more data on that, but that's the only envisaged change.

Now training has worked out this way: The auditor who comes here usually has had lots of loses. He's had loses. Let's admit it, see. First place he's been auditing up against a not totally refined technology and he's been doing this and that and he's also been doing things that were way off-line and he's lost. He's had some loses. Furthermore, he didn't have the technology which cleared everybody who walked up the walk, you see. So naturally he had some loses.

All right, then the faster we get a student into the Auditing Section to get some wins, the better off we are. Simple. We already have the solution that gives him wins. Get the rudiments in and do Havingness in the body of a session. Now, that will give him some wins – if they could read a meter, if they get the rudiments in, if they run the Havingness Process for the pc.

So this calculation has moved up to this degree: If a student has not finished his Theory, Practical and has not audited his rudiments and Havingness and all of his Prepcheck and finished up all that auditing and all of the Theory and Practical for that auditing – that's three classes, see – by the end of his sixth week, his chance of leaving here Clear is greatly diminished.

Now, I was just working this out. Based on a sixteen-week course, if he has not finished up all of that work in that auditing – finished by the end of the sixth week – why his chances of leaving here – so Clear that you rap him on the rim and he rings for hours – these are badly diminished, you see – the chances of doing that. You follow this reasoning?

Well, actually, it means for faster wins, if you look at it this way, because he's up against something that should win and if he doesn't get a win he'll be checked up on it in a hurry. So we look at the body of the course up to that point, as a *fait accompli*, and then we go on at the beginning of the seventh week to find a goal, and so forth. We might take that seventh week, on a dual capacity. We let him start finding the goal – because already he can prepcheck, see – during that week while he studies the Theory and practice of what he is doing in a Goals Assessment, like mad.

Now, we go on out to the far end of the course – the remaining many weeks of the course, up to sixteen weeks – and we polish up this auditor. In other words, we polish him up. Now, that doesn't mean that you who have not finished this by the end of the sixth week necessarily are out in the rain. But I would say, unless streams of sweat like Niagara Falls started falling from your brow, and if you have gone as much as three months now and are not yet on a Goals Assessment on anybody or on yourself and so on, your chances of leaving here Clear are quite poor. If you're only up to two months, well we might make it rather easily, still, you understand. If you're here three weeks and are still stumbling around with Model Session you

ought to have your head examined. See, you should have finished that at the end of the first week. See what I mean?

Grooming up the auditor would most easily take place, of course – making the auditor an absolute finished product – would more easily take place after he'd had wins. You see? So anyway, we had a bit of a conference this afternoon and that's what we were talking about and we're going to run it from that particular quarter.

Now, this has some influence on training outside. The Saint Hill graduate, going out of here, at this stage of the game, is – right at this moment – is the only one that knows anything about this three – three-section training system.

And I have gotten back some questionnaires, answers from Ds of T, that show they're terribly adrift. One of them wanted to know ... Many of them were very good, but some of them, *hm-mm*. One of them wanted to know what you did with the incoming students after all the old students had gotten up into higher classes, if you were using the class system. That's still got me boggled. I don't what he doesn't know, you see. That's rather marvelous – you get to asking that as a question. I don't know what he's talking about!

And, a few questions of this character demonstrate that the workability and how the system goes together, and so forth, is very much, a question in the minds of people out in Academies and that sort of thing so any assistance that any of you can give an Academy in straightening this out would be appreciated. Any way you can give them a reality on it, would be appreciated. But all training is going onto this pattern. I think you'll agree with me that it's a rather successful pattern of training.

Audience: Mm-mm, yes.

We should actually only be teaching here Class III. That's what we all actually ought to be teaching. Training is slowed down by the fact that we have to groom up the earlier classes. That's what holds one back. But naturally if we didn't have the technology, how could anybody learn it? If we didn't have it grooved and so on.

But, I've been working like mad along this particular line and I've finally got it grooved out and, your mistakes have served. Don't think that your mistakes have gone unacknowledged. The – most of what we call a textbook solution today is in there to get around the mistakes you have made or to steer you through those chasms and back alleys that you might otherwise have gone into and so forth.

For instance we used to have as a maxim, "The auditor must get an answer to every command he gives." Remember that? Yeah, but how few auditors knew this! We'd get a new auditor coming up the line and all of a sudden he'd be saying, "Do cats spit?" you know, "Do cats spit? Do cats spit?" And the pc about every third time he asked it, you know, would say, "I think so." And he thought this was all right, see?

And of course you had your end rudiments set up and the pc is way out of session and you'd be surprised how often this is the case. So much so that you know, you could take – you could take an old-time auditor and ask him in the first session in which he had failed to answer an auditing command and you'd find out you'd get a little bit of a case surge. Quite interesting. Just ask him, "What was the first time you failed to answer an auditing question or

command?" you know. And it'll rip up the line like a – like a mad buzz-saw. I remember Herbie one time when he first heard it, he just suddenly – on an ACC – and he just suddenly had remembered the first time, you know? Made an awful difference to him. He walked out of there – he was glowing.

But, so what do you have now? You have an end rudiment, something that constantly reminds the auditor of this. Constant. It's always in front of his eyes. Every time he goes down the Model Session line, he hits all the basic errors that have been constant and continuous in auditing. Of course, it so happens that these things are the *sins* of auditing and when – they're only the sins of auditing when they're out of order, auditing doesn't take place, so of course they do belong in as rudiments. But you see how the thing is packaged up? Instead of an isolated unimportant maxim that nobody has ever read, the thing sits there and is done every session.

Well, it works this way: The auditor going by this particular point is reminded every session, because he occasionally finds the thing out, you see. And he's reminded every session, you see, that he should get his auditing commands answered. You get the idea? And he's reminded about these other little points. He's reminded about the pc's overts during the session under the heading of "damage" you see? All kinds of points are interwoven into this thing. Actually it'd make an interesting crossword crazy quilt, if you figured out all the things that have finally been lined up into the textbook solution.

Actually, they're minimal. They're the minimal number. You could get far, far more expansive about this thing. But I'm certain now, that you'd be running off into relatively unimportant data. Yet – oh, you could – you could trim it up, see. You could put more in it, but you'd be running off into unimportances. You'd be running off into things that processes or listing or something like that would normally care for. We've got the minimal number – well, we've got the minimum and maximum. Beyond what we have as the textbook solution, you can be pretty confident that it can be safely ignored. See, if it isn't in the textbook solution, it can be ignored – not with – not – without vast consequences, don't you see? But those points which are the textbook solution if ignored will scuttle the lot. The ship will go down in a trail of bubbles.

Now, there's only one thing that I myself have felt questioning about, in all this. I've seen a pc get – and myself in one session got – sufficiently ARC broke that nothing in the rudiments or anything in any part of it would do anything about. That was very interesting. There was nothing would have done anything about any part of it. Why? Well, I finally worked it out and you'll be interested in this little piece of technology here, which was based on a subjective reality. Why did nothing in the whole ruddy lot affect this particular ARC break line. And you'll find out, then, that an ARC break can exist outside of this particular area. The healing of same is a bit too heroic to attempt. In other words it's too big to straighten out in a rudiments proposition.

And that is this: When a pc takes responsibility for withholding – it took me many weeks to finally curve down to what the answer of that was. And don't think about it too long, you'll get a headache! If a pc has taken responsibility – we're still on the subject of Model Session, see. If pc has taken responsibility for withholding from this auditor or from there on

out, he has dove-tailed straight into the mechanics of Routine 3GA. There is the bridge. There is the button that makes 3GA what it is. Because 3GA of course is based on the mechanics of taking full responsibility in a limited way, for one purpose.

The individual dedicates himself to never eating cats, you see, or some such goal, you see. He dedicates himself, basically, newly, primordially and before anything occurs, you know, prime postulate. He takes full responsibility for this prime postulate and here he goes.

Now, because he's taken full responsibility for the prime postulate, he of course, has set up a thing where all other things are otherness. See, so everything else is an otherness. So this is a marvelous pat, single look and a departure from all pan-determinism. And he's had it. Oh, he's had it for more reasons than that. Any other action than never eating cats... See, funny part of it is, it just doesn't even have to do with cats, you know. It doesn't even have to do with eating. Just an other action. You know, like gazing at cherry trees – is an alter-ness of the basic purpose. So, he mustn't do anything but it, because he's taken full responsibility for it. This is what he stands for – to never eat cats. Therefore doing anything else under the sun, moon and stars is a breakdown of his own determinism – which of course is very isolated determinism. And this is the way he backs out of the universe, see. And thereby runs square into it with a thud.

You see how single-minded all this gets? So therefore other occurrences are not as-ised, they are alter-ised, mass gathers around these things and that sort of thing.

Now, if a pc were to – you understand that it's a withhold in a – it's a withhold *missed* that louses up a session. Have you got a reality on that these days? Yeah, well! All right.

It's the withhold missed that louses up the session, see. Now, what if a pc took responsibility for never getting any off? If you could push a pc into a point where he would make a postulate that he would never get off his withholds, you'll get an ARC break that no rudiments could undo. And I don't even know if a process would undo it, because, of course, it ties right straight into the GPM – just like that. Nothing would go straighter to the heart of anything. It'd just key in all those basic purposes, you see? Not that they're responsibility for withholding. But they are certainly responsibility for an action of one kind or another. So when he takes responsibility for the highest button in the bank – withholding – why of course, wow! Do you see why?

Now, if you were to try to run a pc on this, "What withholdingness have you taken responsibility for?" I guarantee that you would get more somatics per square unit of pc than he ever thought existed. Because you're trying to run the GPM out from the topside down.

Now, I'm still talking about Model Session, so the final question of Model Session is under – on withholds, is under test at this time. I'm trying to find out, before we finalize any versions, whether or not you could ask anything that would undo the possibility that the pc had postulated that he wasn't going to tell you anything or talk to you in that session. It would be "Have you taken responsibility for any withholds?" Well, that doesn't do it of course. "Have you taken responsibility for not talking to me?" That might. And so forth.

Well, I've got to thrash through the woods and the saurian forests and the deep bituminous zinc pits and get this one properly nailed down and so forth. That's why you don't have a final version of Model Session, complete.

But I have found a button which is in excess of all other buttons. There couldn't be any button senior to it. 3GA is clearing people, you see. We're sitting there. The only indicated theory that explains this phenomena, locks up with this particular question. We already got a reality on what happens when these things do get collided one with another and it is quite cataclysmic. It is undone with the greatest of ease by 3GA. Maybe the rudiment process in the end rudiments for the final responsibility for the withhold question, whatever that works out, of course is: Do 3GA, you know?

I've got to work on this a little bit farther and find out if there is anything there that can be done which would wipe out any possibility of the pc doing such an idiotic thing as to deciding never to talk to the auditor again or something like that during the session. Because that would be the only thing that could keep him in a permanent ARC break. And I swear to you there'd be no process under the sun, moon or stars could budge it. Because it locks right straight down against the GPM. It's absolutely bang, bang! It is.

The reason why you get occluded childhood, probably, is the number of times you decided you weren't going to communicate. And took full responsibility for not doing so. "I'm never going to talk to you again! I hate you! You're a beast!" Yeah. That kind of thing. That locks right straight in on the GPM, bang.

All right, enough for that. I'm just forecasting technology there. There's nothing extraordinary about that; it's just another mechanism of the alter-is of the bank – responsibility for. All this alter-is exists on the total responsibility the pc has taken for a basic postulate. And if he's entered such a basic postulate into the session, as would actually make a goal, you could hang the session up, see, on top of the GPM. So that this particular session is now part of the GPM. He's run a GPM session.

Now, the possibilities of this happening if you use the textbook solution are quite, quite remote. But, it could happen.

All right, let's look a little further now. Existing technology, changes in: *Nyet*. I've just been waiting around and shifting around and working like a beaver trying to get a clearing process that applied to all cases. Everybody run with any degree of expertness, high technical accuracy, yes.

But, anyone who has been run with expertness on 3GA and some that have been run remotely from here with no more than bulletin data, have gone Clear. 3GA is not laying any eggs that are not very easily explained or straightened out by just straightening out the technology.

So you heard so often that we're there and all of that sort of thing. But I think you have also heard that, yeah, we're clearing people, but the percentage is damn lousy. I think you've heard that. Well, the reason why I wasn't concentrating in this particular line, during the past year, concentrating on old clearing techniques – one of the reasons you were getting chained

all the time – is I was trying to move over into the category of all cases Clear, see. Clearing is no good to you or anybody else unless it – you can make a full sweep, you see.

It can't be that Joan and Bill and Isabel can be cleared, but, Mr. Snodgrass and so forth, he'll never make it. You just get consistent randomness of various characters.

Well, 3GA apparently – and this is without any real reservation – I – everywhere it is – I just put "apparently" in because it's fashionable – 3GA has been taking every case apart that it was intelligently addressed to. Where the textbook solution of technology was applied to the case and the technique was 3GA, we got coming out the other end of the line some results. Now, of course, we had to know a little bit more about this and about that. But one learns that from what can an auditor do wrong. And what are they doing wrong at this particular time with this particular technology. And you keep that corrected up rather than shifting the basic technology.

Now, I gave you a talk just last Tuesday on how you do a Goals Assessment and so on. Now, that talk pointed up and summarized it. That's the first actual release of 3GA, the first bulletin on 3GA is sitting on my desk half-written at this moment – as formal release, see. The only things I was curious about and more or less were those things which were standing in people's road. I mean I was still working on these points, trying to ask these questions and get intelligent answers.

How many should a goals list consist of, you know? Do – can you completely discharge a goals list? Is there such a thing as a complete goals list? Yes, there is and about how long would it be? Well, I can't tell you how long it would be, but I can tell you how short it must not be. It must not be shorter than 850, see. Might be *longer* than that. And probably the proper question on it is – you said today – is, "Is this goals list complete?" not "Are there any more goals?" And this sort of thing, however, is ... It's obvious that if you haven't got a goal that you can get a goal. We've never failed to find a goal on somebody. But what's the easy way of finding the goal? That's been the main question.

Soon as this got broadly workable, I could understand more about the GPM and see a new method of tearing the GPM to pieces. And then I found out where the GPM went, so that's that. The GPM will go *poof!* And that's that. There is no GPM after you finish off this type of activity.

Now, how many – how many goals do you have to list out? Well, I haven't demanded anything more than 3G – of 3GA at this particular stage of the game, than that it did bring the pc, by listing, down to a free needle. Because I know by experience that if you can bring a pc down to a free needle, you could find another goal and bring him down to a free needle. We've done this lots of times, see.

And you can keep doing this and I also know now if the GPM entirely disappeared, how to get it back again. I can always get a GPM back. I know about – oh, I know lots of ways. I know lots of ways. Let a psychologist question the fellow, I mean. So his needle is clear. So his needle is gorgeously clear and so on. It's free and floating and he's only had one goal listed. How are you going to find some more GPMs to list, see? *Uhh!* Well, it's gone, you know? You can't get any tick on a goals list or something like that. Aw, I could fix that pretty easy, long as there's any GPM there, why – and so on.

I'll give you a method of doing so. This shows you how corny this could be and so forth. "Did you ever want to do anything you couldn't? Thank you, that's it." All right, just write that down as a goal and insist on auditing it for a few seconds and the GPM will be in. [laughs] And then prepcheck it and run out the suddenness of it. But you'll have a GPM to audit.

Obviously, if the fellow can still give you a spot purpose that he couldn't do, you still have a piece of lock on the GPM, you see. So you could just pull that in so that you could do enough with it so the fellow would take off and you get a registry on the meter again. That's horseplay – what I'm talking to you about – because I don't think you'll run into this particular problem. But even if you did run into it, you could solve it.

Now, on the problems of listing, these are very simple problems. The only real dangers and the only thing that a graduate of Saint Hill should be very careful about, is just kick the living teeth in of any untrained, unschooled auditor who is trying to use 3GA. Just bat their brains in mercilessly. Just tear off their thetan and send it in for a box of shredded wheat, see. Because let me tell you, that could get a pc into more trouble than you can easily dig him out of.

Now, 3GA solves 3GA. That's how you know you're there, see. You run a 3GA wrong, why, you do more 3GA to run it right. Now, it's a peculiarity of problems in this universe and the mind and a lot of other things, that a prime solution runs out errors to itself. See, that is the test of a prime solution. You make an error with this solution and then it corrects the error. So therefore it isn't a cure. That tells you it is not a cure. So 3GA is the first thing we have that isn't a cure. 3GA is not a cure. A cure does something about a prior problem. 3GA doesn't do anything about a prior problem. 3GA operates on the prime – the prime postulate. There can't be anything ahead of a prime postulate. It wouldn't even register as a goal if it weren't a prime postulate in some section of track. So it isn't solving anything. Oddly enough it solves nothing. But it puts the person into a situation where he doesn't have to be solved.

This is very tricky. But you'd find out if you were discussing this with a Catholic priest or a mathematician or something of that nature, but they would tell you that the Prime Mover Unmoved is the only thing that can resolve the Prime Mover Unmoved. That's right, you see, it's perfectly true. It's a mathematical fact, you see. The only thing that divides seven is seven, you know, that kind of thing. And you've got one of those things in 3GA.

But somebody using – it isn't so dangerous that you as an auditor cannot undo the damage done, providing the person's still alive, see. You could undo it. But you can really wind somebody up in a ball, you know? Some other – some corny auditing and auditing over the top of missed withholds and messing it up and finding the wrong goal – as they inevitably would – listing the thing.

The reason I say this is because I've never seen right goals found broadly. The number of wrong goals I've seen found in the field is terrific. That's too many. I know some of you blame yourselves occasionally for having found wrong goals or maybe something of this sort.

Well, you'll find wrong goals until you go at it in a – in a perfect textbook method and with a total Prepcheck and there's too many things can make a goal apparently stay in, don't

you see? And you get a supercharged list that you haven't exhausted any of the charge out of it is, you've got a goals list of fifteen. Well, the charge is liable to go around and round on this fifteen, you see – and things are liable to shift one way or the other. You can get a goal that reacted all right, but it's much more likely just reacting because the whole subject of goals is charged than because it's the goal.

Now, you list that thing and it's going to beef up the bank. It'll beef up the bank worse than any creative process we have ever had. It is pure agony. You run – of course you start running an alter-is, you see, and what are you going to get? You're going to get alter-is. Well, mass is alter-is. So, of course, the longer you run it, the more mass in the mind you're going to get. So, some character is going to be very insouciant and he's going to – he's going to know how to audit there. He got an E-Meter – he had it built – he got a couple of pipe wrenches and hooked them up somehow. And – he's really going to go to town. And he can – he can find somebody's goal all right because he knows what the pc's goal is already. As a matter of fact, he tells him, in fact. And what do you know! You know that goal will react after that? Marvelous. But it'll go right on reacting.

And you, if you didn't know Prepchecking could actually touch that goal and you'd find out it was in. "To be an old witch," you see, or something like this. It doesn't even have to be an insulting goal. "Oh, well, I see here you've got 'old' appearing on your goals list a lot of times, and so forth. And you often talk about witches, so therefore I can see here plainly that your goal is to be an old witch. All right, to be an old witch." Tick. "To be an old witch." Tick. "To be an old witch." Tick, you see?

A fellow who didn't know his business could actually come along afterwards and say, "What's – " to the pc, "What's your goal?" and he said, "To be an old witch." And it would go tick-tick-tick-tick. Marvelous! Look just like a goal. You prepcheck the thing, it goes *ppfff*. See? Because it's been suggested to the pc and the misowningness of it has made it seize up into the GPM, you see? Wrong ownership causes it to read. You can always make a goal read.

Now, if you take that goal and you list it, the mass in the bank is going to increase and increase and increase and the pc's going to feel worse and worse and worse and be more and more unhappy and unhappy and unhappy. That's why you must only handle a valid goal and why you mustn't let people who are not qualified monkey with this stuff.

Now, furthermore, a person who is briefly trained and so forth, may be able to put forth a fair technical show and so forth. Well, let's say he's had a PE Course and been on a co-audit, you know and – something like that – and he's going to find himself a goal. Well man, he can do it. You see, he can find himself a goal. He can find himself almost any kind of a goal he wants. And he can list it. The next thing you know the pc's eyes are sticking out about an inch and a half from underneath his lids, or sunk back an inch and a half into the skull or something like this, see. He's getting nauseated and he's dizzy and so forth. And then somebody – this fellow reads in a book and well, "The process that turned it on will turn it off." So he goes on listing it. [laughter, laughs]

So, you're dealing – you're dealing in a sphere where you have exceeded old Class I processes, of which this is totally true. You could louse somebody up with this done wrong.

You can find the goal, prove it out, he'd list it, you see, and the pc caves in. Well, why is that? Must be Scientology doesn't work.

So anyhow, there is your – there is your limit of use. The people who are not adequately trained to do this sort of thing shouldn't be using it, that's all. Some Academy might try to teach this to new HPAs or something like that, you see. Nah. No. They haven't been in the saddle long enough. That's about what it amounts to, they don't appreciate anything that goes on, they wouldn't be enough on the ball. They couldn't catch it that quick. They'd still be fumbling with the sensitivity knob which they never got checked out, you know?

So anyway, actually, we are at a position now where all we've got to do is kick up the general grade of auditing. And you speak of training – should a Saint Hill graduate train? Yes, by all means. Don't however run a four, five, six, eight-week course someplace and call it a Class II Course and have some people on it and that sort of thing. Don't do that kind of training.

Rather, get some people – I don't care if they pay you or don't pay you. Say, "Yeah, I'll bring you up to scruff. Yeah, I'll make something out of you." And run them through check-sheets and classes or anything you care to over a period of time, until they can audit, don't you see? I'm talking about oldtime auditors, bringing them up the stuff and so on. That's what I mean when I say a Saint Hill graduate should train.

As far as somebody going on a full-time course is concerned it takes today a considerable staff and a lot of administrative organization to handle this thing and you would wind up the loser if you tried to handle something like that. Oh, yeah, by all means say, "All right, I'm running a bit of a center here. You want to be an apprentice to this activity, all right. I'll require – when you are finally fully trained – I will require a thousand hours of auditing of you – of pcs of my selection and collection." I don't care what you do. But, oh, yeah, by all means train them up – apprentices – train them up, any way you want to. See, your training to a large degree would be lost if you didn't do such a thing.

As far as putting in a formal Class II type of course is concerned, saying "You come here for five weeks," and that sort – nah. *Aber nicht*. Bum show. You haven't the equipment or anything else to do so. You'll get a lot of people upset with you and so on.

Way to do it, say, "Well, if you want to hang around for the next two years and contribute a thousand pounds to the center, why, we'll make you an auditor at the other end of the line." I don't care what you tell them. But it must be on the basis of, "You've got to stick around long enough till you can do it and you abide by whether I tell you, you can do it or not. You understand?" That would be the end of that.

Now, in an Academy – would run a reread course on a grind-grind daytime basis – remember that it is not qualified to issue a classification. It can say it's a Class II Course, but it doesn't make a Class II Auditor.

This is the regulations along the line. Yes, by all means, train some people. I used to train auditors on this basis myself. I'd go downstairs to eat breakfast and so on ... We're actually back in the old swing of 42 Aberdeen Road, practically, now. Want to say goodnight to

the children, I'd have to go – I go outside where they're sitting talking to an auditor – you know, call them in – tell them good night. They – this is – this is usual and ordinary.

You shouldn't, however, mess yourself up to this extent: of let them audit pcs for you before – they don't know what they're doing. Because you will very quickly learn this lesson yourself. Actually there's no reason for my telling you this at this particular stage of the game. You'd find it out for yourself. You'd learn fast. People will be on the phone two and three o'clock in the morning, the police would be coming up from the morgue, to find out – to identify ... Be a cheerful scene.

Some of you may have seen the code of ethics of the National Academy of American Psychology cooked up by us. You might have seen that, you know. "Must be willing to accept the treatment they dish out," you know, and – did you ever see those?

Audience: Mm-mm. Yes.

Well, we're thinking of calling this a convention. A convention of ethics. The convention of ethics of international healing, you see, so that we have the World Mental Health Organization. Now, this is the only – the only horrible plot, this, in the very near future. We incorporate this thing in Switzerland, see. And it's the World Mental Health Organization. And its literature cannot be told from the World Health Organization, you see. And we have – we have credentials which we issue to people who subscribe to the convention of international healing ethics, you see. And we give them a certificate they can hang on the wall.

Well, it has various things like not curing people they can't help, you know, all these various embarrassing points. Returning people's money if they don't help them. You know, the very things that these clucks out there would never dream of approaching, you know? Guy can't give a prefrontal lobotomy by it, unless he's had one, you know? [laughter, laughs] So anyway, this is – this is this sort of thing.

Now, this doesn't go out on a common line at all; what we do is ... This is just a mock-up. This might not come to view, you see, but we're going to try to push it in that direction. And that is we appoint people around the world – inspectors for the World Mental Health Organization. And they have a card that identifies them perfectly, you see – a perfectly fine card – and they have a questionnaire. They have several types of questionnaire, one is for a doctor's office, one is for a psychiatric office, one is for a psychology department of a university. One is for a mental hospital, one is for a regular hospital. And sometime when you want a lot of laughs, you see, why you take your card down and you see – you see Doctor Cutsbin. And you simply walk in, you hand him this and it announces that you're an inspector for the World Mental Health Organization.

Now, that's a perfectly valid organization, don't you see? And we actually are the only world mental health organization there is, so this – you want to fill out this form. You want to know about his results. And you want to know about his technology and his facilities and his credentials. And you just fill out a form representing those various things. And it's in triplicate and you send one to the minister of health, of the government of the country you're in, as "*failed.*" [laughter] "Failed and forwarded to the International Headquarters in Switzerland." And the other thing – you simply send it to his superiors, whoever they are, board of trustees

of the hospital, don't you see. And the other one of course you send to Switzerland. It's very interesting. Saturday morning's work when you're walking around someplace.

Think of going into a mental hospital and presenting a card to inspect their results and their facilities and their technology, you know, and their ethics and credentials. Think of this, man. You'll be surprised. It's not just a gag, because I think the right to inspect gives the right to command. And it's your first gradient scale step over taking control. All you do is inspect. But you tell the – you're very pleasant, you see, while you're in such an interview. Very pleasant about the whole thing. He protests, "Oh, you people. I've heard about you people. You're a bunch of quacks and.... "

"Yes that's fine. 'Opinion of World Mental Health Organization – bunch of quacks and bums,' that's fine." [laughter, laughs]

Yeah, you can have a lot of fun with that. Anyway, you'd be surprised. They'd actually get all whipped up about this sort of thing. Inspect the Department of Psychology of Natal University. Of course, obviously they haven't anybody there who is qualified to teach anything about the human mind. Nobody's graduated from the Academy of Scientology in Johannesburg – they haven't got one in the place. You put it down as a serious omission. Numerous false credentials in the area. It would be a lot of fun.

Well, actually you don't have to do it at all. But very often you have PE Courses and you have people coming in asking you what they can do. So you appoint them as inspectors. [laughter] Yeah, I think – I think there'd be a lot of red faces, wouldn't there?

But I think the right to inspect is something that you can simply create by assumption. And I think it's a gradient step on the right to command. You're actually going to get people worried about this. See, they'll be worried about you.

Now, it might work out that one copy goes to the newspaper, you see – one copy goes to the minister of health of the country and the other copy goes here. We'll work out these little details later. But I can – I can hear the scream now, from the Sunday-Monday line clear around to the Sunday-Monday line, you see. Campaigns on the floor of the United Nations that we have abrogated their authority, so forth. It's all good publicity. Nobody can do anything to you at all for inspecting. [laughter]

Newspapers could become very worried that they had a hospital in the place that was not qualified, that was not staffed by qualified practitioners and that killed patients. And had been condemned by the World Mental Health Organization. "Spinbin Lawn Hospital condemned by World Mental Health Organization." [laughter] "Doctor Cutsbin declared to have inadequate training and credentials." "Quack Doctor commands hospital."

Maybe we'll have a rightist press that will be as enthusiastic someday as the leftist press. Not that we're right or left.

Actually, you know – you know politically where we stand. We're so far to the left that we sometimes look right.

If a communist ever asks you where you stand politically, the way to worry him – the way to worry him, is to come down on him with all four feet – by wanting a government. And

he'll look at you and he'll know exactly what speech to give you. He'll pull it right out of the file. It's "how you deal with an anarchist." [laughter] And he'll say, "The valuable parts of governments, governments serve a useful purpose." See, and he'll try to argue you into – not revolution, but how you have to have a government, so forth. And I don't think very many of us would buy that. But we're actually so far to the left we sometimes look to the right. We actually are not on the spectrum at all.

But where it comes to reasonableness, you can't be sensible on this planet at this particular time and belong anyplace on the spectrum of government politics.

Okay, well, having given you a few words of cheer and forecast, why we declare it closed.

Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.

LISTING

A lecture given on 14 June 1962

Okay. This is a short lecture about listing. This is lecture two, 14 June AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Listing: Listing is an activity which is engaged upon after one has found a goal. I gave you a talk the other evening about how to find a goal. Well, the way you list a goal is relatively simple. If the goal is in – it stays in after being duly checked – you begin listing.

Now, you may run into some problems of listing. And the first problems you run into is: the goal has been found, the goal has been checked out, the goal is – that's fine – and the first thing you run into are the first invalidations the pc is being careful not to make with his new-found possession. So the first action of listing is a Prepcheck.

Now, you see, we – this has nothing to do with checking out goals or anything like that. Only let's emphasize lists and listing all over again. This person has had a lot of Prepchecks on this subject, but he now has a – new expansive opportunities to invalidate.

Now, this goal that he's got there is going to do peculiar things in the next few sessions. It's going to read and not read and it's going to do this and it's going to do that; because its reads are going to go over on to lists, and these reads are going to go onto items, and it's going to flick back and forth. And it'd be funny if it didn't, because you are using the most powerful method of getting rid of an aberrated prime postulate that has been devised: 3GA. So, of course, it's going to *do* something to the goal.

So the first thing we must know about listing is that when we *start* listing, we Prepcheck and make very sure that the goal is there to be listed. That's for sure – because that's the last, pure, clean opportunity we're going to have to nail it down.

Now, we make this as a specification for this particular reason: goals have often been found by other auditors and checked out by other auditors. But remember, if you are a listing auditor who did not find the goal, your responsibility for listing is tremendously great. So, you should start it with a Prepcheck.

Now, if the goal is partially listed and been partially listed, you're kind of around the bend. Now you're not so sure about this whole thing. And I know of no other way to go about it than to check the line wordings for a read. If the goal doesn't read, perhaps the line wordings will read. If a line wording reads, of course the goal is valid.

Now, this means then, that your Prepcheck – if you're taking over a case that's had a partially listed goal – your Prepcheck must include "discussion of items." You're going to ask

about goals and you're going to ask about listing, and you must also ask about items, specific items and auditing sessions for items. Why? Because you could get a line ticking merely because it was ARC broke. See?

Now, these line wordings are just as vital as the goal itself, so don't skimp them. And they're going to offer you some very tricky problems.

The usual and ordinary goal is something like "to catch catfish." All right, that's fine. That's a perfectly ordinary goal. That lists – you can form up the wording very easily because you simply add "want," "not want," "oppose," "not oppose," before the goal, and then before each one of those, "Who or what would ?"

See, the formula is very simple – nothing to this, "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" "Who or what would not want to catch catfish?" "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" "Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?" So those are perfectly valid lines in most cases.

But you have changed the goal, haven't you? "To catch catfish" has been changed to "catching catfish." So there's one little alteration there that you should be rather careful of. Usually you will get away with it. This is quite valid and everything is fine. But if there's any question in your mind, you had better put "the goal" in front of the goal itself. "Who or what would want the goal to catch catfish?" "Who or what would not want the goal to catch catfish?" "Who or what would oppose the goal to catch catfish?" "Who or what would not oppose the goal to catch catfish?"

Now, that is not a perfect alternate, but it might be all right. Not perfect, but it might be all right. You must realize that there is no perfect wording. You've got to have, however, "want to," "not want to," "oppose" and "not oppose" as the subject and character of your lines.

But goals vary, and for that reason – and pcs' reaction to goals vary – semantics gets in the road of it. Now, any way that you can get the actual goal – as originally worded – expressed, is the best way to word it. That is the best way to word it.

Now, I can give you an alternate wording, but – of various kinds – but *no* wording would fail to have in it "want," "not want," "oppose" and "not oppose." Those are the four lines. They are not necessarily in that order while you list them, but those are certainly the proper ways. And each one is preceded by "Who or what would ?" Not "could" or "can" or anything but "would." "Who or what would ?" Always "Who or what would ?"

And now we get into interesting things. I have not seen many negative goals prove out, but negative goals can exist – not to invalidate negative goals. And it's very, very remarkable that a negative goal does not lend itself to good listing at all – wording – doesn't lend itself to good wording.

Let's take the goal "not to be detected." That's the goal, "not to be detected." Not even "to not to be," see? It's "not to be detected."

"That's my goal, 'not to be detected.' That's it!" It's not "to not to be detected." See, just "not to be detected." What the hell are you going to do with this?

Well, it depends on your meter. Your problem is to get "want," "not want," "oppose" and "not oppose" in front of that goal and "Who or what would ?" in front of each one of those in some fashion that (underscore) registers on the meter like the goal. It's got to register; got to make sense to the pc. So there's two tests there that you can immediately resort to.

Now if you word it wrong, you're going to get a cow's dinner. You're going to have three lines worded right and one line at right angles to the Federal Church, Incorporated and has nothing whatsoever to do with the case. There's going to be one line missing.

Now, that the pc can or cannot list on a line is actually no test. That's not a test, because the line "not oppose" is always something on the order of reaching into the wild blue nowhere, because it has never offered any resistance. It is the bull and the cape. See, nothing solid to push against – every time he lunges at the cape there's nothing there. So you say to the pc, "Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?" And the pc goes ... [demonstrates something] Nothing there, you know? Makes him feel bad. Dandy. It's nothing wrong with that. So he feels bad, but that's no test. So he feels bad, but if you were running that and the pc was telling you he has a *lot* of trouble with it – most pcs will tell you they have a *lot* of trouble with it. Believe me, it's a vital line, because it's one of the four flows.

Well, let's suppose you worded it up in some fashion, "Who or what would not oppose catfish?" See? You make a horrible error like that, see? Everything else was "catching catfish" or "to catch catfish." But this last one – this last one was "would not oppose catfish." Well, he's going to have – very interesting – very interesting list! No doubt, it's going to be a fine list, but that needle is never going to go free. It's going to park the case, you see? A mess.

Now, the negative goal offers you the problem of the double negative. "Who or what would not oppose not being detected?" Isn't that horrible? So the word *the goal* – by the way – by the way, don't say that that's impossible not to use the double negative, because for some reason or other a pc has already listed well on a double negative and wouldn't have it any other way – and just listed fine. But we can't count on all pcs doing this that well, so we get *the goal* interposed in there as a method of separating out the double negative. "Who or what would not oppose the goal not to be detected?"

Now, when you're doing that a question enters into it on the first line: "Who or what would want the goal not to be detected?" Doesn't work, does it?

Audience: Mm-mm. Mm.

Well, it's a mess. Now, you'd better reach into the truth of the situation, because that first line is basically concerned with an item which does have this goal. So in that particular case you can test the line, "Who or what would have the goal not to be detected?" So we drop out "want" and we'd substitute "have." But notice all the rest of them fall into line quite well, but that one changes. Do you see that?

You've got to get four flows that operate against this line – now this particular goal – four flows that operate around and with and in this goal.

Now what do those flows consist of? The goal is a prime postulate which has accumulated on to itself a number of identities by which the purpose could be executed. It has assumed these identities because there were a bunch of people that didn't want the goal and

those were stupid and incomprehensible, so one had to prove it to them that the goal was okay.

And there were a bunch of more people who violently and desperately opposed this goal and there were a bunch more people who didn't oppose it, and nevertheless, were in some peculiar way associated with it.

Now, if you can't express those flows on your four listings directly and immediately surrounding this prime postulate, of course the thing is not going to go clean. This thing is going to mess itself up one way or the other. Now, to change wording in midflight can be quite upsetting to the pc. So after you've prepchecked and fixed up the goal, and it registers and it reads and it bangs like mad, and everything is fine, and any little dabs at listing or monkeying with it or invalidation – these things are all knocked out and they're all cleaned up beautifully – you make sure of that wording. And that wording should register.

Now, after you've gone into the wording – make sure that you go into it well enough and thoroughly enough with discussion with the pc and that sort of thing – that this wording actually works out to be *the* wording for the four flows for that goal. Because after that, to change it is going to be upsetting.

Now, this doesn't say that you will never change the line – the wording of a listing, because you'll pull a bloomer sometime or another on something and you'll suddenly find out this line never has listed, you know? Nothing – no item on the line has anything to do with anything you've been doing, and something like that. That would be almost catastrophic, however.

Try desperately to hold to your original solution, having established it. So establish it with care and then hold to it unless the spot is absolutely untenable. If every time you say to the pc, "Who or what would not be a catfish?" or whatever the goal is, he says, "I – I can't answer it," see? And you get the middle rudiments in beautifully, polish it all off, and he still can't answer it – you're faced with some kind of a super emergency of this particular character. In other words, your wording was wrong in the first place and now it has moved into full view and the moon shines piteously down upon it all, and your crime lies stark upon the moor.

Well, the thing to do is be right before you start. It isn't saying you can't recover from it, but it'd be upsetting if you had to – pc now feels all confused.

Now, in listing, you probably will list against a low-sensitivity-set tone arm. In other words, you just turn the thing on barely and keep your needle more or less at set so as to get your relative tone arm read and position. Now, you get your relative action without having to madly shift the tone arm all the time to keep your needle on the dial. In other words, it can be neglected for periods while you're busy writing and the fur flying in all directions.

Now, every fifth session you're going to prepcheck the whole subject of goals, listing, auditing and so forth, newly, just as you did in a Goals Assessment. And you're going to run the middle ruds, regardless of how often you prepcheck them, every time you stop running a list – regardless of whether it needs it or not. You're going to get the middle rudiments in every time you stop listing on a list.

Now, you'll find that there's a periodic order of frequency of action for each list, which diminishes. (Boy, didn't that sound complicated? 'Tisn't. I'll say it in English.) It decreases: The length of time a list is active for one listing before you leave it to the next becomes progressively shorter. You'll get good action on the TA on a list, and then the action will slow and become less impressive. Get your middle rudiments in, go to your next list and list that, and you'll find out you've got your TA action back again, and then that will diminish. So you're always running to diminish TA action.

Now, I couldn't tell you, because we can't hazard a guess, where this prime postulate is going to sit on the pc's track. What GPM – what track, or rather what cycle GPM is this thing preceding. Well, we don't know that. So we don't know how much bank we're relieving and so forth.

But ordinarily, I'd say a half hour of listing on a list seems overly long, but you probably, you probably at the beginning, on a very mucked-up pc would only be able to list – if you're going to list all the TA action out, see, all the TA action is going to come out and so on – you'd probably find it a session – I just want to give you an example – a session per list. See, you'd list – list one for a session, list two for a session, list three for a session, list four for a session. You understand?

I'm not recommending that. Don't put that down as recommended. I'm just giving you how long that list would remain active before the TA action went out of it. It is, however, very unbalancing and impractical to do anything like this. It's impractical.

So, you just do – better do it by the count at first or by the minutes or any other way. But if you stop a pc in the middle of an automaticity, he gets a suppression. So, allow – allowing for automaticities, you more or less list an arbitrary number for each list, making perhaps fifteen minutes a list early on – something of this sort. You list maybe fifteen minutes on each list: list fifteen minutes, get your middle rudiments in; list your next list fifteen minutes, get your middle rudiments in; list your next list fifteen minutes, get your middle rudiments in; list your next list fifteen minutes and get your middle rudiments in; go back to your first list and list it. Now, of course, none of those lists were exhausted, so your TA action there is deceptively high.

Now, if a pc gets into an automaticity, for heaven's sakes don't stop him in his tracks – please. Please don't stop him in his tracks, because he'll do a suppress. So if a pc is listing rapidly and freely, let him go on listing, but that doesn't mean four sessions. You understand? Doesn't even mean one session, because none of these automaticities will run more than maybe 135, 150, 175 items. That's an awful lot. And that's an extreme automaticity. But they'll just start firing off, you know? "Waterbuck, tiger, clock, policeman," you know? And you're having a hell of a time keeping up with him.

Now, on listing it is very, very bad form to do either one of two things: to tell the pc to wait while you write the thing down and to fail to write it down. Either one of those things is a crime. You pay your money and you take your chance!

However, the pc will comm lag in the ordinary course of human existence, adequately as he runs along on a list line to give you lags, at which moment you can catch up. Of course, if you got into a 135-item automaticity that was firing off like a machine gun, you've practi-

cally had it. Now, how you handle that, I don't know. As far as a solution to the thing is concerned, it's *wrong* to stop the pc and it's *wrong* to miss the items. Well, you say, "Well, I guess I'll just have to write faster." Yeah, that's a good answer; that's a good answer.

Another thing you could do, of course, is set a tape recorder going back of you – not advised. You won't find that you have too much trouble with this, but there is some little problem comes up in connection with it.

Now, when you're so busy writing, how do you ever find time to keep your auditor's report? That's difficult, too. But actually, pcs can be encouraged to comm lag. [laughs] You say, "Well, you think there's any more on that particular list, now? 'Who or what would not want to catch catfish?'" You already knew he'd run out, see? That's not advised either, but I'm afraid I would subterfuge to it in more agonized moments of auditing.

Now, your setup on listing is that your lists must be kept of parity length. Try to keep them somewhere on the equal number of pages. Don't let one list run madly ahead of others. And you will see this tendency before you have been listing on four lists very long. You will all of a sudden look over at list three: "Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?" *Ahumpf*. It has twenty items on it and everything else has two hundred. Now you're up against the horrors of trying to catch that list up. Now, how do you do it? Well, you don't encourage any additional on any of the other lists, that's all. You list some on "Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?" You list quite a few, see? You list as many as you can possibly get listed and then you list briefly the other three lists, just almost as many as are volunteered. You just say the name of the list and the fellow gives you one item. And you say, "Fine," and you say the name of the list and he gives you one item – that's the next list – and you say the name of the next list, and he gives you one item. And then, you of course have gotten your middle rudiments in very carefully when you left this other list. Do you see? Well, get them in again very carefully, you know, and then list eighty on it. You can bring a list back to balance. But really it's quite wrong to get the list far out of balance.

Now, in the first part of listing you list more or less arbitrarily, in other words. You list arbitrarily as in terms of time. You keep an arbitrary number increasing. That is to say, you – you're listing maybe twenty per each, and so forth, because it's not important early on. It's such a mass anyhow, that it doesn't make much difference as long as they all get listed. And then as long as there's some equality in the lengths of the lists, you're not going to get lost as you go along the line.

But later on there's another factor enters into listing. As you come on down the home-stretch, you will find that you are up against the terrible thing called a free needle. Now, let me point out to you that it is an Auditor's Code break to list a line on which a free needle has appeared. Why is it a Code break? Because then you're running a process that is not producing change. See that?

So you come on down the line and you've listed six, eight – something like that – and all of a sudden the needle is floating and free. Well, don't sit there admiring it. A stage four needle can be mistaken, by the way, for a free, floating needle, but only by a very amateur amateur. Stage four is a repetitive sweep up and a stick and a fall, and so forth. Well, the free

floating needle just drifts. It's a beautiful thing to see. You never make the mistake of reading one after you've seen one once – that is a free needle.

Well, when you list down to a free needle, you're now going to upset the interesting pattern of your way, because you're only now going to list the next line that produces a needle reaction. So you list down to a free needle and then you read the next line to the pc with the forecast of "This is a test," see? And if that free needle isn't upset – that is to say, if it doesn't stick or bop or do something – you don't list that line. You skip that line. You go on to the next line after that and test it. If it remained free, you go on to the next line and you test it and if it remained free, you go on to the first one and test it; and if it remained free and you couldn't get any of the four lines to react at all, you better find a new goal because that one is dead.

But toward the end of listing you will discover that you had better list by test – you better list by test. In other words, line one all of a sudden has taken it into its head to float free and line two doesn't upset it, but line three does, so you'd better list line three to free needle. But if it doesn't go to free needle after a little while, you figure you're running on too far and too fast, you'd better go to line four. Do you see? What you're trying to achieve, there, is listing by test. You're only going to list against the needle in other words. If you don't get a needle reaction when you read the line "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" then you don't list it.

You'll find this way, at the end of the case, you catch up all the inequalities of lines. When those inequalities are all caught up... By the way, they're not numerical inequalities, they'll just be charge inequalities. Don't you see? Your lines now at the end, by doing this, might get quite uneven. They won't become double the length or anything like that, but they will become uneven just because you're listing against needle reaction.

Now, I must caution you against the sins of overlisting. The sin of overlisting is of course an Auditor's Code break. The needle is free and it isn't upset by a line and it isn't upset by further items – you're, of course, listing a flat process. It is like running a process that no longer produces change on the case and it'll *upset* the pc.

But that isn't why you mustn't overlist. You can fix up an upset; I'm sure you can keep in rudiments now, thank God. But your goal that you're operating with on this pc is not the prime postulate of his entrance into this universe. It is only the beginning of some cycle or another that you have laid your paws on through a Goals Assessment. And it might be no more ancient than a few centuries – might be that close to PT. Now look, this thing has some dim harmonic against some other goal earlier or something, because there's earlier material that can be pulled up. And you get too enthusiastic and you start yanking in earlier track, because you're pressing the pc to give you items, and the pc obligingly starts picking up the wrong GPM.

So you list *just* to free needle. You don't list *beyond* free needle on each one of the lists.

My, you know, I'll tell you this on the side, it's a great relief to be able to talk to you about what you do with a free needle. [laughter]

So anyway, it's a little merry-go-round and you keep going around: one, two, three, four; one, two, three, four; one, two, three, four – like a well-ordered engine. And it batters down the gates of Jericho like a bang so there's nothing much to handling it, providing you are listing the right lines and you kept your rudiments in when you did so.

Now, toward the end, you will find that getting the middle rudiments in every time you list one item gets to be just a little bit of a strain, and more tends to throw the pc out of session than in. So I would only get them in as I went around each time there was a beefy line listing going on or you did fifteen items or you did ten items or you did something like that. Now get the middle rudiments in. And now you've got two and that only took one or two items each, and then the third one, it took ten items. Well, get your middle rudiments in against the ten. Do you see? And you'll find out you'll make more progress. Otherwise than that, early on in listing, you run it every time you have finished a list – see, every time you've stopped listing on this.

Now, the reason a pc stops listing is because the pc has some middle rudiment out – just mark that up. That is the *only* reason a pc stops listing, whether he's listing a goal or he's listing any kind of a line proceeding from a goal – only one reason, is the middle rudiments are out.

A pc, however, can accumulate sufficient residual charge on the subject between sessions, and so on, that the middle rudiments have to be prepchecked to get it all swept in. So you could perhaps find that the fourth session after your Prepcheck – your last Prepcheck of the middle ruds – ran more arduously than the one that ran immediately after the Prepcheck session.

But listing stops, and – take it from me, it's absolutely true – it only stops when the middle rudiments are out. It does not stop because the pc is out of items. It doesn't stop for any other reason. You could probably *force* a pc with middle rudiments to list a thousand items on a single one of these lines. The fantastic imbalance which this would cause in a bank would be absolutely frightful. But you could use middle rudiments to make him list quite happily on all thousand before you touched the other three. If you did such a thing, you ought to be shot, but I'm just showing you the extent of the middle rudiments in assisting listing.

Never get the idea that the pc has run out of items. Never get the idea that this is a "Oh well, naturally, he can't think of any more," and so forth. This is not true. He hasn't thought of a single one since you started auditing him. He hasn't! He hasn't thought of a single item. Pcs *don't* think of items – they deal them off the bank. If he had no more items to deal off, he would have no GPM! So obviously, he stops listing only when the middle rudiments have gone out and he, therefore, can't get into communication. Do you see?

Now, what do you do after you have brought one goal and four lists down to a free needle on each list? That is the end of your first stage. In earlier days you would have called this a Clear and gone around and patted everybody on the back. Well, we'll still call it a Clear, why not? Because we have – we can say a stable Clear; we can say a Theta Clear; we can say other states of case, don't you see? That guy is sure Clear. You can clear up his needle almost any time by cleaning up the middle ruds on the goal or something, see, or on lines or on life or something. You can always get your free needle back. He wakes up in the morning; he

finds out that he's at 3.24 constantly. Oh, do a little Prepcheck, and you can get that out of the road, and he'll happily wake up every morning dead-on at 3. Do a fish and fumble for fifteen minutes – you could probably accomplish that, you see? Ten minutes, eight minutes.

So your listing is auditing and is done as the sole operation of auditing.

Now, you want to watch your acknowledgment in listing. This is another little tip. The fellow says, "A grizzly bear, a lion, a wolf, a – something-other, so on." Well, now, of course, the fact you're writing these things down is an acknowledgment all by itself. That's quite an acknowledgment. But you keep up a little humming song of "Mm-hm," and let me tell you, you will be a lot, lot better off than: He says, "A lion," you say, "*Thank you!*"

Well, that's the end of that, man. The guy – sits back and – what happened? You're not now going to get the next two items until you get the middle rudiments in. It's operated as an invalidation; you ended cycle. Of course, end of cycle is the end of the list. So listing is sort of on the basis of he says, "A lion, a catfish, a grizzly bear, a wolf." And the auditor each time is saying – or as often as he gets around to it – saying, "Mm-hm. Any more? All right." Saying, "Mm-hm. Got that. All right. Thank you," and so on. He's just going on.

Now, an auditor doing listing very often feels so much like a secretary obeying the boss that they lose control of the session. I've noticed this as a phenomenon. They get so willing to be inflowed on that they don't control the session and that is the first great auditing error in listing. You just keep writing and you never do anything else and the next darn thing you know the pc is out from under, all the rudiments are out – not just the middle rudiments – and, you've got hell to pay. So, when you've stopped listing you give him a good acknowledgment – not to blow him out of the chair or something like that – but, you give him a good acknowledgment and say, "Now we're going to do the middle rudiments." And you go ahead and do the middle rudiments in a very *brisk* fashion.

Now, in listing, you peculiarly must look much more like an auditor at the time you are doing rudiments and middle rudiments than you would in a Prepcheck session. You must really look like an auditor when you were doing these things because you've so little looked like an auditor before then. There you are, scribbling away and saying, "Mm-hm, mm-hm, yes, mm-hm, fine," and you write, and you write and paper and trying to catch up. And the pc sees he's got sweat streaming off your brow. He sort of slows down, and we see that we have two pages here now – we've listed two pages on everything else so that sounds good. So we say, "All right. Now we're going to do some middle rudiments." And right about that moment, you fix him with your beady eye, you know? And man you really do those middle rudiments.

Now, "In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Invalidated? Failed to reveal? Yes? What have you failed to reveal? Hmmm. All right, good. I'll check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Good." Get that clean – clean as a wolf's tooth – finish it up. You say, "All right. Now we're going back to listing." Put in the R-factor and you read off your next line – read it off as a good auditing command. That's really the last auditing command you're going to give him till you've listed two pages. Don't you see? You're going to read it to him occasionally, going to remind him of it.

Your first one is, "Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?"

And he says, "a grizzly bear," and so forth. And he – you go ahead and you write "Mm-hm, mm-hm, mm-hm, fine, fine, fine." Your actual acknowledgment is when you've finished listing for that list. Then you give him the cheery, "Thank you" and you've got to take over control of the session again.

It's one of these awfully long auditing answers. You see, "who or what" are not singular. You consider them as a plural auditing request. And if you consider it as a plurality of auditing request, then you're not always getting in his road by saying – he's saying, "A grizzly bear, a lion, a – a – a – a wolf," and – and right about the time he said, "a grizzly bear," you see, you said, "Thank you. Now, who or what would not oppose catching catfish?" What are you doing burning up time, man? He knows what he's talking about. He hasn't lost the auditing command, see? What are you doing getting in his road?

Well, he sort of runs down and you know you got to make two pages on this sprint. See? He sort of runs down and you say, "All right. Now, who or what would want – would not oppose catching catfish?" See? "Got some more there?" See, and go on running, and he thinks about it and so forth, and he'll get some more. Now, supposing – supposing you had a goal set and you actually – yourself – and you had to get two pages out of this pc. How are you going to get the two pages out? Well, it's by throwing the middle rudiments in when he just refuses to go on. Well, he says, "That's all I can think of." Well, you see he hasn't thought of any anyhow. So you get the – you get the middle rudiments in. And also get them in when you have finished the list. You see? So that's the additional use. You *must* get them in when you have stopped listing a list of any length, you see? You *must* get them in, but you coax him into additional listing by getting them in when he stops.

He's sitting there and he's saying, "Ah, *mmmm, hrrrrr*, I just can't think of any more. I mean, it's all too dreadful."

And you've got two pages to go and you've only done one. You see? So you better roll up your sleeve and you say, "All right. Well, thank you." See? And, "Now let's get some middle rudiments in before we go on listing on this list." You get the reality factor in there, see? Never let him think you're going over to some other list. Get them in, square them up, find out what it was, and he'll come back up, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*. You see? You got your two pages. You say, "All right, that's it. We hit our quota here. Thank you very much. All right. We got that now – thank you. Good. Thank you. Thank you!" He's now going to run four pages on you, don't you see?

You say, "All right. We're going to do some middle rudiments here before we go on to the next list. All right? Good! Good. All right." And go ahead and do so.

Pc takes handling on lists. And you sit there as an animated wound-up stenographer, see, you're going to have a bad time. You've got to control that session. But the liability of a listing session is, you look like you're so little in control when you're writing the thing, but of course you, in resumption of control you have to do with a little more power than you would ordinarily do so.

But it's all very delicate and it's very easy to smash these items down; it's very easy to glum it up one way or the other. Now, if you fake one item – just like listing a goals list – if you fake one, you know very well you may never null these things; you probably never will.

And supposing you say, "Because we're never going to null these things, it doesn't matter whether I understood did he say 'a wolf' or 'a wuff?'" You've entered a missed withhold into the session and it's going to blow up. So you have to ask him *right then when you missed it*, "I didn't get that. Did you say, 'a wolf?'"

"No," he said, "I said 'a wuff. '"

You say, "A wuff? What's a wuff?" See, remember. Remember – TR 2. "What's a wuff?"

"Well, a wuff's a wuff. Well, they're big, boundy things that – they're big, boundy things, you know, and they have hair all over them. And some – oh, they were on some other planet around here!"

"Oh, a kind of animal on another planet. Is that it?"

"Oh, yeah," he said. "A wuff."

"Oh-ho!" you say. "Well, good. Good." And you write it down. [laughter]

But you just let it go on the basis of "*Mm-hm*, I'm just going to fake it in," you know? And the next thing you know he's slowing down and you're slowing down, and your auditing is tiring you out, and you don't know whether you're going or coming.

Now, keep your R-factor in but also keep those missed withholds off the auditor, huh? TR 2 says that you understand. And he gives you a bunch of porridge and you don't know where to pour it. You better find out, man! He sounds quite – quite – quite raspy sometimes. He'll sound quite snarly to you sometime. "What are you – idiot? What's the matter with you? You don't know what a wuff is? You know? A wuff! You know? A wuff! A wuff! A wuff! A wuff! A wuff! A wuff!"

Well, the reason he's acting like this is because he thinks he – you have a missed withhold. That's the only reason the asperity, and as soon as you eventually get it, if you really do get it – the apparency of the missed withhold disappears and that makes it all right, see? The thing to do wrong at that time is not to get it. You want to know what a wuff is; he can tell you what a wuff is. Of course, it really doesn't matter to a hill of beans whether – factually, whether you get that it's a wuff or a wolf or a what, because you're never going back over it again, *except* if you didn't understand it. And a falsity enters into the session there which can crash the whole session, you see?

Next thing you know you don't like auditing this pc. Your hand gets so tired when you write. There'll be all kinds of things like this. It's just missed withholds; you didn't know what the hell the pc was talking about. You were missing them, then the pc gets sensitive to these things, you know? And then it enters into the tone of your voice. And next thing you know, his session is going out, and he doesn't feel like listing, and you can't keep the middle rudiments in, and God help us all.

Keep your R-factor up and for God's sakes understand what the pc is saying before you go on. Very, very important.

Now, you look over the lists quite routinely, count them up; make sure they're in parity; do good administration on the thing; make it so these things can be looked over and so on.

One of the things you do with a list or one of the things you will notice about a list, is when an actual goal is being listed out that the items will transfer over from list to list. And it almost is a test that when an item has been on all four lists, why, that's about the way it is. It's very funny, but I mean, the item will transfer.

"Officer." "An officer is something that would want to catch catfish," and then "An officer is something that would not want to catch catfish," and then "An officer is something that would oppose catching catfish," and then "An officer is something that would not oppose catching catfish." As idiotic as it may seem, he's even thinking of a game warden, you know? He would not oppose catching catfish. By this time, it's gone the full route, and all four flows are discharged off the item, and the item is fully discharged against other items and it lies null. So you find the whole list tears on through this.

Pc is trying to do this or is trying to strain at it or something like that – he will soon fall wise to the whole thing.

Well, now, that is listing. After listing is completed, find yourself a new goal. I wish I could tell you how many goals there should be on the new list for – to find the new goal. I can't at this particular time. However, I can make a very good forecast founded on very accurate information that the list would only be about half as long and that the length of time it would take to find it is briefer and the amount of items it would take to list it out are less and you get – as we already have had ample experience of in Routine 3s – you get a dwindling quantity of everything. And eventually you can't get anything and nothing will stay in and so forth, and you hit the pc on the rim and he rings for an hour.

You should, with this particular thing, wind up at the other end of the line with a – with a Theta Clear. Now, it's also my guess that on most pcs you will eventually find a type of goal that you find in the basics of Scientology. These things will register – *suddenly* register. Why didn't they register before? Is there one basic goal for all pcs? Oh, yes! But they daren't reach it and it's not real.

You want the goal that registers now – not the perfect goal – because they eventually get back earlier and earlier and earlier and earlier on the track and they will eventually run into prime, prime, prime (exclamation point) postulate, which sweeps all before it. You will see then that there's a broader generality going into this thing and its regular progress back on the track. Different areas are being tapped; different subject matter being hit.

What happens to the GPM as it is being listed? Actually, the repetition of items gets the discharge off of the basic postulate which you call a goal. And the definition of a goal is: a basic postulate for whom the individual has taken full responsibility. Therefore, as that tends to be discharged – that is to say, the items (bricks built up on that postulate) – tend to *not resist* the postulate anymore, the postulate itself runs out. And because it is the only brick that is keeping the house built, you don't get the house falling down – this is not the result of it. You don't get the house being blown away and moved over into the next county; you don't get the house being disintegrated or sold as scrap. It's just, oddly enough, the house diminishes and diminishes, and the bricks get thinner and thinner, and you eventually have a no-brick, no-basement, no-first-floor, no-roof, no-chimney edifice. The pc is now sitting there with all the

experience accumulated on the line and none of the mass, because there's no alter-is connected with it.

There's no way known to man or beast to get a prime postulate back earlier than his experience. So of course he's had it. You say, "How stable is a Clear?" A Clear is stable as you're unable to put a prime postulate ahead of the whole track again. See, that's how stable a Clear is. And of course you can't do it.

Now, that doesn't say that you couldn't get the pc sitting there gritting his teeth making a new prime postulate and going out and fighting the whole world to make that postulate stick and not have him accumulate a GPM – in another two hundred million years he'd have something to show for a GPM. He'd be in rather serious trouble, let us say, in fifteen or twenty trillion. He'd be having a rough time of it in another – another hundred trillion from now. And two hundred trillion, well, he'd be in the same condition you were when you came into Scientology.

All right. Well, that is listing and that is what is done with it and I wanted you to get all the data I had on it. Probably more data will come up, but not all the mistakes have been made yet, so I can't settle them out.

Thank you very much.

Good night!

DO'S AND DON'TS OF R3

A lecture given on 19 June 1962

Hi-ya!

All right. So, I'm going to talk to you now about the do's and don'ts of R3.

Now, Routine 3 is an ultimate in auditing and frankly should be regarded as such. No auditor who is unable to keep the rudiments in, handle middle rudiments or do Prepchecking has any business whatsoever doing an R3 process. You can try and you'll fail.

An auditor who doesn't know how to keep his rudiments in, keep his middle rudiments in and prepcheck just has no business whatsoever doing Routine 3 because he'll wind the pc up in a small ball and that will be that.

Some auditor – it's not terribly serious – some other auditor can come around and unwind the pc from this small ball, with just some more Routine 3 processes, but it means a very significant auditing failure. And don't mark it down as anything else – it will be an auditing failure.

Somebody trying to do Routine 3 who cannot basically audit with perfection will chalk up a failure. That is all there is to that. There is no arguing with that point. I'm not saying this point so we can have classifications or any other reason; I'm just saying this point because it's true.

If you want to be convinced of this sometime and you happen to be teaching a PE course, something like that, well, just take some Book Auditor out of the – out of the lot and set him down and say, "All right, find this person's goal and list it out to Clear." And oh, a few weeks later you are going to hear some screams, telephone calls in the middle of the night from the local spinbin, or something of the sort. God knows what will happen, but it won't be clearing.

Auditing successes are attained on a gradient. An auditor has to approach auditing on a gradient of successes. That is something you should sort of burn into the woodwork in an Academy. An auditor approaches auditing on a gradient of successes. If he does not have a gradient of successes, he will not approach auditing, he will go further and further from auditing. Oh, he'll keep on (quote) auditing (unquote), but the less success you have, of course, the more likely you are to get an unusual solution.

Now, not even all here have recognized, right now, that the schoolbook solution is the solution. It doesn't need one eyedropper full of anything to make it work; as a matter of fact, will only work if you simply relax and do it.

Now, it isn't the textbook solution because I tell you it is. I've been working on auditing as a framework, and the training of auditors as an activity – completely aside from processes and technology – working on the framework of auditing – for twelve years. And you're not going to dream that up in a session. Man, you're not going to. I've had too many guys I've taught how to audit and I've had the benefit of all of their mistakes. Their mistakes are absolutely fantastic. The things that a pc can get into are absolutely fantastic. The difficulties which you can confront by omitting what we now call textbook auditing parts are absolutely numberless. And the difficulties you can now get into with additives are absolutely numberless.

Once upon a time they used to string wires down along the Niagara Falls and tight-rope-walk across them. I think sometime in the 90s was the great adventure by which they used to have people walking across Niagara Falls on a tightrope. They had to balance themselves very neatly.

The wire in this case happens to be the textbook solution. There's only one other thing that I would add to the Model Session and so forth – of course, you are getting a reworked version of Model Session just in the interest of instant reads and that sort of thing – that is possibly in the end rudiments, something on the order of: "In this session have you made any decisions?" It would go in just before the withhold question. I haven't finished experimenting with it, so – but that – only thing that I have seen any reason to do anything about. And even then it would be quite unusual.

But sometimes you'll spot – could spot an ARC broken case that you wouldn't otherwise spot. And somebody has hung himself up in the auditing session who might not otherwise have been hung up.

Now, the natural impulse of the auditor is, when auditing doesn't work, to add something. For some reason or other he never subtracts; he always adds something. Now, if you see some auditor adding things, that auditor does not have a reality of the workability at the level of process he is doing. Those are also letters of firebrands on the Academy wall.

If the auditor sees fit or finds it necessary to add something to Model Session, to do something else to get a list, to do something odd or unusual in order to get Prepcheck questions, and so forth, it hasn't worked for him, see. He hasn't had any success with what he is doing, otherwise he wouldn't be doing something else. In the absence of a reality on result, then, he adds.

Now, this gets pretty wild – this gets pretty wild. Here are some of the things you have added in the last thirty-six hours on Routine 3.

Now, naturally you haven't got any reality on Routine 3 processes. You never had any wins or successes with Routine 3GA, or any wins or successes with this method of finding goals or this method of listing, so naturally you are going to add things.

Now, if you were getting good results with Prepchecking, if you got very good results with Prepchecking when you were in Prepchecking class, right this minute I'm sure you are in the frame of mind there isn't a single thing you would change about Prepchecking. That make sense to you?

And if you got good results in your rudiments and Havingness sessions – if you got good results in those – is there anything you'd change about a rudiments and Havingness session? You see? And if I were to ask any of you who got a good result on your pc – or consistently good results – in rudiments and Havingness sessions if you'd change anything about them, you'd say, "No." And we'd watch you go through a session – we could put you on the TV and watch you straight through a session on rudiments and Havingness and you'd knock it off *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, see. Fine, fine, you wouldn't change anything. There would be nothing added.

All right. If you had good results in prepchecking a pc and so forth – we'd put you on prepchecking a pc – you are not going to add one single cockeyed thing. You'd just walk right through it, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, see.

But of course, doing Routine 3GA you are up against a *brand-new unknown*. And the night is dark, and the things you are adding are absolutely unbelievable. But why would you add these things? Well, you'd only add these things because you, yourself, didn't have a reality on its working. So you think that you have to do something else to make it work. In view of the fact that you are not up against what is to you a high level of reality, you fall into the area of alter-is.

Alter-is is the bigness of the bank. So you are up against a "don't know" and what keys in is alter-is-ness and some marvelous things happen.

Here's – listen to a few of these. Unbelievable that an auditor who just finished up Prepchecking beautifully without any additive of any kind would all of a sudden fall into this pit, or any of these.

Making up oddball goal categories to keep a pc listing rather than getting the middle rudiments in. Well, we have a few, they are the middle rudiments categories, but somebody's been making up oddball categories. You know? Just anything that came to mind, you see. The pressure of trying to get the goal. Middle rudiments wildly out, see. So the – and the pc, of course, not listing goals, so the auditor promptly moves in and gives a lot of oddball categories.

In this particular instance – the one single instance where this happened – we had a category of sacrilegious goals – I think was interesting. That arrived in another route, but it's an oddball category.

Asking the pc what his goal is or what he thinks the pc's goal is, you know. "What do you think your goal is?" I don't know, why – why not just dump a coal bucket over his head. That's what you are trying to find out. You mustn't ask the pc what he thinks it is because you are just going to restimulate the living daylights out of him. He's going to sit there, and he's go – all of a sudden go ... He was perfectly calm a moment before, you see.

You ask him something like this, an additive and he goes "Hey, what is my goal?" see. You've asked him this similar question.

"All right. Do an assessment now. Thank you. Now, tell me the last one in. Thank you." Same, be identically the same result. Pc can't do it and of course he goes *brrrrt-boom*.

After that you can hear him going around muttering, "Wonder what my goal is. What is my goal? What is my goal?" Up to that time he was perfectly comfortable to list, you see. Not now, not now, now he's got to guess. So you just get a long list of wild guesses after you've done such a trick.

Asking for only this lifetime goals. "Now, we only want goals that have occurred to you in this lifetime." I'll tell you something, if you don't get a goal that is before this lifetime you're not going to get any part of a GPM, because he's accumulated no GPM in this lifetime. The number of locks he has put on the GPM are quite slight. If you ask him only for this lifetime's goals, of course, and then you carefully made sure that he gave you nothing but this lifetime's goal, it would only accidentally get a harmonic of something he had had before. See, you've immediately almost obliterated your chances of finding the pc's goal by asking such a question.

An auditor refusing to list "To get rid of" goals or negative goals or difficulty goals. Just saying, "Well, I'm not going to list that." This is from an old Routine 3A activity of some kind or another, just followed through in the wrong time and place. There is no such provision on 3GA of any kind whatsoever – no slightest provision. The pc gives it to you, you list it. "To get rid of this headache I got at the beginning of session." Put it down, man, put it down.

You know why you put it down? He's giving it to you because it's charged up. It's part of the goals channel and if you don't write it down you won't bleed that much charge off of the bank. You're not listing goals to bleed charge, but you can't find the goal unless you have bled the charge.

Putting in oddball reality factors. One of the things in the TRs – this TR admittedly hasn't been issued at this time – but an evaluative R-factor put into the session is *verboten*. This would be a broad example: "You are such a difficult case," see, "that ..." And actually, an auditor did do just that here just in the last day and a half. "You are a patch-up case." That's not an R-factor – that's a mud ball.

Now, here's another one. Scratching goals off the list when the pc wants them off after he has put them on the list. Oh, we haven't done that for ages. You never take anything off a list. I found out that the pc would take off of lists the thing it was. But you got it onto the list by a fluke and it would be the first one the pc would take off. Well, it's the most hidden thing, it's the most withheld thing, so of course he'll look at that and he'll, "Oh, well, that really isn't a goal of mine, you see, to kiss women. That, oh, that really isn't a goal of mine." See? He'd like to hide that and he will by taking it off the list. So if you are lucky enough to get anything on a list, you for God's sakes never take it off.

All right. Now, varying the tone of voice on embarrassing-type goals. Now this has been with us from the earliest goals assessments. You must not vary your voice tone or degree of loudness for any reason whatsoever.

I'll give you an idea. [in a loud voice:] "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish." [in a soft voice:] "To catch squirrels. To catch squirrels." [in a loud voice:] "To run downhill. To run down ..." And you know why you mustn't do that? Because an auditor will unconsciously evaluate as to what the pc's goal is. That's the main crime.

This actually was used to keep the pc from being embarrassed auditing in a room with other pcs. He found some embarrassing goals so he said them softly. But look-a-here, the real reason that you would never vary your voice doesn't lie in that nonsensical reason, see. The real reason lies elsewhere – is it weights the goal. And you must not weight a goal. If you permit change of loudness and change of emphasis as you are nulling a goals list, then you can throw the pc's attention or belief. You can actually do an "evaluate" with it, you understand?

And it would be like this: You may have decided unconsciously, more or less, that this pc's goal was "To fly kites," you see. He always talks about kites, and so on. You've got it all figured out, there's a lot of goals like it. Auditor is perfectly all right to figure out what your pc's goal is, as long as you follow this other rule: Read them all in the same loudness and tone of voice and the same emphasis. Don't ever emphasize one goal more than another, because you'll come down the list and you'll say, "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish," see. And then you'll get this one that you thought was real good, see, and you'll say, "To fly a kite? To fly a kite? To fly a kite?" [in a disappointed voice:] "Oh, that's out." [laughter, laughs] That's just doing an otherness, you see, but it'll weight the goals list for the pc. He sees you are disappointed, he sees all this sort of thing. Devil with it, just do a mechanical rundown – same loudness, same pitch, same intonation.

Now, not getting middle rudiments in well. And by the way, by the way, we find out now, that because you've got good reality on them, of course, you are getting in the beginning and end rudiments very well, but you're not getting in your middle rudiments, which I think is marvelous. How possibly can you do this, you know? What are they? They're just some more rudiments, you know. They're gotten in the same way, they're the same thing. Check a session afterwards and you find the middle rudiments have been out during the session. Well, how could they be, if you've got them in, and so on. Well, true enough, the middle rudiments go out more often than the beginning and end rudiments on a Routine 3 type process. But – admittedly they do, but they couldn't be that much out, you see. If you've gotten them in four or five times in the session, something like that, how could they be out very much. And yet they have been found out.

And the next one is suggesting goals in that if the pc has done something in this life he must have had a goal to do it. You know, getting a goal surreptitiously, like, "What have you done in this lifetime?"

"Well, I was a streetcar conductor."

"Well, fine. Huh. Did you have a goal to be a streetcar conductor?"

You know why you don't evaluate for – on any goals list, and why you must shun it like mad on a Routine 3 activity? Just shun it, man, run like mad from evaluation, because the suggestion of the auditor is an alter-iveness of the goal and what is wrong with the goals channel is it is alter-ised. So you alter-is the alter-is, and when you've got that, the thing will now react till your evaluation has been picked up; and you will have the wrong goal.

You can always get a (quote) "get a goal" on the pc and look good simply by – in the middle of the session, sometime toward the end of the middle – middle of a – of a late ses-

sion, and so forth – just say, "I've noticed recently that you chew gum. Isn't it true that you have a goal to chew gum?"

And the pc says, "Well not – not really."

"You really do have a goal to chew gum, don't you?"

"Well."

"Look, you chew gum, don't you."

"Well, yes."

"Well, then you must have had a goal to chew gum at some time."

"Well, I guess I must have."

"Good."

So we put that on the list and it'll read now with a single tick and with every other indication that it is a goal. It'll read beautifully. It will check out as long as nobody prepchecks the middle ruds. And if you neglected to prepcheck the middle ruds on that goal, it will stay in much better than any other goal. As a matter of fact, it's the only goal that will stay in. Because, of course, as long as it's in, the rudiments are out.

Change one word in the wording of a goal and that goal will read at that point of word change. If you change the next to the last word in a goal and you're reading an E-Meter badly, so that the meter is actually reading across the last word in the goal, and you've changed the next to the last word in the goal, that goal will go on reading like that – right on, on, on, on, on. Every time you say it, it'll go, until of course you prepcheck the middle ruds in.

That one is particularly dangerous because I've seen it persist until the actual word that was alter-ised was picked up. You see how dangerous it is to suggest something to somebody, in any way.

You can say, "Have you had any suppressed goals?" Or "Are there any goals you have suppressed? Are there any goals you have invalidated? Have you had any goals that you have invalidated?" is a better question. "Have you had any goals you have failed to reveal?" and "Have you had any goals you've been careful of?" Of course, there's your middle rudiments. Naturally it would be coincidental: the same goals that would be out, would exactly parallel the middle rudiments. And you don't want any goals that have been suggested, so you wouldn't add that in, in any way.

Now, I'm not roasting you. I'm trying to get you to learn a lesson off of all this. And the lesson I want you to learn is actually in relationship to teaching other auditors, many of whom will do just that.

An auditor, actually, will do perfectly the textbook solution only so long as, having done the textbook solution, he has achieved a gain thereby. And if he has consistently been able to apply the textbook solution and achieve a gain, you wouldn't be able to blast him off the textbook solution with dynamite, TNT and atomic fission, see. He'd stick to it.

But where an auditor has not done a process to success, you can expect either he has not done the process, you understand, or he has – that is, he's never – he's never done a full cycle on the textbook solution even though he's trying to use it, or he has altered it in some way so that it didn't work, and so on. You will find that an alter-is-ness will very easily be introduced by the student. The student will introduce alter-is-nesses all along the line, because it's not a set reality. It's something that looks very insecure to him and something that is subject to many changes, and so on. So you actually have to ride herd on those ponies. You have to ride herd on them hard.

And frankly, it takes that much supervision. And that's basically probably why nobody could pick up a bulletin out in the field and do R3 and come up with the goal and list it out without any further coaxing of any kind whatsoever, unless he had himself been utterly sold on the idea that the earlier thing he'd been doing, Prepchecking by textbook solution, was perfect and was gaining perfect results for him, then he might tend to follow through. But I even then don't think he would. I think it takes a lot of horse wrangling.

I'm not trying to tell you that the textbook solution is the perfect solution. I'm only trying to tell you it's more perfect than one which will be evolved in one session by one auditor.

That's twelve years I've sweat over, not hot brains, but sweat over wet palms which were leaning over hot brains. The students who have been auditing pcs over a long, long period of time, and the duplication is so slight that you easily go into despair. But the duplication will be as slight as it isn't working. They are directly proportional. The less it works, the less duplication you are going to get.

Now, in that we have had things that even if duplicated would have gotten a tedious result, or a long result, or occasionally would have walked you into a box that you couldn't easily have gotten out of, don't you see, old auditors knowing this already have developed an interpolative attitude toward technology which debars their use of exact technology at the time you get up to an exact technology, you see. So that itself tends to cut it out.

The textbook solution that you're using now, I don't think you have any reality, actually, on what Prepchecking will do – maybe one or two of you have – but what Prepchecking – no, I don't even – even one or two of you – what Prepchecking will actually do on raw meat addressed straight in the direction of a neurosis.

Somebody is strictly fruit cake, you know? They go out every day in their pajamas and shoot pigeons, you know? And you prepcheck them, following the various lines and rules of Prepchecking, and use as your Have question exactly what they are doing in just this variation: They are going out every day and shooting pigeons. So, you assume that there are overts against pigeons, that there are overts against somebody who went out every day and shot pigeons, you see? You just assume the mechanics of it that they are – they have overts on whatever they have neuroses on, and you just do a lined-off of business. You haven't any idea how fast this would be. Do you know how fast this would be, if you just ran it like that? Oh, something like twelve and a half hours to a complete release of a major neurosis if you went straight at it hammer and tongs.

This person can't live because they have an absolute terror, absolute terror of traffic – complete, complete terror. They can't go uptown and they can't go shopping, and so forth. Well we boil it down, we find out – they tell us – they have a terror against traffic.

Well, it's what have they done to traffic and what have they done to somebody who had an absolute terror about traffic, you see. It's what have they done to somebody who had their exact neurosis and what have they done to the various things which compose the neurosis. And by the time you separate out all the items which might compose that particular battiness, you'll find out you've only consumed a few hours of Prepchecking. Now, they're quite interested, too, by the way – I might comment on that – they're quite interested, because you're right on a center line of fixation. How could they be otherwise than interested?

No Freudian analyst could do this in a thousand hours of analysis, for what you could do now in just a few hours of Prepchecking. I mean, you could do the job, they couldn't do the job, see.

And you haven't – certainly haven't got a full reality on how far even Prepchecking goes. But I think you do know that Prepchecking on a fellow student does work and it's swept along and it was fine, and the closer it was to a textbook solution the easier it was to do. Did you notice that fact? That the difficulties that you were having you were interjecting. Well, all difficulties are additive; one has added the difficulties.

So anyway, that you should be very aware of, both as an auditor learning a new procedure of some kind and as an Instructor working with students, and you're getting on the telephone... Somebody calls you from Lumbago, West Queensland, see, and they call you up and say, "I've got this pc in session and he just keeps screaming. What do I do?" you see? And you're fool enough to give him some directions. Well go ahead, by all means give him the directions. But he got the pc screaming by doing something unusual. He isn't going to tell you what that is because he doesn't spot it as unusual, see. And now you are going to give him some instructions and he is going to alter-is those. Well, give him the straight dope and hope, but don't be shocked if nothing ever came of it, because you are already dealing with somebody who's going to alter-is, because he got there by alter-ising. Oh yes, by all means give straight dope out over the telephone to West Lumbago, by all means, but don't be so damn hopeful about it.

And don't be so curious why it is – you will – you will start to get an incredulity in your area... You'll say, "Well, you want to know how – you want to know how – how to find a What question. Well, here's a bulletin, read it, you know. Here – here – here, read the bulletin. That's right. That answers your question all right. It's all taken care of." You come back in a half an hour and this guy has got a pc in session, and he's sitting there saying, "What?" Then, "What?" The pc says something, he says, "Thank you. What?"

Pc says something, he says, "Thank you." He isn't stupid, it's just never worked for him so he does something else, see.

Now, there is the primary barrier which you have to cross in instruction and the primary barrier of – to getting things across. That is to say you, of course, in teaching things to somebody on a set procedure, of course, are teaching something on which they have no reality

because they haven't done it. So you have to make up for that lack of reality with horse wrangling.

Just assume it's going to happen. Don't go into a decline and despair and keep your derringer oiled up to blow your brains out with. There's no point in all that. It's – just be fully prepared to be far, far more suspicious than you would ordinarily credit it ever being necessary to do.

And one of the basic things – all of a sudden this auditor suddenly starts doing a terrific job: the pcs start getting along fine, everything is along fine, and he's getting no trouble, and fine, everybody thinks, you know, you and any other Instructor around here, think he's doing fine. What magic happened? Well, he just got a reality on the process. It wasn't that his learning process got any better, see. He suddenly got a reality that what he was doing was what he *should* be doing and that by *doing* that he *achieved a reality of result*. So now he gets a reality on the procedure he is doing, so it's an acceptable procedure and it's something – after that, why, he'd say, "Well, why get off the M1?" See? But up to that he was on – he was on B 23, 42, 7, see. It wasn't M1. And he looks up all of a sudden – it's just straightaway, a hundred and twenty miles an hour, see. Now the phenomenon that takes place is that.

Now, in spreading Routine 3 you are going to run into many difficulties in teaching somebody else to do Routine 3, and they are basically composited just on what I've been giving you.

Yes, it's an involved process. Well, you say, "Why on earth – why on earth then do we do Prepchecking and these lower processes if Routine 3GA is such a splendid process?" Well, in the first – fact that the case has to be prepared, but you've got to have some security that the fellow has got a security on auditing, see.

Teach him something that will work and then make him do it till it works and then he gets this win and then after that he is willing to do the procedure which he is going to use in Routine 3GA, you see? He's at least going to do that Model Session and the middle ruds. He knows those work. Well, that's three quarters of your battle, is bringing about a reality.

Now, instruction up to this time on this planet, of course, has consisted of simply – if they didn't learn it you shot them, see. In other words, you – if a person was unwilling to learn something or they couldn't learn something, why, you just stack up the penalties about not learning it, see. You just stack them up and stack them up and stack them up. Well, their mother and father are going to throw them out in the street. They are going to be disinherited by their grandfather, you see. The school board is going to fix it up; they give them lectures about the fact they'll be digging ditches the rest of their life, you know. They'll never have an old school tie to stir their soup with, you see. And give them all kinds of terrible things and horrible fates and threats, you see, and that sort of thing.

Well, on a subject which isn't an actual subject, such as they teach on this planet, of course, that's nonsense. That is simply beating somebody's head in, and you just beat their head in and beat their head in and eventually they give up and say, "Yes, Hadrian discovered America in 1167 B.C., yes." They'll just say anything, you know.

Well, you've gotten training at the expense of judgment. You wonder why leadership amongst man gets worse and worse and why we have Nikita Kennedy and Jack Khrushchev. You wonder why these boys can't seem to make any decision that has anything to do with... I think a guy, the secretary of defense of the United States, yesterday or today, made a statement that everybody must now sign something or other to bomb only nonmilitary targets with atomic fission, see, and they were not to bomb cities. This is secretary of defense of the US trying to make a pact with Britain and trying to push it down the throats of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other people, you see, and trying to get them to sign that they will only bomb military objectives with atomic fission.

Well, this is very, very interesting. And the British group up here told him, "Well, Britain was so small that it would be impossible to separate a military from a nonmilitary objective anyhow, so they didn't think that they had better sign the pact."

Of course, these things are bombing now at the rate of a sixty-mile radius. They are getting there up to a superbomb. Now, how do you select out of a circle a hundred and twenty miles in diameter, or something like this, the military target that's not military.

You see you have – they've invented some new protons and they're called begatrons, and a begatron, you see, avoids all nonmilitary targets [laughter] – and this is very simple. They finally got it all worked out, you see. You see, any other types, you see, they're attracted by military-type targets. So it's perfectly safe, you just throw a bomb with these mixed particles in it, you see, and it just sorts itself out and attacks the proper target, you see. And this is very simple because it's been stated by the secretary of defense, you see. That's why it's true.

How do you get stupidity like that? You get an educational line on subjects which were nonextant, see. You get nonextant subjects, you know, just dream-ups.

It's very funny, the – only the universities keep reiterating that we dream up Scientology, you see. That is their primary accusation and if you prepchecked them, they knew damn well that their subjects were all dreamed up, see.

And the medical profession, you see, says we don't know our business. [laughter] It's marvelous, you know. Why don't they wear a badge on their chest, man? And the psychiatrists say we're a bunch of quacks. [laughter] Down in South Africa, the psychologists say that we are agin the Afrikaner. [laughter] How they do confess, man. [laughter, laughs]

But the university is always yapping about the fact that we're not a science. Now, they've never even defined a science. They are just loaded with imaginative subjects. One of the most imaginative subjects you ever wanted to have anything to do with is any humanity in a university, anyone of these humanitarian subjects, or even as far as economics. If you want a walking nightmare to nowhere, why, open up an economic textbook and it says, "If the demand exceeds the greater, then the supply isn't," and all kinds of things. Other rules and laws they have worked out. Marvelous.

And if somebody doesn't pass these things, he doesn't get his old school tie to stir soup with, you know. It's pretty serious – family, disgrace, never get a job in the government, nobody'd ever pay attention, nobody'd speak to him, never be able to belong to the country club, never own more than two cars. You know, life of sheer necessity and desperation stares him

in the teeth, you see, unless he says, "The economics of huba-hubungan are all square rooted on the bugga-bugga," you know? He does, he just sits there and he says this. Some guy got A on the subject, economics, A. And you ask his advice on an investment, boy, have you had it. [laughs]

They say you never take legal advice from a modern lawyer. More business men have told me that, successful business men, legal advice, you don't take – ever take legal advice from a lawyer, and never take financial advice from an accountant or economist.

Well, what are these guys supposed to do? Well, you just – I don't know what they are supposed to do, but men who have succeeded never take advice from either one.

Pretended subjects. Well, you see you have to keep after somebody with a club and an axe on a pretended subject because he never will get a reality on its working, because it doesn't work and it doesn't go anyplace. So if he never gets a reality on it, he, of course, will never do it and you just get further variations of it, but you have to use the most fantastic duress to even keep him in a classroom going through this subject, you see?

Look at the amount of hidden and covert duress, social punishment and other things connected with education. Well, it has nothing to do with judgment, it's – you memorize the text, why, you are all set.

All right, now, we are in conflict with this because many people in Scientology have been educated this way and know the falsity of it. Now, we all of a sudden ride up alongside and we say, "You do exactly this, this, and this with no variation, goddamn it," and it looks like the same thing. But look – look, there is a difference – there is a difference, because all of a sudden the duress is removed. It's actually removed at that time when – it's the same thing – Instructors and I are always having the same type of conversation. "Well, can he do it?", you know. "She can do it. He can't do it yet," see. This is about the gist of these conversations. "Well, what part of it can't he do," is a secondary consideration, but we all want to know, "Can he, or she, do this final operation?", see.

Well of course, we know he or she can do the final operation because he or she has got a consistent, comfortable result and because they are not inventing all of a sudden. See, there's not a bunch of newnesses and alter-is-nesses coming up. It must be working for them, you see? And then they get very comfortable about it, and they look more and more comfortable about it. You've been over the jumps – some of you – on this already and you notice there is suddenly no pressure on you.

Well, it isn't that you have been grooved into something by hypnotism or something, but your reality was substituted for the duress. Well, isn't it funny that your reality could have more power to hold you on a groove than the duress. Well, of course it could, because you're getting a result and if you're getting a result, then you are able to accomplish what an auditor is doing, and that's the way to get a result. You've already had the reality of not getting a result some other way. And so you say, "Well, that's it and that's fine," and you plow through.

This has a great deal to do with Routine 3GA, or a Routine 3 process, because I'll call something to your attention; when a person's goal has not worked, the individual has done something else. And listen, that's all the trouble there is with him. He didn't follow – he didn't

do what he said he was going to do, you know? He had a goal and he – he had a goal to play a piano so he started throwing eggs. He had a goal to farm, and so forth, so he went into the city and got a job in the telephone office. That's all that happens to him and now he looks sadder and sadder, and more and more apathetic. He isn't winning in life, you see, and so forth.

It's actually very easy to make somebody's life a complete misery and disappointment. Just carefully find out what he's supposed to be doing in life, what he thinks he's supposed to be doing, carefully, and then use all of the bulldozers you possibly can to force him to do something else. And he is going to be an aberrated mutt, man.

You never quite saw as much aberration scattered around the wits of some poor kid whose parents have had great expectations. You know they do it – they do it with a smile and a kiss, you know, as they push the poniard in the back.

The child, unfortunately one day, this thetan one day picked up this body whose aunt was a successful actress. And because the aunt has the fortune of the family and everybody else, why, this kid finds that she is about to become an actress. Now, this is wild, you know. And the further they go in life – the further this person goes in life – the unhappier they get. And they might even make a third-rate actress, see, but it would be a very nutty actress.

That's all you'd have to do, you see, to produce all manner of collision and upset. That is below the level of impact, below the level of knocking people out and hypodermicizing them and electric shocking them and giving them impacts and working the love-hate cycle and betrayal and dialectic materialism and psychologosis and all other aberrated practices besides making them run through rat mazes and pick up cheeses and other human activities. Yeah, yeah, you can produce a small amount of aberration that way. But the basic method, I'll tell you right straight off the cuff, of producing a nice, big, juicy aberration, see, is this character has got a basic goal, and it goes this-a-way. And then you stand over him with a cotton-picking club for years and get all of life standing around with loaded guns making the person go that-a-way.

Not – not bunk – you know, not just say to the persons, "Your goal is wrong," and resist his goal or oppose his goal. That's not what I am talking about. No, just make him do something else. It has to be complete departure from the goal. Now, his whole life is an alter-is-ness. His whole life is based on a falsity. And some of you sometime or another will find out that ... Well, we have already had a student who had a goal – I think something on the order – of "Never to be a doctor," and so forth. Here and there you will have some student with a goal which is diametrically opposed to being an auditor.

Well, it's perfectly all right in Scientology to use a club on him, man, to push him into line because if you are doing anything like a good job, the next thing you know, why, you are doing Routine 3GA or some even more advanced routine. Naturally you've picked that up, so there is no liability to it whatsoever. You get the idea?

We are talking about the business of livingness. Let's carefully badger little Rollo until little Rollo has decided unequivocally that he is going to be a streetcar conductor. And now fix it up so he becomes a naval officer. And then wonder why it is that he drinks or wanders in and out of jail or gets this or gets that or gets the other thing and that he just keeps being on the skids all the time.

There's one for the commies. I suppose one of these days they – I doubt that they will ever use that though. They couldn't duplicate that well. They probably would duplicate it like this, that you let everybody do exactly what they want to do and that will spin them in. And if we – I guess if we convinced them of this, why, everybody would win, you see.

We probably ought to tell a psychologist, "The trouble and the real cause of aberration, you see, the real cause of aberration is letting people do exactly as they please. And if you let them do exactly as they please, you see, spin them in, ruin them, absolutely ruin them." Textbooks out, "How to do as you please," you know. [laughs]

The results of duress, force, energy, smoke and all the rest of it, of existence, are expressed from – departure from a basic goal.

Now, nobody would do any auditing if he didn't have a desire to help his fellow beings. That's a rather basic and fundamental goal, not necessarily the goal, but it is certainly part of a goal. Furthermore there is sometimes in the background – there is a feeling that one doesn't deserve to be helped and one – unless one can help a bit. There are other feelings of this character. These are quite fundamental fundamentals, and factually they override – auditing overrides these rules just as it overrides human aberration.

I can think of times when I might have had a goal, "Never to be an auditor." You walk out of session, you know, and you've had – you've had everything crossed up one way or the other. Never again. Next guy that walks in the front door of the base, the easiest and best thing to do is simply put a trap gun there. And yet when the doorbell would ring, why, you say, "Hello, come in, sit down."

But therefore, you show somebody a positive channel which does help another and does bring about a realization of those more fundamental, humane goals and they will follow that channel. They will do what will help. But they actually don't want to do it as long as they feel it won't.

Now, they feel it's going up against their various goals, like it's deriding and overthrowing their individuality and it's doing this and it's doing that.

But that, in essence, is what we are trying to do in Routine 3GA. You could therefore expect an enormous amount of alter-is-ness on any process, and particularly on something which is straight against alter-is-ness, such as 3GA. So you have to be very careful in doing it, to do it very precisely and very simply without additives.

And in teaching it, you have to make awfully, awfully sure that it doesn't get altered every time you turn around, and additives are entered into it. They will be entered into it even before they are needed.

And therefore this is climbing Mont Blanc on a Sunday afternoon, you see, on the wrong side. It – people in doing it, of course, maybe going up against innumerable factors, all of which tend to compel them to alter the way they are doing it, and so forth. And all you have to do is just hold your course steadily, then you see that it did work out.

You actually finally are sitting there one day and you – every time you say a goal it goes tick. You didn't believe it could ever happen, you know. You really didn't know up to

that point that you didn't believe it. And you say, "To catch catfish," tick. "To catch catfish," tick, what? "To catch catfish," tick. "To catch catfish," tick. Check it all out, get all the evaluations and invalidations and everything else off the thing. "To catch catfish," tick, "To catch catfish," tick. Hey look at this, you know. You feel like getting your fellow auditors over to take a look at this thing, you know, looks pretty remarkable. And yet all the time, why, you intellectually knew that that would happen, but you hadn't seen it.

Well, if you get at it in some circuitous route that you yourself didn't quite understand, the next time you do it you will try to duplicate your own route. And you can accidentally find one of these things about twenty out of a hundred without following the rules. Trouble is, the rules are securing to you the other eighty that you wouldn't find with an oddball procedure, you see. It isn't that you will never find one with an offball procedure, it's just eighty percent of the time you won't with an oddball procedure, you see, that's the difference.

Well, the do's and don'ts are: do the procedure, do it without alteration, run your session without additives or interjections, just relax and pilot it on through and at the other end you will all of a sudden say, "Hey, what do you know."

The little girl who doesn't believe that she can make a cake and doesn't believe the recipe will end up in one, seldom does make a cake. And if they do, it will be quite remarkable.

4 dozen eggs,

3 pounds of sugar,

1 cup of flour,

1 bottle of vanilla, [laughs]

2 shakers full of salt.

See, it's on the basis that you can't make a cake anyway, so how you make it isn't really necessary to know, you see.

And then you'll see some old lady with – somehow off in the Middle West on a farm or something like that. And she's apparently doing something else. And you hear something hit the bottom of a pot with a swish, swish of beating up something and something of this sort and all of a sudden there's a cake and a couple of pies on the table. They are perfect, they are absolutely delicious.

And then she is the other extreme. You say, "What's your recipe?" And she damn near goes mad trying to think of how she does it.

It will work that way with you someday. Somebody will come along and they'll say, "Well, how do you do Routine 3GA?" You see you haven't seen a bulletin on it for years. "Oh well, uh – let's see, well, it's very important – uh – to prepcheck your rudiments. That's very important to prepcheck your rudiments. That's really how you do it, and to null everything out until you get it. Yeah, now you understand. Okay? All right, thank you."

And people will sit there and look very baffled, you see. And you'll say, "What's the matter with you? What's the matter with you? Haven't I told you adequately? Haven't I told

you adequately?" And then some timid soul lifts his hand, one finger, you know, "Do you use an E-Meter?" [laughter]

Okay, take a ten-minute break.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: GPMs, RELEASE

A lecture given on 19 June 1962

All right, this is second lecture, June what?

Audience: 19.

Nineteen, AD 12 and it's a – this is a Q and A. Gag. Questions? Yes?

Male voice: Uh – in the lecture last week on listing, you – uh – mentioned that the second goals list would be shorter than the first one.

In the lecture last week on listing, I mentioned that the second goals list would be shorter than the first one that was done.

Male voice: or words – words to that effect. Uh – I sort of thought that you took the original goals list and added to it for the – to get the second goals list.

That is not a settled fact we are talking about.

Male voice: I see.

We aren't far enough advanced on second goals to make very sweeping statements concerning whether it's longer or shorter, whether there's any virtue in using the first list, or otherwise. I personally would simply take off into the blue, run the TA action out of the listing – on doing the second goals list. That way we'd be sure would be fairly right.

And if we didn't find the goal on it, then we'd take the first one and the second one, see. But the easiest way to do it would just simply be to list some more goals and take the TA action out of it. If you find after a person has had the first one done – the first goals list – and it's come down to a goal and then that goal has been adequately listed and it's now not acting and everything is fine, you've got a sporadic or free needle on the case, you'll find now that the person does have tremendous numbers of new goals. And you'd have to take advantage of those things anyway.

So the simple way to do it is why make the thing more complicated than it is until we find some reason why we should make it more complicated. Which is you just take the TA action out of the goals list – make them list goals so you don't get any TA action anymore. They think that goals list is complete, null it, put any additional ones that they want on it, come down, find a goal, check it out. If you find a goal and it checks out and that's fine, and if you've got it, why, fine. If you haven't, you've still got the first list. Maybe work that one over.

But this is – this is to some degree a guesstimate. Okay?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. Yes, Tom?

Male voice: I'd like to know if you get tone arm action if the rudiments were out, on listing.

If you get tone arm action if the rudiments are out, on listing. I'd say that was fantas – very, very doubtful.

Male voice: Thank you.

Okay.

Male voice: Ron, what might be the liabilities of running Havingness while shifting lists – lists of items?

What would be the liabilities of running Havingness while shifting lists. If Havingness is run in a Prepcheck with the What question null, it has no liability. And in a Routine 3, Havingness run as you shift lists would only have a liability and it could have a liability, if you hadn't even vaguely exhausted the list you had just left.

Male voice: Okay.

And if you had the pc way back down the track someplace and you all of a sudden uncork a lot of havingness, wow! See. It might be very poor indeed. Might throw him.

I'd say, that this would depend on how much TA action you were leaving. As a matter of fact, I see no real reason to run much Havingness between lists unless your pc is just – seems to be going out of havingness every time you turn around. If a pc's havingness runs down ordinarily their rudiments are a bit awry. That's another little side rule that belongs there as an addendum – pc's havingness going down.

Of course, you mustn't go around worrying all the time about the fact that the pc's rudiments go out. So they go out. So you can put them in. The thing you worry about is that the pc go on listing smoothly. See, you start getting worried when the pc's listing smoothly...

There's something I'd like to comment on. Some people are doing a fish and fumble halfway through a session of listing or a session of goals or something. In other words, they take a – they see that the needle gets dirty so they start doing a fish and fumble and it's half-way through the session, something like that.

If you're going to do a fish and fumble to clean up a needle on a Routine 3, you do it at the beginning of the body of session. And if that needle occurs – the dirty needle – and it gets rather unreadable and that sort of thing, try to get it in with your middle rudiments. And if you can't get that needle cleaned up with the middle rudiments – right away, you know, nothing laborious, nothing superweighted – your best bet is to go on listing.

But if you're nulling a goals list at the time this happens and the needle gets so confoundedly dirty that you can't do anything about it and you can't read through it and so on, don't fish and fumble. Don't fish and fumble; shortsession it. Put your middle ruds in. Needle's still dirty, still messed up, you still can't read it – go right on through your end ruds; end the session; give your pc a little break; start right in at the beginning of your next session; put in

your beginning rudiments; and you'll find somewhere along the line that you're going to catch the reason why.

But I really wouldn't be too quick to take extraordinary action in nulling. Because I have seen too often a goal persist in its read.

Let's say a goal rock slammed. Goal rock slammed. Now, do you know that your next five goals are going to read for that goal? Yeah, I mean there – you shouldn't worry about this. You'll find this in doing a Prehav Assessment. You'll be coming down the line with the Prehav Assessment and you unfortunately read "killed" or something. And my golly, the next five levels are all going to rock slam just like "kill" did. In other words the pc's stuck on a rock slam read. It was a heavily charged area. So that that dirty needle coasts right on over the next few items.

So you hit a goal, "To kiss girls," and it rock slammed like mad and now you've got a dirty needle, see? And you can't do anything – you apparently... You get your middle rudiments in and so forth. Now, what's wrong with this? It was actually a rock slamming goal. Well, a rock slam persists. And a rock slam will go over your next four or five, if you just kept on going. In other words, you never got off of the goal that you were on.

Now, the best thing to do is call their attention to a room object. If you want to turn it off, if it's going to turn off, this would be your first thing to *do*. And this is a common thing to do in nulling. This is not unusual. This – we've been doing this for a long time except nobody's just called it to mind recently. You hit "To kiss girls," rock slam, you're going to see a little tiny rock slam. Looks like a dirty needle, you know, there it is, *jiggle jiggle-jiggle-jiggle-jiggle*. "To catch catfish" *jiggle-jiggle-jiggle-jiggle*, no change of the needle. "To run horses." No change of the needle. Can't read it, see you don't know whether it's in or out or something like that.

Well, if you're real good, you remember where that turned on. It was, "To kiss girls." And to assist the auditor in catching up this bug, we used to put "R/S" whenever we got a goal or an item that was rock slamming, we wrote "R/S" after the thing. That was in case – well, it was to help us track goals originally. But it also served this: That was in case you got a persistent R/S. So that the one after that and the one after that and the one after that and the one af – they all R/S. Well, what's R/S? Well, you know where to start in again to pick the thing up; go to the next one after the R/S. Don't read the R/S again because that's just going to give you R/S. Take the one after the one you've marked "R/S."

But what do you do? What is – what was the old solution for this? And that was to say something like this: "Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor." Use a null word. Preferably a room object. "Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor." The rock slam turns off and you go to the next one after the one you marked "R/S." It was quite a little drill and I see now that you're having to fish and fumble in the middle of a session. I'm sure all you are running into the persistency of a tiny rock slam. And it's not really a dirty needle. It's the fact that you've got a goal that read with a rock slam – tiny rock slam. And of course it's persisting right on through.

If you went on ten or twenty levels, it would also turn off. It would also turn off. It's a symptom, by the way, of an insufficient number of goals. If you're getting this thing stuck up

like this and you're getting this rock slam that goes like this and it turns on and won't turn off, you haven't got enough goals on the list. It would be the first thing you would think of.

But when you see one of these little tiny dirty needle rock slams, you know, this is *g-b-z-z-z*, something like that and it turned on with something and you saw it turn on, write "R/S" after the thing. And if the next one that you read, see, it was, "To kiss girls" *b-z-z-z-z*, see, mark it "R/S." And then, "To catch catfish," and man, that R/S is still on, don't be so im-perceptive as to realize that this isn't just a persistency of read on something you have just read.

Now start saying, you know – it's just, "To kiss girls" *b-z-z-z-z*. You write "R/S." "To catch catfish," and it's still going all the way through and at the end – *b-z-z-z-z*. See, it's just consistent and continual. It'll just go right on going *b-z-z-z-z*. You say to yourself, "To hell with it," and you say, "Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor." And all of a sudden the pc says, "Floor? What floor?" You know, "Floor? Oh, floor! Heh-heh! Yeah, well, thank you," you know. "Floor, yes." And your rock slam will turn off.

Now, don't read that R/S goal again, go, "To catch catfish" and you'll get your proper read on, "To catch catfish" which is one of the easiest ways to put this little phenomenon back on the rails that you know of. That's the proper way to handle that sort of thing.

What was your question originally, Jim?

Male voice: The liabilities of running Havingness when shifting lists.

Yes. Well, your liabilities of running Havingness on shifting lists comes under the heading of having the pc back on the track, well in-session and calling his attention out into the room environment and getting him kind of madly out of it all and so forth.

However, if your needle is persistently dirty and that sort of thing, you've probably got down havingness going and so forth and it wouldn't be any liability to it anyway because the pc probably isn't in-session anyway.

Now, that's a form of Havingness. This is how I got off onto it. "Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor. Floor." Thought I'd call it to your attention, because on marking folders this has been called to mind in the last day or so.

Male voice: Thank you.

Okay, you bet.

Okay, what other question is there that I can diverge on like that? Yes, Quentin?

Male voice: You mentioned in the previous lecture, a possible new rudiment, "In this session have you made any decisions?" How would uh – that cover any decisions made prior to the session?

Well, "Since the last time I audited you" is a characteristic, of course, of the beginning rudiments.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

And, if decision went into the end rudiments, it'd probably go into your Prepcheck of the mid rudiments list.

Male voice: I get it.

And, you'd catch that every few days anyway. And I wouldn't try to strain at it too hard. But there still, as you say, there might be some virtue. But you couldn't use it in the end rudiments. You want to know if he made any decision in the session. They do. They make decisions. Not to go into that goal channel again. Not to hold the cans this way. All little odd-ball things.

Actually, they all constitute a type of withhold. But if it went into the end ruds, it'd probably go into the Prepcheck list, so that every fifth session you'd be picking up those interims anyhow. Okay?

Male voice: Uh-huh.

Right. Any other question? Oh, I don't think you're that well informed. Yes, Jack?

Male voice: Uh – this fifth session, is that based on the fact of a two hour ...

This, this ... ?

Male voice: This uh – Prepchecking every fifth session. Is that based on the fact of a two-hour session?

That is based on a two-hour session. Prepchecking every fifth session is based on a two-hour session – based on what you were doing. Then this would be considerably different in an HGC.

Male voice: Yeah.

But it still – it would mean a Prepcheck about every second day. Yes. Okay?

Male voice: Thank you.

Right. Yes, Tom?

Male voice: Uh – as far as uh – completing the goals list, can we expect any uh – help as far as the tone arm's concerned ?

In completing the goals list can we expect any help as far as the tone arm is concerned. Anything more?

Male voice: Well, I was looking at also, the other thing that stuck me – would there be any good between that and the rudiments being out? Because any time, as I mention, the rudiments go out, how would one determine which was which, if we did get help from the tone arm motion of slowing down like flattening out?

Go over that last again, now. If we did get ... ?

Male voice: The first thing I was interested in, what help could we get from tone arm motion as to telling us when the list was complete? Would it help us any?

What help could you get from tone arm motion telling you the list is complete? Well, in the first place by the time you get up to R3, you should have a good security as to whether your rudiments are in or out.

Male voice: Yes.

You should be able to know that rather easily.

Male voice: Yes.

If your rudiments are in and you're getting tone arm motion, then of course the list of goals is not complete.

Male voice: Yeah.

If the rudiments are out and you're getting no tone arm motion, of course you would just expect to get the rudiments in. But in any event, a checkout of a goal is a little bit late to find out whether or not you've got the goals list complete, so you probably should be very careful in prepchecking at the end of your goals listing. And that'll make sure that your stuff was in and all was well and so on.

Ask if there are any more goals and the fellow ponders for a while and gets a quarter of a TA division change. You know your rudiments are in. So you know there's more goals. You ask him for more goals and the needle flies around – that's the best way to read it. And you say, "Well, is this list complete?" and the needle flies around. You say, "Is this list..." and the needle flies around. You say, "goals" and the needle flies around. You say most anything because, frankly, it's not very critical – it's an open and shut proposition if you're going to get any help from a TA action.

An incomplete goals list is terribly incomplete. And with just one more goal on it, it's complete. See, it's not necessarily quantity of goals that makes it incomplete, but it's whether the goal is on it and therefore that channel is sufficiently discharged.

All of the rules of Routine 3GA are based, now, on making it very easy to find a goal. And all activities of earlier Routine 3s, unless restated for 3GA, should just be forgotten. Just forget those earlier activities – just skip them because 3GA goals listing is not in an effort to get the goal on the list, but to permit the auditor to find it, you see. And there are other little changes of this particular type.

You'll get TA action if the goal isn't on the list and your rudiments are in. You'll get TA action. And with one more goal on the list you will cease to get TA action. It's not a quantitative additive, see. Yes?

Male voice: If you have run one goal, once all lines have gone null on – on the thing, the goal is gone, the lines are gone, the needle's sitting on Clear read and free, uh, you – would you expect it to stay free for any length of time ...

Uh-uh.

Male voice:... or does pieces of the GPM fly back in or ... ?

Well, I wouldn't expect it to stay free at all.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

You're saying now, if you've listed a goal and TA's come down to the clear read and the needle has gone free, would you expect it to remain free? *No*. The answer, definitely not by the mere fact of breaking the Auditor's Code and overlisting. You may – got a free needle, so you list the next list, see. You read the question of the next list, "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" and you don't get any interruption of free needle and if you ask for one more item on it, it's a – it's a break of the Auditor's Code.

Now, by asking for one more item on it – this is what I'm getting around to here – for asking for one more item on it or two more or a half an hour's worth, you all of a sudden are going to get yourself a pretty wild needle. It is going to get wilder than scat. It's probably going to have more read on it than you've seen for many a day.

What exactly is happening? The pc is being obliging and is hauling chunks of the GPM on. And you could overlist a free needle and overlist it and overlist it, until you had the whole thing stuck up like a circus poster after a wind storm, see. It'd just be a mess because you pulled in the GPM.

So because you can pull in the GPM early on, so easily, you shouldn't have any difficulty whatsoever in cancelling out that free read with a new goals list. Now, that means of course that the pc, just living in their environment, going to be able to key that in like crazy, because they got a bunch of new goals. But actually they aren't new goals, they're earlier goals.

Now if you see the GPM as a series of cycles – you ever read *History of Man*? All right. Now, *History of Man* talks about cycles on the whole track. This would be a pc in a new environment dedicated to a new activity, going through a whole bunch of new nonsense and experience and so forth, would be a complete cycle. Then he changes. He changes his activity. And he goes over here and he becomes something else in another area and dedicated to other things. Well, that stays relatively keyed out. But that first area could have grouped and become – that first cycle could have grouped and become a piece – a piece of the track GPM. It's actually a cycle GPM, see.

All right, and then he's got this next GPM up here. Now, what you've actually found when you found the first goal, is something that is relatively new. You have found the basic postulate on usually some track piece of a cycle. Just a cycle, see. You found the earliest basic purpose of the cycle. Now you, of course, have got all the cycles earlier than that yet to clean up. So if you overlist, just in an effort to be cooperative and so on, the pc will start coasting backtrack. You see, he starts to make something out of it. And the second he does that he starts pulling in earlier track, see? All right.

Male voice: I didn't communicate one thing, Ron. I wasn't talking about overlisting, I was talking of blowing the one package. The first package is gone.

Well, I'm talking to you about how you can get the second package in.

Male voice: Oh, I got it, I see. I get it. Oh, I'm sorry.

See? Now, you can get your second package in, in livingness, by overlisting and so you sure get it back in that. And there's probably nothing more delicate or easier to cancel out than the first package's free needle. That's the only point I'm trying to make with you. And I was just trying to show you how it is cancelled out. You can cancel it out numerous ways. Fellow has a perfectly free needle, he's had a free needle for days, he feels wonderful, he's up on Cloud Nine, he sails around without even a rudder, he gets up in the [laughter] – he gets up one morning, he gets up one morning and sees a glass of water alongside of the bed. You put him on the meter and he reads 6. What was it? Well, God knows. It just happened to be an earlier piece of track. It might have been the time she poisoned all the boys or something like this. But it's – it'll just go out, just like that.

That's what happened on your first Clears. See? And some of them stayed quite remarkably stable. Went along for quite a while. And some of them folded up by the next day, see. And that was just all because there was earlier track. You'll eventually get back to some rock goal, some goal around the rock someplace, the first time he decided to be or something like that and it'll be something way early, native state transition sort of goal. And after that you could hit him over the head with a club, shoot him with a shotgun – free needle. Free needle. You couldn't get anything but a free needle. And it's just going to take them ages to get into a state where they could gum it up now.

You see, the reason you get a – you know, you all get a very weird view of what livingness can do to a human being in Prepchecking. Well, you find out this little girl, this little girl actually made an improper remark at a dinner party. And it's ruined her whole life! And life begins to look to you from a Prepcheck viewpoint, you know, like man, you've just got to walk through with your breath held, you know? And that's life, you know? And if you just hold your breath just right, then you're not going to get aberrated much, you see. And it looks from a Prepcheck viewpoint as though aberration is much easier to acquire than dandruff, you know? [laughter]

So you – and then when you start blowing off pieces of the GPM, you recognize that all of this stuff – which you were getting in Prepchecking – depended, of course, for all of its force and power on the GPM. And with the GPM gone, of course it doesn't have any force and power. And a person's viewpoint becomes just as exaggerated in the opposite direction. And you could measure how long somebody's free needle would stay free by their somewhat exaggerated ideas of what wasn't aberrative. See, you could make a little test. This is all on the same line.

You could say to a person that you're prepchecking, "What would aberrate somebody?"

"Well, making an improper remark to a hostess at a dinner party. You could become very, very aberrated through having been acquainted with an aunt who took sleeping tablets. Having a mother who loved you too much, yeah, these'd all be sources of aberration. You see, this'd drive a person crazy."

And if their free needle's going to stay stable, their answers are much more likely to be in this classification: "All right, what makes a person aberrated?"

"Well, that's hard to say. It's his own Goddamn foolishness, that's – that's – that's – that's one of them."

"Well, all right, thank you. Thank you. What would make them aberrated?" You say to him – foolishness?

"Oh, I don't know. Let's see, you could find somebody who was trying to get out of this universe and then you could torture them for a long time while saying to yourself all the time that you were not responsible for doing so – no, that wouldn't make somebody aberrated." [laughs]

You get the idea? Well, similarly, the key-in is as delicate as this. See? The glass of water keys them in on that first goal, you know. Oh, that brings in the whole GPM, everything is going to hell. And later on they're in an automobile accident and they were standing in the middle of the street – if this would happen, which it probably wouldn't, you see. But they're standing in the middle of the street and got hit by an automobile or something like that and you put them on the meter and they've still got a free needle.

Relative stability would be length of duration by which they could retain a free needle. You want to know relative state of Clear would be relative time that the needle stayed free. That's just answering and over-answering your question, but there it is. Okay? All right.

Any other questions? Yes?

Female voice: Yes. I have something about this – the length of these cycles. Could one – like a sort of a Prepcheck to find out how long ago it goes back?

All right. You want to know about the lengths of cycles ...

Female voice: Yes.

... and how about a Prepcheck to find out how long ago one goes back?

Female voice: Yeah. If that overlaps with other track.

Well, you can read all this off on a meter. You could actually ask people how long they've been here and how long ago it goes and you can use old electropsychometric auditing techniques that are given in that first earliest, earliest, earliest book on the E-Meter and check out pieces of track and find out how many years it responds to, although what's known as "year" we haven't a clue. But the reactive mind seems to know all about it.

And the – you could check all this up and get your responses off the meter. You could do this. And you could plot out the length of each cycle. And the funny part of it is, is you will get most of them. You would probably get it very well plotted.

What you want to do is take *History of Man* and about five yards of adding machine paper and write figures on it one way or the other. You'll finally come up with a track map. You get a track plot and then you would – you would have it fairly straight.

The oddity is, is you could do this without the GPM being gone. That's what is odd. I mean, you could do this over the head of the GPM, which is quite remarkable. Don't expect your pc to have much reality on it and don't expect a lot of other things, but you actually could do that and find out how long the cycles were and everything else.

Now on the other hand, there's another way to go about it, is you clear them with 3GA, you see. And you get them so Clear that you tick them on the shoulder and they ring for hours, see, and then you just ask them. See? The information is very available.

Female voice: That would collide with the free needle then? On that particular goal ?

Yeah. Well, if that – if that section of track has no further bunchings, groupings or masses which have been accumulated by alter-is, it'll read free needle.

Female voice: All right. Thank you.

All right. But if you're going to investigate track with an E-Meter, then you do it before you fully clear somebody. Because you're not going to do it afterwards. You have to have very aberrated banks before you can really get data. Unless you ask somebody.

Okay, any other – any other questions? Yes.

Male voice: How many packages would one have to run or would there be a fixed number of packages to be run, before the person really goes Clear?

How many packages will the person have to run to get Clear? All right, term "package" is Routine 3D. Hope you realize that. And it has no existence in 3GA, so let's – not scolding you – but let's – let's omit that. A package, we mean by a package, we mean the opposition goal and the terminal and all that sort of thing. We're not finding them today.

Now, how many cycle GPMs would you have to run out? I don't know. It's a very finite number. But I wouldn't know. You couldn't even, I don't think, guess from pc to pc. It's going to vary. Look at the life you've been leading, see. All right, now compare the life you've been leading to the life that somebody else has been leading. Now, have you ever run into a case which was basically just all free track? You know, you tell them to go back down the time track, you ask them to look at the picture and they tell you all about it? You ever run into such a case? All right, did you ever run into a case of, ask them to – what they're looking at and they tell you it's all black as night and it's never been any other way, except for this little rocket that's going from left to right. See – you get the idea?

All right, there are two factors. One is *severity* of immersion into the GPM and the other is lightness of experience. These are each two different factors. You could have somebody with light experience who's thoroughly immersed into it and totally jet-black. Now, they'd clear up awful easy. It's a fact; you could have.

Then you've got somebody else with tremendous amounts of experience, lots of – lots of cycle GPMs and so forth, only for the last cycle, he's rather new on the cycle and he doesn't int – he doesn't tend to be smeared up in anything. It's all just free track and three dimensional color pictures and so forth and you say...

All right. Now, this is a fooler. Because this bird is cruising along and you say, "Oh, what an easy case. There's nothing to this case, see." *Crash!* See, and we're back into the lineup and *crash!* Here we go again and there's horrible somatics and everything goes black and the person is totally *appalled* because everything has gone black. Now they know they're getting *worse* and everything ...

And then we find out that it takes three times as long to clear the free track person than did this black five that could never move an inch on the time track, see. These are the oddities you run into. I wouldn't know of any way of estimating it, for this reason: Nobody shows the total aberration of which they are track-capable, see. Nobody shows this much aberration. They never show as much aberration as can be keyed in, man. Impossible! And it's going to vary from person to person, case to case, so on one person you do twenty packages – I use your phrase – another person, why, you do fifty.

Also, this factor enters into it: The thoroughness with which the auditor is working. Some auditor is being a little bit sloppy and he goes three cycles. And he just gets three GPMs of a cycle-type out of the road and off the main GPM very easily, see. Beautiful job of it. Beautiful job. And then he says it's so easy, now, that the fourth goal he finds, he finds very sloppily while the pc is being very insouciant and he's being cross-eyed. And he didn't check it out. He didn't add it up. And it's the wrong goal. It's a really wrong goal. So he lists it. So the case goes *zzuupp!* Thud! Crash! Black mass, where is it? You know, what wall?

The remedy for that sort of thing is to find the right goal. But you see, auditing would also tend to produce a variable picture. When we have four or five thousand cases in the racks, why, we can add up a statistical average. But I think the statistical average will be filled with so many variables that it'll be worthless. Some people live 'ard. And some people just haven't had a chance to. [laughs]

Okay? Answer your question? All right. Yes?

Male voice: Ron, what is the definition of Release and what test can you make to ascertain whether a person is a Release?

Oh, the whole subject of Release is a very easily covered subject – is, is the person better by reason of auditing and does he know it? That's a Release. In the first place, unless he's been released from some chronic difficulty that he considers – then he won't consider that he has been improved, because his attention is sort of thoroughly pinned down onto the chronic difficulty that until he has gotten out of that he won't admit to having gotten any better even though you may have cured him of a dozen other things.

So, a Release, purely and simply, is a person who has obtained results in processing and has a reality on the fact that he has attained those results. That, severely, is the definition of a Release. Now, when you try to subject this thing to a test – which can be duplicated in HCO offices for some sort of an award or something like that – you run into a difficulty. Because you don't want this sort of thing whereby you walk in – somebody walks in and says "Well, I feel much better by reason of my processing."

"All right, you're a Release, thank you."

The guy – it isn't necessarily true. They might just be hitting a manic at session end. I've never seen anybody so *deliriously well*, now, as a psychoanalyst I audited one time and she stayed "*wonderfully, wonderfully well*" for three days. Then she really fell on her coco. Coconut milk splattered in all directions, practically. She just sailed into the middle of a manic point, you see. Dramatizing like crazy. So, that doesn't give you anything.

So something of the idea of a stability of gain enters into this when you talk about testing. And it isn't something that an auditor would release – issue; he wouldn't issue an idea of having released the pc at the end of session, you see, or even perhaps at the end of an intensive. He'd let it cook for a little while. But he'd have to figure some way to ask just these two questions so that he wouldn't get an offhanded or unreal response, is: "Have you had a distinct gain from processing?" and "Do you have a reality that you have had that gain?" see. "Do you know Scientology has made you better and are you better?" That – that is it.

You see, it's one of these things that's overly simple. It's so simple that it's almost impossible to – well, you can't issue a perfect test for it. You'd have to put the person on the E-Meter and find out if they were telling you the truth and you'd have to do a lot of other things to have the perfect test. But that is a Release and that has been a Release just absolutely for years and years and years. But it gets fancied up. And what you see is a release form that has to be filled in to tell whether or not the person is released. Well, actually it's just trying to be secure in getting an answer to those two questions, whatever the form is.

And you'll find that a person who has not had any improvement because of auditing and who has no reality on that fact, basically, well, could be in propitiation, you know, and could be in some other state of mind. But you'll find that that person – they're never – not really very safe to have around. They've been audited for quite a while and they haven't had any gains and so forth and, "What is all this?" They – these are the people that give you trouble and so forth.

Why is that? Well that's because, of course we know now, they have withholds and missed withholds and things of this character. You know, a missed withhold can throw somebody down into propitiation.

Now the earliest statement of release is about 1952 and it's simply: The person knows he won't get worse. So you could add that as one of your requirements for Release and to get the full historic picture. He knows he won't keep on getting worse now. And you can achieve a Release rather easily on some people – just, you can break up a neurosis with ARC Straightwire. If you get somebody that's real bad off and it's what wall and what bank and you run a little bit of ARC Straightwire on him and all of a sudden it clears up and they've got some hope and they know they're pointed in some right direction.

Well, if you were then assured that that improvement would be stable, see, through waiting a week or two, why, you'd have a Release. Do you get the idea? All right. If you've – if a person has improved, by the way, by auditing – just to lay it on – if a person has improved by auditing, you've got one other factor here. You know that their missed withholds and that sort of thing are fairly clean and that you won't wake up some morning with a poniard sticking out of your abdomen. Looking down and finding poniard hilts in your abdomen, I don't know, you've probably done it yourself, but it's uncomfortable. Not that one feels that one is going to be struck at every time by other people, I'm just giving you whether their...

You'll find somebody who has not been to this exact definition a Release and they go along, just fine, for three or four months and pat you on the back and that sort of thing and then give a story to the newspapers and you wonder what the hell's going on here. There's no stability.

You see the value of a state called Release, then? You see, there is a value in having a state called Release, the difficulty of testing that state, because of the simplicity of its definition. Now, I think that's the best way to answer you on the subject of Release. Okay? All right. Of course, that's quite a question, what exactly is a Release.

Male voice: Troubled me for years.

Huh?

Male voice: Troubled me for years.

All right. Well, that is exactly what it is.

Male voice: Hmm.

Here's the weirdity. There's very few Scientologists realize they are Releases. [laughter] They're bird-dogged on to Clear, you know. If they could answer that question positively and affirmatively, they're a Release.

By the way, this is very appropriate. We're just now getting a – we've got a release button, it's the "S" and double triangle, with an "R," a red "R" on it in the middle of the enamel. Very pretty little button. It's exactly the same size as the old "S" and double triangle.

Male voice: Can we all have one? [laughter]

If you pass the test. [laughter] Oh yes, and – but many are called and few are chosen. And in your particular case, because you brought up the subject, we'll give you one when you devise the perfect test! [laughter, laugh]

Male voice: Okay. That's...

Because – well, frankly, right at the moment, we don't have one that I consider adequate. We just have guesstimates. Okay? "Many are called, few are chosen, the lightning often strikes...." Okay, you bet.

Yes?

Female voice: I have one more question. Uh – if someone gets good 3-D pictures on goals listing, that would be free track, wouldn't it? Would that be a possible indication for a goal or not a goal?

My – the whole subject goes back to the first lecture, Louise, is you're not interested, as the auditor, in whether they got pictures, haven't got pictures, where they're getting their goals from or anything else. You can read no indications from this because they're going to hit free track or they're going to hit black areas or they're going to hit free track and the second that you start to list it they'll hit black areas. When you finish the listing of it they'll be hitting free track. You don't – you're walking with a variation here, of considerable magnitude. And you should never, never, never, on listing goals, inquire if the pc has any pictures.

Female voice: Uh-huh.

Never. Never mention it to the pc. Because it's of no value of any kind in listing goals.

Female voice: Yeah.

Good enough.

Female voice: Thank you.

I didn't mean to scold you. That's a good point to keep in mind.

Female voice: If it – if it is mentioned, without asking?

Hm?

Female voice: If it is mentioned, during listing, without asking for it, I just wondered what...

So it's mentioned!

Female voice: Yeah.

TR 4. TR 4. Understand it. Acknowledge it. And return the pc to listing.

Female voice: Yes.

But God almighty, don't ever say, "You mean the last few goals you have listed you've had a stuck picture? Hm! That is very puzzling. What is the stuck picture?" Now you could go on like this, you could say, "Well, what is the largest object in the picture?" Overboard would go your pc and that would be the end of goals listing.

By the way, we had somebody, last year, who found a pc's goal by sticking the pc in a picture and then asking him for goals out of the picture. We didn't find a goal on the pc either. Because there weren't that many goals in that picture. I think the goal was, "Not to be be-headed" or something like that. [laughs, laughter] That was a good thing to bring up, Louise. All right. Okay. Yes?

Male voice: Uh, in your E-Meter book you mentioned about an OT meter. Is that still going to be used ?

In your E-Meter book you mentioned about an OT meter, is that going to be used or not? All right. Well, I haven't had any need of it. We would be researching it madly if we had much need of it. We started into researching on it. We found out body read is so enormous on that type of reaction. We did a little other research on it. We tried to get a very sensitive needle meter that the medicos have – I guess they've tried to duplicate our E-Meter, which has been around long enough – and it wouldn't read either.

And we've gone into this, but frankly, we haven't, since the advent of the Mark IV – see, that was not – the Mark IV hadn't appeared at that time or had been proven out – we haven't found any real reason to have an OT meter, yet. If we do, we have gotten a leg up on its research and so on, but I won't say that there is no reason for one. But right now we don't need one, so there is no priority on it. Okay?

Male voice: Yeah.

All right. Okay, any other questions? Yes?

Male voice: Could you briefly summarize the data you're got now about chronic tone arm readings, at say 4.5, 3.5, 2.5, 1.5? You told us a number of things about chronic tone arm reads over the years, like 4.5 equals actually stuck in a crowd, is a chronic reading there.

Yes.

Male voice: Could you give us your – the current ...

The significance of chronic tone arm read.

Male voice: Yeah. Especially 2.5 and 3.5.

Yeah, well they're the same as they were. The same as they were. Your person who reads below 2 is lower in responsibility and... the same as they've always been. 2.5 is inevitably something about a machine, a robot or something like that. Your 4.5 is a crowd, it's just as it's always been. I don't know what 7 is. But it's something. And in general, chronic reads on people grabbed off the street do fall into these categories. But you must realize that you no more than start to get the rudiments in and you start upsetting this. And when you prepcheck the pc you upset it farther. You're keying out things now. Now, you've changed the pc's position on the track and numerous other things with R3GA and your tone arm sweeps, as they move back and forth across the dial, actually denote nothing of any significance except that you have motion on whatever you are doing, because it's all relative motion. See, it ceases to be fixed motion as soon as you start disturbing the case and it then and there becomes relative motion.

You're starting to push around the reactive bank. Your modern processes do not leave this chronic state of affairs chronic. They're very briefly there. So that the meaningfulness of a tone arm, once it has started to move on a pc by reason of Prepchecking and R3GA is practically zero. It has no meaning as such except the fellow isn't Clear. Masses are passing through, don't you see. It doesn't even mean if he has a high TA that he has a withhold now. See? There's no significance actually attaches to the exact meaning of a tone arm read, once you have started the fellow in the modern processing. But all of those reads, which have been announced previously, are all factual and apply very definitely to the man in the street. If he's sitting at 4.5, you can adjudicate some oddball facts about him with regard to crowds. If he's sitting at 2.5, you can make some kind of an odd estimate on what the fellow might be doing in life.

You could tell fortunes with it that would upset people god-awfully. The – this guy walks in, sits down, PE Course, you know. I'm not saying you should do this, but he comes in, sits down, you put the cans in his hands and you find out he's reading at 1.5. Well, you could start off with a long song and dance, "Now let's see, now you've often, often had difficulty with your family, isn't that correct? *Hm-hm*, yes, *hm-hm*, as a matter of fact you've left home quite a few times. Yes, *hm*, you ever been married? Yes, well, you've left your wife a few times and you haven't been doing too well in business. And, you haven't been this and you haven't been that ..."

He'd agree, "Oh my God," he'd say, "Yes."

"You very often are very careless of yourself, you stand out in the rain very often without coming inside."

And he'd say, "Oh, yes, yes. How – how did you know that? How did you know that?"

See, you could go on and on. Some bird is sitting at 2.5, see, and he comes in there and you say, "Well, you constantly tinker with machines. You are very interested in computers. You probably have wondered about giving people orders at a distance through some communication equipment and having those orders exactly, promptly, immediately and never defied – obeyed, you see. Never defied under any circumstance."

"Yes. Yes. How did you know that?"

You see, of course you've got a robot read. And you just read the character ...

"You run your home on a highly systematic basis and are very, very impatient of your wife's irregularities. Isn't that true?" [laughter]

You could go on, you know, you could make an astrologist look like a punk with this thing. [laughter] And, you've got other reads and so forth. This boy comes in, he's reading at 2.

"Well, you've had a great deal of trouble with women, haven't you? You've had a lot of trouble with your mother, isn't that correct? Yes, and the last time you were in love, it didn't go well, isn't that right? You have a tendency to be rather didactic with regard to women and give them orders and – to do this and to do that, with women, but secretly, down underneath it all, you are really afraid of them, aren't you? Isn't that the case?" [laughter]

"Oh, yes, yes, yes, how did you ever know that?" you see.

Some girl walks in, she's reading at 3. "Now, you've been death on men, haven't you?" [laughter] "You've always had trouble with men, isn't that correct?"

Oh, my, you could go on and on. Or, "You've often thought of getting married and/or of staying married – which are you, married or unmarried? Now, you've often thought of – of staying married, but have changed your mind."

Oh, man, you could really read it out well. "You actually don't prefer housework. You think the woman's place is not in the home. Is that correct?" Yeah, you could really do that.

Have – he reads at 4.5, "You – haven't you often thought of yourself as a priest or heading a large congregation or a large organization of some kind or another? Have, you had – often had thoughts of doing revolutionary type work. You have envisioned yourself as out there talking to the multitude, isn't that correct? You don't like armies or navies and you don't like crowds. You hate to go downtown at the rush hour. Isn't that right?" And so on.

"Oh, yes, yes, how did you know?" you see. 4.5.

You'll get the positive-negative aspect. You'll get the plus and minus aspect the way one of these reads. And if anybody wanted to do a complete job of this, he would actually have a fortunetelling scheme that would make anything since Chaldea look pale. But its validity, for an auditor, once it has been disturbed, becomes zero. You audit a guy for a while and – well, it's true, if he settled down on a new read and stayed there several weeks, yes, he'll have the characteristics of the new read. But you see auditing doesn't really do that with somebody. It moves it all over the place.

Answer your question?

Male voice: It does, thank you.

All right, didn't mean to answer it at such length, but it's an amusing subject to me. Some of the things you can do – the longer we look into this, why the more swami the swamis look.

Someday – I used to be very good at telling fortunes and that sort of thing. Simple expedient, reading other people's pictures. It was very embarrassing to people. They come in and you tell them all about what – where they've been that day. I never realized at the time that you could also shift their bank. And I've never worked it out since, so that you moved the somatic strip and looked at the pictures. You see, you get the idea? You can – you could look at the pictures where they've been that day, you'd say, "Well, where have you been today? Let me see, I can tell you where you have been today." You see, you're reading their pictures. And you give them just a description of the picture you see, you see. And, "Oh, yes, yes" and it sounds very wonderful. "You must be very prescient" and so forth. Of course they're carrying it right in front of their face.

Well, as the years have gone on – I hadn't thought, actually, until just this moment, the fact that all you have to do is move the somatic strip through various portions of the person's past, you see, in order to read all of their past life, you know. And then really all you'd have to do is move in future track. Well, we don't know anything about the validity of future track, but you could at least move in the track on them that they would like to have or were afraid of having as a future and either one of them would be other – equally satisfactory in a fortunetelling, wouldn't it?

You know, it's funny how tricky man has been about all of these tricks without ever being able to do anything for man, isn't it? You realize all fortunetelling is basically based on making the person agree to a postulate. You create the future for them by creating a postulate. So the next time the ancient witch gazes into her boiling cauldron and says, "I see you meeting with a dark-haired young man," you say, "I don't like dark-haired young men. Make it a blond." Something like that, you see. Or she says a blond, say, "I don't like blonds. I like dark-haired young men," you see. Get her to change it around, till you get an acceptable future! [laughter, laughs]

Okay, well, we're overtime and overdue. That's it.

Thank you very much.

Good night.

TV DEMO: NEW MODEL SESSION

An auditing demonstration given on 20 June 1962

LRH: Little closer up. There we are, thank you. How are you tonight?

PC: *Well, I'm surviving.*

LRH: All right. Okay, here we go. Tonight you are going to – I'm going to run you on a new Model Session with its thing, and find a Havingness Process if yours isn't working, and just that and nothing else.

PC: *Good.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Okay, pick up the cans. All right with you if I begin this session now?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Here it is. Start of session. Has the session started for you?

PC: *Yes, it has.*

LRH: All right, very good. What goals would you like to set for this session?

PC: *Well, I'd like to get my havingness up. I think it's been a little shot lately. And feel more confident as an auditor, do a real good job as a result of this session with Dorothy tomorrow.*

LRH: Good. I didn't quite understand the last part of that. What was it now?

PC: *Well, I'm about to start nulling Dorothy's goal list, Dorothy Broaded.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *And I'd like to feel that I'm in real good shape to do that.*

LRH: All right, all right, very good. You are on auditing now.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Yeah, all right. Okay. Any other goals?

PC: *No, I think that's enough.*

LRH: All right, very good. Any goals you'd like to set for life or livingness?

PC: *Yes, I would like to be a top-notch auditor.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And in general to communicate freely and effectively with people.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *To get off the effect-point that I've been on since I've been plunged into practical which seems a little beyond me at times.*

LRH: Okay, all right. Well, let's see where you are sitting on this meter here, hm? Ah, your tone arm is sitting here at about 3.25, not too bad. And – all right, no other goals for life or livingness?

PC: *Well, yes, I want to go home feeling that I've accomplished something here.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That I'm better able to cope with my life and to influence others when I get back.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I think that's it.*

LRH: Okay, very good. All right. Tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: *Yes, it seems a little strange, but it's all right.*

LRH: All right, okay, that's clean. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Yes. I rather hate to admit I have any.*

LRH: All right, all right, good, that's clean. Now, in the last day have you done anything you are withholding? Let me check that. In the last day have you done anything you are withholding? I've got a reaction here.

PC: *Well, I flunked TR 4 twice today and I'd rather not admit that.*

LRH: All right, okay. All right, I'll check that on the meter. All right. During the last day have you done anything you are withholding? All right, that's clean, thank you. Do you have a present time problem? I don't get any reaction on that.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. All right, what we're going to do here is check over some of these Havingness Processes and see where you stand on them. All

right?

PC: *Good.*

LRH: Regardless of whether you have one or not. Now we're going to test the first one, and the first thing I want you to do is give the cans a squeeze. Oh my, yes, that Havingness Process – that's pretty low. I mean I only got about that much. All right, very good. Here's the first one. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That sofa.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The fireplace.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That door.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That picture.*

LRH: Okay. All right, squeeze the cans. Well, that's working. Is that the Havingness Process that's been working on you?

PC: *No, it's been, "Touch that object," which has been, I thought, very good.*

LRH: All right, but this one is working.

PC: *Okay, I'm not contesting that.*

LRH: All right, good enough. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The rug.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That wall.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That secretary.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The telephone.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That goosenecked lamp.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The ashtray.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The drapery.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The ceiling. I always liked ceilings.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The fixture.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *That green cover to the couch.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The armchair.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The cover on that door.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The cover to this table.*

LRH: Good. Now we're going to make another havingness test now. Squeeze the cans. All right, that's very interesting, but that does not sustain its gain.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. So we're going to test the next one. All right?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: And that is, "Point out something in this room you could confront," and "Point out something in this room you'd rather not confront." Here is the first command. Point out something in this room you could confront.

PC: *That bag on the sofa.*

LRH: Very good. Point out something in this room you would rather not confront.

PC: *I think the grate to the fireplace.*

LRH: Okay. Point out something in this room you could confront.

PC: *This sign with your name on it.*

LRH: Okay. Point out something in this room you would rather not confront.

PC: *Um, perhaps the telephone. There is something a little sinister about a phone.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Now let's make another can test here. Squeeze the cans. All right, that's apparently loosening the needle. You said your – the process you had been running was "Point out something."

PC: *No, "Touch that object."*

LRH: "Touch that object," all right. Well, let's push this one a little bit further.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Point out something in this room you could confront.

PC: *That glass door to the secretary.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something in this room you would rather not confront.

PC: *Well, the apparatus up there.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something in this room you could confront.

PC: *The upper part of that wall.*

LRH: Okay. Point out something in this room you'd rather not confront.

PC: *The television screen behind me.*

LRH: All right. Point out something in this room you could confront.

PC: *The cord to this meter.*

LRH: Good. Point out something in this room you'd rather not confront.

PC: *Mm – the valve to the radiator.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Now let's test this again. Squeeze the cans. All right, that – put your cans up on the table. Just put your hands there. Now lay your cans definitely in your hands. All right, good, now squeeze the cans. All right. How were you squeezing them before?

PC: *Well, I don't believe I had them held quite as loose as they are now.*

LRH: All right, let's check that again. Squeeze the cans. All right, well, we apparently are now getting an adequate ... You can put them back in your lap.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Well, we're going to run this a few more commands. Okay?

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Point out something in this room you could confront.

PC: *That door.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something in this room you'd rather not confront.

PC: *The right side of the mantel.*

LRH: Good. Point out something in this room you could confront.

PC: *The corner of the rug.*

LRH: Okay. Point out something in this room you'd rather not confront.

PC: *The arm to that sofa.*

LRH: All right, now let's check this can squeeze test again. Put your hands back up on the table. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right, that – that is increasing it. We're getting an increase.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: I'll check it again just to be sure. All right, put them back now. Point out something in this room you could confront.

PC: *The picture.*

LRH: All right. Point out something in this room you'd rather not confront.

PC: *The hook on the door.*

LRH: Good. Point out something in this room you could confront.

PC: *The ceiling.*

LRH: Good. Point out something in this room you'd rather not confront.

PC: *One of the boards of the floor.*

LRH: Okay, thank you. Let's test this again. Put your hands back up on the table. All right, now squeeze the cans. All right. Do it again, squeeze the cans. Well, we're going to mark that as conditional. Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: We're just going to put "conditional" down, because actually it's apparently – you can put them back in your lap – it's apparently loosening it and tightening it very slightly, but it's not making any wild swings. All right. We don't test IV of course; no point in testing V. All right here – here's a good one, here's a good one. All right, it's, "Look around here and point out an effect you could prevent."

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right, here's the first command. Look around here and point out an effect you could prevent.

PC: *Well, I could prevent my purse from falling on the floor.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and point out an effect you could prevent.

PC: *I could prevent that picture from having an effect on me.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and point out an effect you could prevent.

PC: *That chair.*

LRH: All right. Now put your hands back up on the table there. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right, I get no, no real increase with that, so we're going to leave that alone at the moment. All right, now here is

ordinary, old, "Point out something." Okay? So here we go, and you can throw the cans around all you wish. All right. Point out something.

PC: *The handle to the door.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *The molding on the wall over there.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *Well, this part of the curtain that has the bouquet on it.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *Telephone receiver.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *The base of that lamp.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *The cover to this table.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Put your cans back on the table again with your knuckles down. That's right, all right, now squeeze the cans. There we've got one I think. I think we've got one, heh, heh. And it also gave us tone arm motion.

PC: *Hmm.*

LRH: All right, very good. Put your cans back in your lap and we'll run this a little bit longer. Okay?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Point out something.

PC: *That ashtray.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something

PC: *The rug.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *The sofa.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something

PC: *The ceiling.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *The fixture.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *The frame to that picture.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *The ship model on the mantel.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *That wall.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *Uh, that wall.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: *The shelf up there.*

LRH: Thank you. All right, now, let's take a can squeeze test again here. All right, squeeze the cans. Put them back up on the table again. Socket 'em down in your hands there. That's right, that's right. All right, just hold them comfortably. All right, squeeze the cans. All right, that is causing us an open – it went better, and now it is swinging less. Squeeze the cans again. We get a variation of swing here, but we haven't any marked increase. That was closer to the truth than we have had, because we did get a little tone arm motion with it. All right, put the cans back in your lap. We'll go on to the next one. All right, we are now going to test, "Where is the (room object)?" Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right, here's the first command. Where is the table?

PC: *Here.*

LRH: Thank you. Where is the bed?

PC: *There.*

LRH: Thank you. Where is the chair?

PC: *There.*

LRH: Thank you. Where is the curtain?

PC: *There.*

LRH: Thank you. Where is the telephone?

PC: *There.*

LRH: Thank you. All right, put your hands back up on the table again. All right, all right, now squeeze the cans. All right, once more squeeze the cans. All right, that – that's not too bad, that's not too bad. We're going to go on. Pretty high read. Going to leave that. We're going to go on now. All right?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Here we go, you can put your hands – cans back in your lap. Squeeze them from there now, yeah, all right, you're getting the hang of it. All right, this one is, "Look around here and find an object you are not in," okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Here we go, here's the first command. Look around here and find an object you are not in.

PC: *I'm not in the – in that cupboard of the secretary.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find an object you are not in.

PC: *I'm not in that telephone.*

LRH: Okay. Look around here and find an object you are not in.

PC: *In that E-Meter, thank God.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find an object you are not in.

PC: *In that chair.*

LRH: Okay. Look around here and find an object you are not in.

PC: *In that sofa.*

LRH: Okay. All right, put your hands back up on the table. All right, squeeze the cans. All right, that's a fairly decent squeeze. Let's – let's try it again. All right, it could be better, it could be better. You got a cognition out of that though, didn't you? Huh? What was it?

PC: *Well, I guess it's that the situation isn't quite as desperate as I thought this afternoon. In other words, I seem to be coming to life again here.*

LRH: All right. For your information, actually all of these are doing a little bit of something. None of them are really mucking it up.

PC: *Hmmm.*

LRH: But I suspect at this time, I suspect at this time that we could get a little distance by doing some mid ruds on the subject of havingness. Put your hands in your lap.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: We are going to do a little bit of a mid rud Prepcheck just on the subject of havingness here. Huh?

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: And we're going to say, "On havingness," all right?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right, so here we go. On havingness have you ever suggested anything? I'll repeat the question. On havingness have you ever suggested anything? There's a tiny halt there.

PC: *Well, what I was getting really was that my preclear suggested to me what her Havingness Process was. I did a little flip on that. When she came to me, said her Havingness Process was TR 10, so she suggested that to me.*

LRH: All right, thank you, thank you. All right, on havingness is there anything you have suggested? That seems to be clean.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Good enough.

PC: *Um-hmm.*

LRH: All right. On havingness is there anything you have suppressed? Yes, what? What is it?

PC: *Well, at one time I thought it was possible to clear people on Havingness. Then I more or less suppressed that when you came out with some other modus operandi, you know.*

LRH: All right, okay. All right, let me check that now. On havingness is there anything you have suppressed? I still got a little hang-up here. What is it?

PC: *Well, I have perhaps a wistful feeling that I'd like to have everybody's havingness up to the nth degree at all times. It's a kind of a goal of mine. You know, I feel that if everybody's havingness was up that everything else would fall into place.*

LRH: All right, very good. All right, let me check that on the meter. On havingness is there anything you have suppressed? All right, I'm going to have to read that again. On havingness is there anything you have suppressed? Yes, I've got a reaction. What was it? There it is.

PC: *Well, actually it antedates any Scientology. I mean it goes back to childhood and it seemed that at a time when I was giving a Punch and Judy show. You know, I mean that sort of havingness.*

LRH: Hmmm.

PC: *And I more or less suppressed that, my interest in operating puppets and marionettes, that type of havingness.*

LRH: Um-hmmm.

PC: *So I kind of jumped back into that period.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Let me check that on the meter now. On havingness is there anything you have suppressed? I'm having a rough time reading this now. It's probably not clear. All right. When was this suppression when you were a child here?

PC: *Well, I was wondering then if it was a half-truth because I blur with it a time that I gave a puppet show for my son and his friends.*

LRH: Um-hmmm.

PC: *I mean those – the two seem to be a little locked together here, the two incidents.*

LRH: Um-hmmm.

PC: *Which is the one? I was a little dis-*

turbed as to which was the one that really concerned havingness.

LRH: Hmmm.

PC: *Because I wanted to give those children havingness very much. You see, my son was three years old and I had this party for him, and I put on this show, and I guess it re-stimulated me on my old desire perhaps to have – to be kind of a puppeteer, you know.*

LRH: Hmmm.

PC: *So that's the one that seems to be predominant at the moment and that was in 1930 – the spring of 1930 would be May 22nd, 1930, his third birthday.*

LRH: All right. Let's – let me try to get some little test question here. What about suppressing a puppet? That doesn't make any sense, does it? What about suppressing children?

PC: *That would make more sense probably.*

LRH: Was there a suppression of children in that early incident there?

PC: *Well, perhaps the sense that I should run a little 8-C on them so that they wouldn't get out of hand, you know, that they would uh ...*

LRH: Well frankly, there isn't any overt there. You say in that first one that you suppressed the desire to.

PC: *Yes, there's no overt really.*

LRH: Just suppression on the thing. All right, very good. All right, let me check the question. On havingness is there anything you have suppressed? Yes, it's still alive, and as a matter of fact as we go into this,

this is getting terribly alive.

PC: *Well, but it would go backtrack quite a bit you know, probably.*

LRH: Yeah, yeah.

PC: *That has me a little concerned. I'm not too anxious to go backtrack.*

LRH: Does that worry you?

PC: *Well, it's just – how it could be handled in a very short time perhaps.*

LRH: Who is handling it?

PC: *You are.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I'll let you handle it.*

LRH: Good, thank you, thank you. All right, now let's – let's take a look at this. We got a suppression and we got puppets, and we've been getting a sort of a slammy sort of a needle out of this thing. Now I'm trying to make up some kind of an overt that has to do with children or puppets. What can we find here? Children, puppets, havingness, trying to give children havingness, trying to prevent children from giving you havingness?

PC: *Well, actually I got a little off the chain. The last few days I've been preoccupied with a facsimile of a shipwreck, you know, where I have been responsible for the shipwreck and the ship went down with all hands, and so forth. So perhaps I was trying to lead you astray with it. I mean, perhaps my bank was bound to lead you astray on that thing – it could be because there seems to be an awful lot of havingness bound up with that ship.*

LRH: Yeah, yeah, all right, all right, I'm not ...

PC: *It's in a former life.*

LRH: I'm going to check this out now, and let's see, let's see if we haven't freed this up. All right?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: On havingness is there anything you have suppressed? I don't get a reaction on it.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Do you want me to check it to make sure?

PC: *I don't care.*

LRH: All right. On havingness is there anything you have suppressed? Oh, oh, I got a reaction.

PC: *I always worry if the auditor checks it again; I think, oh, now it won't stay clear.*

LRH: Is that what that is?

PC: *There's a little of that usually on a recheck.*

LRH: Oh, well, all right.

PC: *Even with you.*

LRH: Yeah, all right, all right. This rock slammy needle here, I don't get it back right away. I'm actually not trying to clean it up particularly. On havingness is there anything you have suppressed? Now that isn't reacting. That really isn't reacting. Let me get the next one.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: On havingness is there anything you have invalidated? Yes, yes, yes, yes, oh that's hot. What was it?

PC: *Well, I have invalidated my own ability to select the right Havingness Process for a preclear.*

LRH: All right, thank you. All right, let me check that on the meter. On havingness is there anything you have suppressed? [sneezes] Excuse me, clean, that's clean. I beg your pardon for sneezing.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right, on havingness is there anything you have invalidated? I asked you the wrong question a moment before. Thank you. On havingness is there anything you have invalidated? I don't get a reaction on that now. I get – this needle roughs up on the subject "on havingness."

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right, here's the next one. On havingness is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, no instant read there. On havingness is there anything you have been careful of? Yes, I got a reaction there.

PC: *Well, I've been too careful of possessions in this lifetime.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *I think of them as havingness.*

LRH: All right, very good. Let me check that on the meter. On havingness is there anything you have been careful of? That's clean, that's clean. All right, anything you'd care to say before we drop off what we've been doing here?

PC: *No, it's been interesting and I feel that it's been a little revitalizing for me.*

LRH: Mm-hmm.

PC: *This experience, you know, of your giving me a little auditing.*

LRH: Mm, hmm.

PC: *Very interesting.*

LRH: All right. Well, thank you. I've gotten a little TA reaction here all of a sudden. Let me see something here. On havingness have you told me any half-truth? Yes, I got a reaction.

PC: *Well, there is the – perhaps a half-truth about that former life and the ship.*

LRH: Mm-hmm.

PC: *Because there have been times when I've kind of flipped to being the lighthouse keeper rather than the captain of the ship. I'm not completely sure of my identity in that incident.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Let me check that on the meter. On havingness have you told me a half-truth? Yes. What was it?

PC: *Well, I was thinking I probably exaggerated this puppeteer thing – making it sound, you know, as if that was my one ambition as a child to be a puppeteer.*

LRH: All right, thank you. On havingness have you told me a half-truth? That is clean, thank you. On havingness have you told me an untruth? That is clean, thank you. On havingness have you said something only to impress me? No reaction. On havingness have you tried to damage anyone? That reads. What was it?

PC: *Well, perhaps myself a little bit*

because I did say, you know, that I had trouble, or that I didn't – or that I invalidated myself when it came to finding processes, Havingness Processes for preclears – times I've done that.

LRH: All right, thank you. Okay, I'm going to check that now. On havingness have you tried to damage anyone? I get a little reaction. What was it?

PC: *Well, I was just wondering whether you are confining that to this session, you know, or you meant in general. I think that's what occurred to me.*

LRH: All right. I'm just using an end rud, see, as a...

PC: *Yes, but I mean my attention began to flick to something that wasn't in the session and I ...*

LRH: All right. What was it?

PC: *Well, I just thought of the time that an auditor had run the Havingness without much intention on it when I was a pc.*

LRH: All right, good. Let me check that on the meter. On havingness have you tried to damage anyone? I got a faint reaction on that.

PC: *Well, then I was thinking maybe I wasn't being quite fair to the auditor. I got a little bit trapped in that, you know.*

LRH: Oh all right, all right.

PC: *One of these foolish go-arounds on something.*

LRH: All right. Let me check that on the meter. On havingness have you tried to damage anyone? No reac-

tion on that, thank you. Now, want to ask you one more, is: on havingness have you ever failed to answer a question or command? That's clean. Thank you very much. Well, we will call that an end to this brief little Prepcheck here, and then, let's see – not of the session.

PC: *Oh, I see.*

LRH: This is just this little mid ruds thing I didn't go into it very deep because there wasn't anything to go into. But what I want to do now is carry on here. One of my favorite Havingness Processes is not on this old list, so I'm going to use that now. We're going to return to testing Havingness Processes. All right?

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Put your cans back up on the table, your knuckles down. Thank you. Squeeze the cans. Thank you, all right. Do that again, squeeze the cans. Thank you. All right, now stand those cans up right where they are and let go of them. All right, and I want you to feel the tablecloth. Would you do that please. Thank you. Feel the arm of your chair. Thank you. Feel your shoulder. Thank you. Feel the other shoulder. Thank you. Feel your right hand. Thank you. Feel your left hand. Thank you. Feel your face. All right. Pick up the cans now. All right, put them in a similar position on the table with your knuckles down. Thank you. All right, squeeze the cans. Let's do that again, squeeze the cans. All right, thank you. All right, we're going to run another one. All right. Stand the cans back up on the table.

All right, here's the first command. Touch the tablecloth. All right. Touch the sign. Thank you. All right, touch the arm of the chair. Thank you. All right, touch the other arm of the chair. Thank you. Touch the base of this lamp. Thank you. All right, touch the sign. Thank you. All right, pick up the cans. Okay. All right, put your knuckles on the table and your cans up there, grasp them rather firmly. That's fine now, all right, squeeze the cans. Good heavens. Squeeze the cans. There we are, all right, squeeze the cans. All right, we're going to get off of that one right now. All right, put the cans back in your lap.

All right, we're going to run a new one, which is, "Look around here ..."
We – we've got two that we had a pretty good effect on. All right, here we go. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *I wouldn't mind being in the space under the bed.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *The space under the table.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *The space under this chair.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *In the chair I'm sitting in.*

LRH: All right, very good. Look around

here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *I wouldn't mind being in that lower compartment of the cupboard if I were sure I could get out again.*

LRH: All right, very good, all right. Put those cans up – no, put your knuckles up on the table again. All right, squeeze the cans. Dear me. Hey now. We seem to have found something here. All right, put them back in your lap and we will carry on with this test. Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right, that seems to be working like a bomb. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *The fireplace.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *That corner between the curtain and the molding.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *Well, actually in the E-Meter.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *That bag.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *That ashtray.*

LRH: All right, put your knuckles back up on the table. All right, that's good. All right, squeeze the cans.

- That actually has widened the sweep. Squeeze them again. It's widened the sweep. Let's carry on with our check. Okay, you can put them back in your lap. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *Well, the light to that light fixture. I mean the shade to the light fixture that is nearest to this body.*
- LRH:** Okay. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *The space between that shelf and the bed.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *The drawer to that secretary.*
- LRH:** Okay. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *That electric light bulb.*
- LRH:** All right. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *That telephone receiver.*
- LRH:** Okay. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *The ashtray.*
- LRH:** Okay. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *Your pocket.*
- LRH:** Okay. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *The grate.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *That chair.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *That sofa, curled up in the corner.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *The space under the table.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *This E-Meter can.*
- LRH:** All right, okay. Put your hands up on the table again like that, and let's see how we are faring here. Squeeze the cans. All right. There's not much doubt about the thing that that has widened the thing, and there's also not much doubt about it that it's not flat because it's kicking the needle. You are getting a little tiny tone arm motion here. I'm going to carry on with it if it's all right with you.
- PC:** *All right.*
- LRH:** All right, put your hands – cans back in your lap. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *That bag.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.
- PC:** *Your watch.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *That space between your tie and your shirt.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *That corner of the room.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *The space – that triangular space underneath the sign.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *The space under that grate.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *That space between the bed and the chair.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *This chair.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being in.

PC: *Your chair.*

LRH: Good. Now we're going to make another test of this, all right? All right, put your hands up on the table like that, as before. All right, good, squeeze the cans. All right, now let's see exactly how you are holding those cans. Get them good and snug down there in your hands.

That's a girl, that's a girl. All right, squeeze the cans. Wow, squeeze them again. We get a variable squeeze here is what we're getting. Squeeze them again. All right, it's less than it was before so that was the last command. Okay? We got the little jolts out of the needle. You can put those back in your lap. All right, here we go, let's go on to the next one here. What did you say the Havingness Process you have been running was?

PC: *"Touch that object."*

LRH: All right. All right, we're going to run now, "Notice that indicated object."

PC: *All right.*

LRH: "What aren't you putting into it?"
You know that one?

All right, here we go. Notice that table.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: What aren't you putting into it?

PC: *Effort.*

LRH: Thank you. Notice that sign.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: What aren't you putting into it?

PC: *Interest.*

LRH: Thank you. Notice this E-Meter.
What aren't you putting into it?

PC: *Milk.*

LRH: Okay. Notice that ashtray.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: What aren't you putting into it?

PC: *Cigarette stubs.*

LRH: Thank you. All right, put those cans back up on the table, knuckle down

- now. Give them a squeeze. All right, let's do it again. All right, that's doing us no good at all. Put them back in your lap. All right, now we're going to run, "Look around here and find something you can agree with." Okay?
- PC:** *All right.*
- LRH:** All right. Look around here and find something you can agree with.
- PC:** *The cover to that sofa.*
- LRH:** Thank you. Look around here and find something you could agree with.
- PC:** *The ceiling.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you could agree with.
- PC:** *That picture.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you could agree with.
- PC:** *That mantel.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you could agree with.
- PC:** *Your coat.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you could agree with.
- PC:** *You.*
- LRH:** All right, very good. Well, let's squeeze the cans again in the same way. Put them up on the table. All right, get it up, now, hold them loosely. All right, now, squeeze the cans. All right, well, that's opening it up from where it was anyway. Do it again, squeeze the cans. That's opening it up from where it was a moment ago, so put them back in your lap and let's try it a little bit more. Look around here and find something you can agree with.
- PC:** *The bulletin.*
- LRH:** Thank you. Look around here and find something you can agree with.
- PC:** *That secretary.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you can agree with.
- PC:** *This expanse of floor.*
- LRH:** Good, all right. Once more put those knuckles up on the table. All right, and squeeze the cans. That is opening up the meter. That looks very promising. Put them back and let's try her some more. Look around here and find something you can agree with.
- PC:** *Your watch.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you can agree with.
- PC:** *Your hair.*
- LRH:** Thank you. Look around here and find something you can agree with.
- PC:** *That wall.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you can agree with.
- PC:** *That door.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you can agree with.
- PC:** *The rug.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you can agree with.
- PC:** *That picture.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find something you can agree with.
- PC:** *The mantel.*
- LRH:** Good. Look around here and find

something you can agree with.

PC: *The facing to the mantel.*

LRH: All right, one more time let's test this. Put your hands up on the table there. All right, now, just relax your hands there. All right, good, squeeze the cans. Well, that is very interesting. Squeeze the cans again. Quite a variability of squeeze here.

PC: *It seems to be easier to snug it down in my right hand than my left hand. The crevices don't seem to match.*

LRH: All right. All right, just hold them relaxedly now. Good enough, all right, squeeze the cans. All right, that actually isn't opening it up any further. All right, you are getting a lot of havingness here though because none of these are destructive. The only one that was destructive is that, "What aren't you putting into it?" started to tighten everything up. You can put those back in your lap. All right. We're going to try the next one. That's, "Look around here and find something you could have." "Look around here and find something you could withhold." Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The back of that sofa.*

LRH: Thank you. Look around here and find something you could withhold.

PC: *That door.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The mantel.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could withhold.

PC: *That sign.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could have.

PC: *The back to the meter.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could withhold.

PC: *Telephone receiver.*

LRH: Good. All right, once more up on the table there and let's take a good look at this thing. All right, squeeze the cans. All right, squeeze the cans. All right, we're off of that one. Okay, that's the end of that. Okay, now there's another one here that we've had lately, and I'm going to check that out on you, which is "reach." Hmm?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Put those back in your lap. All right and here's the first command. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *I could reach that ceiling.*

LRH: All right. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The rug.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The bag.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *That door.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *That corner shelf.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The hearth.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *That baseboard by the door.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *That drapery.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The cord to the meter.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The lamp.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *Your pen.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *Your bracelet.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The ashtray.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The cover to the table.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *That corner of the floor.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *That recessed portion of the wall.*

LRH: Very good. All right, put your knuckles up on the table there and

let's try this now. All right, squeeze the cans. All right, wow, that increased it. We got a nicely increased fall here. Once more, squeeze the cans. All right.

PC: *I bumped it there.*

LRH: Yes, all right, squeeze the cans. All right, that's good. Now we're going to check this further. All right, put those in your lap. Here's the next command. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The top of the secretary.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *That menacing looking apparatus over there.*

LRH: Good, all right. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The cushion to the sofa.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *That sharp edge of the baseboard near the fireplace.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The green cover on the bed.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *That pipe that goes up to the corner of the wall.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *The meter.*

LRH: Good. Look around here and find something you could reach.

PC: *Your coat.*

LRH: Good, all right. Now we're going to make another test of this. All right, put your hands on the table there, backs of your hands down and let's get them – just hold them fairly relaxedly. All right, now squeeze the cans. All right, once more, squeeze the cans. Let's try her once more, squeeze the cans. Well, well that's quite interesting, that Havingness Process is as good as any of the others. It does not particularly tighten up the thing, but there is certainly a limit to the scope it opens up. So we're going to try a couple of more, huh?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. We've already found one, by the way, don't think you are getting any lose. The old Pre-session III here gives you a bit of a spread on the thing, it just doesn't continue to spread. I'm just trying to find a little bit better here.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Perfectionism.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. Now we're going – you can put those in your lap – and we're going to run here – here we go Pre-session XVI, and of course that's, "Point out something around here that is like something else." Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Point out something around here that is like something else.

PC: *That wall is like that wall.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something around here that is like something else.

PC: *That corner of the hearth is like that corner of the hearth.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something around here that is like something else.

PC: *That door, that door.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something around here that is like something else.

PC: *That corner of the secretary and that corner of the secretary.*

LRH: Thank you. All right, put your hands on the table there and, all right, squeeze the cans. All right, let's check it once more, squeeze the cans. That is not bad, you know. Put them in your lap. That is not bad. I'm going to have to test this just a little bit further here to make sure. Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Point out something around here that is like something else.

PC: *That arm of the sofa and this arm of the sofa.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something around here that is like something else.

PC: *This can and that can.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something around here that is like something else.

PC: *Your coat, my coat.*

LRH: Thank you. Point out something around here that is like something

- else.
- PC:** *Well, I don't know the exact names of these devices, but the upper device and the lower device.*
- LRH:** Thank you. All right, point out something around here that is like something else.
- PC:** *That glass door and the other glass door.*
- LRH:** Okay, good. Point out something around here that is like something else.
- PC:** *The top shelf and the next-to-the-bottom shelf.*
- LRH:** Thank you. Point out something around here that is like something else.
- PC:** *That wall and that wall.*
- LRH:** Thank you. Point out something around here that is like something else.
- PC:** *That – the one shade to the fixture, and then the other shade to the fixture.*
- LRH:** All right. Point out something around here that is like something else.
- PC:** *This button and this button.*
- LRH:** Thank you. Point out something around here that is like something else.
- PC:** *The meter cord and the – this other black cord.*
- LRH:** All right. Point out something around here that is like something else.
- PC:** *The base to the telephone and the base to the lamp.*
- LRH:** Okay. Point out something around here that is like something else.
- PC:** *That chair leg and that chair leg.*
- LRH:** All right, very good. Now let's test these things again. Put your hands on the table, there, and hold those cans quite loosely, quite loosely there. All right, now, squeeze the cans. All right, let's do it again, squeeze the cans. All right and that is not for you. Put those back in your lap. We get a tighten-up after a little while that that runs. Now let's see what else we can find here in shopping around. All right, here's Pre-session XVII. And the first – this, of course, is "Where isn't that – indicated object."
- PC:** *Okay.*
- LRH:** Okay. Here's the first command of that. By the way, is there any feelingness, any feeling on your part that you're getting loses here?
- PC:** *Oh no.*
- LRH:** Or anything like that? It's all right?
- PC:** *All right.*
- LRH:** Any feeling like your – you want to make me look good or anything like that?
- PC:** *No.*
- LRH:** All right, very good, all right. Here we go. Where isn't that table?
- PC:** *Well, it isn't in the fireplace.*
- LRH:** Thank you. Where isn't that sign?
- PC:** *On the mantel.*
- LRH:** Good. Where isn't that ceiling?
- PC:** *On the floor.*
- LRH:** Good. Where isn't that fireplace?

PC: *Against the window.*

LRH: Thank you. All right. Now let's put your hands back up on the table and once more give the cans a squeeze. Hey. Squeeze them again. It looks very promising. Put them down. You are actually not – an auditor might very well be fooled trying to find a Havingness Process on you because in the first few commands you always contrive to get a loosening on the thing. I'm looking for one that wobbles the tone arm around and well, of course, I'm looking for one with a can squeeze.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: But I'm keeping my eye on this other because it's rather static. And we'll find something here. All right, where isn't that E-Meter?

PC: *Under the bed.*

LRH: Good. Where isn't that microphone?

PC: *Under the table.*

LRH: Good. Where isn't that ashtray?

PC: *In my lap.*

LRH: Good. Where isn't that sign?

PC: *In the fireplace.*

LRH: All right. Now put your hands back up on the table there again. Good. Squeeze the cans. All right, once more let's squeeze the cans. All right, all right, now let's – now give them a squeeze. It's not for you, tightens up again. You run a cycle – you run a very interesting cycle. Put them back in your lap. You get a loosening and a tightening, and it's almost always the same cycle – you are hanging right around here

on this same thing. All right, I'm going to check the middle ruds now. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Now, that is clean. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? All right, that's clean. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Yes, what? What is it?

PC: *Well, occasionally a little concern that people are watching me downstairs, you know. I forget about it and I feel I'm in-session, and then occasionally I think, well, they're interested in what's going on.*

LRH: Very good. All right, let me check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Probably read. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Highly equivocal. Can you think of anything offhand?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Have to be considered as something or other there. All right, we're going to leave that. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? Yeah, what's that?

PC: *Well, I think I'm a little concerned about my can squeeze and I realize I was perhaps a little tense to begin with and I wasn't squeezing it in quite as spontaneous a way as I like.*

LRH: Okay, very good. All right, let me check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? All right, I've still got a reaction. What is it?

PC: *Well, the main thing is perhaps*

careful to do the right thing, you know, and make it worthwhile for the people downstairs, you know.

LRH: Yeah, all right.

PC: *Some kind of an exhibit A, or something like that.*

LRH: All right, okay, very good. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? I've still got a reaction. What is it?

PC: *Well, I think I have mmh – I have – I am careful about my auditing at present, I'm a little too careful about it, and that just came up there, you know. In other words I'm not – I don't have the confidence I should have, the ease of which you've spoken once we have mastered our tools.*

LRH: Hmm.

PC: *And so that's kind of come into this a little bit, a little anxiety about, being careful, you know.*

LRH: All right, very good. Let me check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? And that's not reading now. Okay? So here we go. We're going to use the first one we found here which is Pre-session II, which is conditional action but all right for the moment, which is simply Pre-session III, and that's, "Point out something you could confront," and, "Point out something you'd rather not." And I think you are right in the middle of some kind of a havingness shift. You're – you're doing Routine 3?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Yeah. I think your havingness is

probably going to shift around on you while you're shifting. None of these things are bad for you. The "Point out somethings" don't do anything for you particularly, they are not particularly good, they are not particularly bad, but when they are combined with "confront," why, it becomes more workable. Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right. Now we have accomplished our purpose as far as I am concerned, and I would like to do the end rudiments now. Okay?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right, here we go. In this session have you told me any half-truth? That read. What was it?

PC: *Well, perhaps what I said about confidence. It wasn't, you know, the whole story, there is more to that than just lack of confidence in my auditing. I mean there is some lack of know-how ...*

LRH: Hmmm.

PC: *... back of the lack of confidence, so in that way it would be half-truth.*

LRH: All right, all right, thank you. Check that on the meter. In this session have you told me any half-truth? There's still a reaction on it. What was it?

PC: *Well, I think maybe I was a little bit glib about some of the things that I could confront, you know. I mean I felt that in a way I could confront them, but I would perhaps rather not on that command.*

LRH: Hmm, all right, very good, very

good. Let me check that on the meter. In this session have you told me any half-truth? Still got a reaction. What was it?

PC: *Well, there's a half-truth when I said I couldn't find Havingness Processes on my pcs. I mean sometimes I can and perhaps I weighted it in the other direction.*

LRH: All right, thank you. I'll check that on the meter. In this session have you told me any half-truth? All right, there's still a tiny reaction on this.

PC: *Well, in regard to this shipwreck incident, I'm not entirely sure just what happened.*

LRH: All right, all right.

PC: *There's a little half-truth for me too on that.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Let me check it on the meter. In this session have you told me any half-truth? That's an equivocal read. I couldn't tell. In this session have you told me any half-truth? I got a reaction on it. It's much less now. Let me see if I can't steer you into this a little easier here. Right there, what are you thinking about?

PC: *Well, I was thinking that I didn't – I wasn't really anxious to be an exhibit A. The way I put it, it sounded as if I wanted to be on display. I don't know, that's the thing I thought of then. My main point was that I wanted to make it easy for you to give your demonstration to the students, you know, and do my part on it.*

LRH: All right, okay, very good. All

right, let me check that on the meter again. In this session have you told me any half-truth? That is clean. Thank you. In this session have you told me any untruth? All right, that's an equivocal read. In this session have you told me any untruth? That's probably reading. What was it?

PC: *Well, I was thinking of goals there. I'm a little bit foggy as to just what goals I gave you. It's possible there was a partial, not a willful distortion, but it may have been that at the moment, you know I thought it was a goal, and now perhaps I don't think so. I just had that feeling.*

LRH: All right, all right. Let me check that on the meter. In this session have you told me any untruth? All right, that reads. What was it?

PC: *Well, of course, I do get concerned about the idea of my telling you an untruth. And this always comes up in a session and I get restimulated on my mother when she used to say, "Now dear, are you sure you've told me the whole truth?"*

LRH: Mmm-hmm, all right.

PC: *That creeps into it at this point.*

LRH: All right, okay. Let me check that on the meter. In this session have you told me any untruth? Now it's pretty hard to read through that. In this session have you told me any untruth? We are going to pass that by. All right. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Yes. What was that?

PC: *Well, right then my left hand was quivering. I have had that of late, a*

little restimulation of the left hand quivers and I didn't mention that to you.

LRH: All right, very good, very good. In this session – check that on the meter – in this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, there's perhaps a tiny acceleration there. Something else, what might that be?

PC: *Well, I have been quite upset over my inability to perform on the course, especially since this practical has been added.*

LRH: All right, okay. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, there's a tiny reaction there. What's that you're thinking of right there. What was it?

PC: *Well, that I'm – it just goes along with that, that I'm kind of engulfed by stupidity at times, of late.*

LRH: Hmmmm.

PC: *On the course, and I haven't mentioned that to you.*

LRH: All right. Let me check that on the meter now. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? The meter is a little bit rough to read right here. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? That reads. What was it?

PC: *Well, I was a little concerned that Tom was taken off as my auditor, you know.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *I feel that if my ruds are out, I – I share the responsibility of that, you know.*

LRH: Oh! All right.

PC: *I have felt a little down today because he was taken off auditing. He was cancelled as an auditor.*

LRH: All right, okay. Let me check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Yes, that reacts. What is it? What are you thinking of right there?

PC: *Well, I don't feel I did as good a job auditing Dorothy today as I should have, and in a way it was almost as if, if Tom didn't deserve to audit, I didn't either, you know. A little bit of that feeling.*

LRH: Oh, all right, all right. Now did that answer the question of something you failed to reveal?

PC: *Something I failed to reveal during this session to you. Yes.*

LRH: All right, good. Did it pass through you mind in this session?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. I'm just being careful.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: I don't want to be cancelled, you know.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right, all right. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. There's still a tick left on that. It's freed up there.

PC: *Well, that I do have this kind of a lump in midriff you know, that feels like apprehension, but I know darn well it's my GPM. I failed to reveal that to you.*

LRH: All right, very good. Let me check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have failed to

reveal? All right, there's still a reaction on that only it's a different one. What's that right there?

PC: *Well, I was just thinking I did a very poor job of going through TR 4 outside with Vi before the evening TV started.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Let me check that again. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. We're going to pass that by, okay?

In this session is there anything you have been careful of? Equivocal read. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? Yes. What is that?

PC: *Well, I suppose careful not to dump my whole case in your lap.*

LRH: Oh, oh. Is that the withhold reading I'm getting here?

PC: *I imagine so.*

LRH: All right, very good, thank you, thank you, all right. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? All right, that is not reacting now. All right.

In this session have you said something only to impress me? Equivocal. In this session have you said something only to impress me? Doesn't read.

In this session have you tried to damage anyone? Check that. In this session have you tried to damage anyone? Have to check it again. In this session have you tried to damage anyone? Got a reaction.

PC: *Well, I suppose by admitting that I was so stupid at present, I damaged*

myself.

LRH: All right, very good, all right. In this session have you tried to damage anyone? All right, that may have read or may not have read. What was it that you thought of?

PC: *Well, I – more or less I felt I was trying not to damage Tom, you know, because in a way I felt I had damaged him a little. So I was trying not to in this session.*

LRH: All right, very good. Let me check that on the meter. In this session have you tried to damage anyone? I don't get a read on that. Okay? In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Yes, what's that?

PC: *Well, I tried to squeeze the cans as I was supposed to.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *A little anxiety about the effect on the meter there by my can squeeze.*

LRH: Good enough. In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? All right, that is clean.

In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you? I'll have to ask that again. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you? Can't read the meter here. It – I'm getting a – I'm getting a constant agitation on the needle here. All right. In this session have I missed a withhold on you? Got a reaction. What was it?

PC: *Well, it's just that I don't feel as secure as I should about auditing I have less confidence in my audit-*

ing. It was false confidence before I came here, you know, and I have to hit bottom. I apparently have to scrape the bottom and realize what a dub I really am before I can begin to be an auditor.

LRH: All right, thank you. In this session have I missed a withhold on you? Yes. What was it?

PC: *Well, just in general, I don't have the mastery of my tools that I should have.*

LRH: All right, very good. Now listen carefully to this question. In this session have I missed a withhold on you?

PC: *No, I don't think so, I mean I have told you these things before.*

LRH: Yeah. Well, have I missed a withhold on you?

PC: *Well, yes, you haven't found out what my goal is.*

LRH: All right, very good, all right. All right. Now, let me ask this and check it on the meter. All right? In this session have I missed a withhold on you? I don't get a reaction. I get an agitated needle on this thing, but that's all – in general. All right, let me see if I've got this clean now. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command that I have given you? All right. In this session have you decided anything. What's that? I've got a read.

PC: *Well, I've decided that you have a vitalizing effect on a preclear. You know, that I feel more alive and more vital and more here. I've been quite dispersed of late and so I did*

decide that, that you could help me to collect myself.

LRH: All right, very good. We'll check that on the meter. In this session have you decided anything? Yeah, there's still another one. What was it?

PC: *Well, to make more of an effort to get my practical work done.*

LRH: All right, very good. Let me check it on the meter. In this session have you decided anything? All right, I don't think that's reading now. Is there anything you care to mention about it?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. I'm going to call it out one more time just for the devil of it. In this session have you decided anything. Yes, there's a reaction on it.

PC: *Well, I've reaffirmed my determination to get Clear. There are times when that submerges a little bit, you know, and doesn't seem so possible.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Now I feel that it is possible and you are kind of steering me toward it now.*

LRH: All right, very good. In this session have you decided anything. All right, equivocal read. In this session have you decided anything. There's a read on the end of that, tiny, but there. What was it?

PC: *Well, it's more or less to keep going and not – not turn aside from my goal, because I have – as I say, I've felt just a little bit overwhelmed of*

late.

LRH: All right.

PC: *So I'm going to keep going.*

LRH: Very good, all right. In this session have you decided anything. Yes, still a read on it.

PC: *Well, it feels more like being on the point of deciding something, not having actually decided something.*

LRH: All right, all right, all right.

PC: *I mean in addition to what I've told you.*

LRH: All right, very good. Let me check this now very carefully. In this session have you decided anything? I haven't got a read there. Thank you. All right. All right. In this session – in this session have you thought or done anything I have failed to find out about? No read. Okay? All right. In this session – in this session have you thought or done anything I have failed to find out about? No read. Okay?

PC: *Um-hm.*

LRH: In this session have you been critical of me? I'll have to check that again. In this session have you been critical of me? I got a little read on that.

PC: *Well, I would say it was quite the reverse.*

LRH: All right, all right.

PC: *As the session has gone along I have felt much more at home with you, you know. Much more relaxed.*

LRH: All right. Got a question: Does the question shock you?

PC: *Yes, I think it did a little bit.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It was – you sprang a surprise there.*

LRH: Yes, you've never heard it in the end ruds before.

PC: *No.*

LRH: I beg your pardon.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: All right. In this session have you been critical of me? All right, it reads, it reads.

PC: *In a favorable sense. Criticism can be favorable you know.*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. I'll check it one more time. In this session have you been critical of me? I got a flick. What's the ...

PC: *Well, there was once in the middle rudiments where you did repeat something after you'd cleared it, you know, and then you pointed it out yourself. But I did notice that you went back to the "suppress" after you'd gone on to the "invalidate" middle rud.*

LRH: Yes, yes, that's right.

PC: *So I wasn't really critical, but I'd noticed you'd made that mistake.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And really it warmed the cockles of my heart to think that Ron could make a mistake like that.*

LRH: All right, good enough, good enough. All right, in this session have you been critical of me? All right, that is apparently clean. Okay?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. In this session was the room all right? You got a tiny slowdown there.

PC: *It seemed a little formidable to start with.*

LRH: Um-hm.

PC: *You know, the sense that we aren't exactly alone.*

LRH: Yes, that's right. All right. Let me check that on the meter now. In this session was the room all right? I get a – still get a read on that. What was it?

PC: *Well, the room seems a little portentous, you know, as if some – something big is about to occur, which may well be the case because I do feel that there has been a case change since I've been in the room.*

LRH: I didn't quite get the front part of that, what ...

PC: *I said there seemed to be something portentous about the room, you know ...*

LRH: Oh yeah, oh all right.

PC: *... and that there – in other words, there seemed to have been something portentous, and something was portentous since I have had certainly the beginning of a case change in this room.*

LRH: All right, very good, very good. Let me check that on the meter now. In this session was the room all right? All right, I get a – get a bit of a reaction on there. What was wrong with the room? There it is. There it is.

PC: *Well, it didn't seem to be a warmly inviting room when I came into it,*

you know. Reg led me in kind of on tiptoe and warned me that sounds would sound, you know.

LRH: All right.

PC: *So I felt just a little tippy-toe about it.*

LRH: All right, okay, all right. In this session was the room all right? All right, that's clean. Thank you very much. All right. Now, have you made any part of your goals for this session?

PC: *Well, I'm sure I have, although I've – oh yes, the havingness goal, I've certainly made that.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And yes I think I will do a better job of auditing Dorothy because some of my assurance has come back. There is more hope there.*

LRH: All right. All right, okay. Now, have you made any other gains in this session you'd care to mention?

PC: *Yes a – a renewed awareness that it is possible for me to get Clear.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Kind of a rekindled hope, you know and ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... and then this revitalized feeling I spoke to you about.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *... which is going on.*

LRH: All right, all right. Any other gains you'd care to mention?

PC: *Yes, I feel more at home with you.*

LRH: All right, thank you. All right. Now is there anything you'd care to ask

or say before I end this session?

PC: *No, except, well, I was a little curious about my tone arm. Did it finally respond to some ...*

LRH: It was responding between 2.9 and 2. ... 3.25 and very slight fluctuations and so forth. I take it from this that you are either in the process of having a goals list nulled?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Isn't that right?

PC: *Well, right now – we have been nulling, but we are adding to the list right now.*

LRH: Yes, well, you're in that process.

PC: *Yes. It's rather an uncomfortable state.*

LRH: Yes. I took it – I took it that this was probably a, frozen arm, slightly frozen on exactly what you were going through on your goals list. And actually you're being checked on havingness halfway through a very powerful process which is R3.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: So I took – took no real attention to it. Just wondered if we could upset it and get some motion in it with this. We did, we did – we got a little motion in it here and there. All right?

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Well, is it all right with you if I end this session now?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right, here it is. End of session.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Session ended for you?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC: *You are no longer auditing me.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Thank you very much.*

LRH: You're welcome.

MODEL SESSION REVISED

A lecture given on 21 June 1962

Thank you.

First lecture, June 21st, isn't it? Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Okay. Tonight's lecture is on the subject of Model Session, revised. It's revised and amplified in Saint Hill lecture 21 June 62, the one which you're about to hear. [laughs] Oh, you didn't get that as a gag – boy, you're really slow. Look, come up to present time. Come up to present time.

Now, if you have any confusion, if you have any confusion about this Model Session, it's actually HCOB 23 June, is the date on it. Actually, it's HCOB 21 June, but it's marked 23 June. Why? Well, because 21 June is today's Thursday bulletin. But this didn't go out as the Thursday bulletin. You see? It's HCOB 23 June, as a special designation. And that is "Model Session Revised." You're going to live with this one for a while. And you're up against throwing everything away that you knew, you see, because Ron has changed his mind again.

You most – you hear Ron has changed his mind again most prevalently on people that didn't know there was any stable data in Scientology, you know? If you hear somebody say that sometime, ask them for, "What's Axiom 3?"

You know, "Axiom? What axiom? Axioms? We're talking about Scientology." You know? They actually don't know their basics.

The fundamentals we're working with remain relatively unchanged. But the further we reach into the never-never land of aberration and life and the mind and this universe and God and beans and catfish and kings and coal heavers and other odds and ends which you find about – not only in your reactive bank but in the actual universe – the smoother we can make it.

And this Model Session actually will make auditing far, far, far, far, far, *far* – the last far has an underscore under it – smoother than you have seen it going before.

Now, Model Session made auditing much smoother. And the earliest Model Sessions had separate processes. In other words, you did a rudiment and then you did a process to straighten out the rudiment. And all to date did this. But this Model Session is remarkable in this one aspect: It – that is, the only extra process which you need is the pc's Havingness Process. And because that has to be found and tested on the meter, it of course can't be a canned process.

The rudiments, whether the beginning, middle or end rudiments, used in this Model Session are themselves repetitive processes. You ask as long as there is an instant read on the

needle. And the moment you get a clear reaction to your question, that is flat and you go on to the next one. You don't ask the question one more time. You only ask the question twice or more if it had an instant read. You ask it merely once if it didn't react.

Now, I refer you to HCOB of the 25th of May for what we mean by an instant read. And the – let's not let this one get by us again. Eleven-tenths of the auditors in Australia, I just learned, were trying to clear prior reads off the meter. So that would have been a horrible mess, man!

The one that makes the pc feel good, the one – you know, that's the only test as to what's right – the one that makes the pc feel good is the instant read, just like it's described in 25 May 62, see? If you clean off that end instant reaction... Let's say the sentence ends with the word "cat," and you want the instant reaction which begins with the enunciation of a "t" on the end of "cat," see? If you have an instant reaction which begins with "c," *heh-heh*, that question is null.

You say, "Well, what about it if the pc thought of it before you got to the end of it?"

What do you mean auditing a pc that much out of session? That is just all there is to that. I mean, it's just ...

You say, "In this session have you invalid – ?" Read. You say, "Well obviously, the pc knew what I was going to say, so the pc knowing what I was going to say, of course you can invalid – you get a read – that's so – figure-figure-figure-figure-figure, screw the head on a little tighter! You know, get the azimuths out ..."

Oh, man, that is *wrong!* It's only one – the only read is when you have stopped speaking and you get a reaction. And if you think maybe the pc didn't understand it, you read it again, grooved. But that would be an equivocal read – that would be it was reading almost on the end, but you were not sure. Was it on the end or latent? You were just a little bit asleep at the moment the thing clicked. That's an equivocal read; meaning which, you don't know whether it was which or which. Was it plus or minus? Did it react or didn't it react? That's an equivocal read and you must establish the actual read.

Sometimes the pc is so busy figure-figuring reactively – got some circuit going, you know, making coffee or something – and you got this circuit going and it isn't true that the pc knowing the question will react to the question. If you think this can happen, then you think you are auditing the analytical mind. Then you would also think that the pc knew the answer when you ask him for a withhold and therefore you'll never search for the withhold. Because you think you're auditing a knowing being. And you're not auditing a knowing being.

So therefore, a prior read which would read on, "In this session have you inva – ?" Read, see. You say, "Well, the pc knew what he was going to say, you know, and so therefore, of course, the pc anticipated the question! Ha-ha. Ha-ha-ha. All right. Oh, I'll just find out what he invalidated this session."

About a half an hour later of tugging and pc out of session and everything all messed up like fire drill, you eventually conclude that there wasn't – there wasn't anything on it. No, the pc was just making coffee in the reactive bank at that moment, don't you see? What you said had nothing to do with any reaction on the meter, see? Something else was going on. It

does, too. Pcs' hearts beat. Pc with very low havingness, eyeballs click to the right – the meter will fall if the pc's havingness is in a horrible shape.

Some pc all of a sudden – you'll see some pc, some pc whose havingness is lousy and so forth – they'll be sitting up this way in the chair, see, they'll be sitting up this way holding the cans and all of a sudden the meter will be reading at 4, see. And they'll decide, well, they're not comfortable that way so they're going to sit this way now, see, and the meter will read at 3. You say, "What the hell went on here?"

Well, nothing went on here except the pc is such a mass that the fact that the pc moved the body put the mental masses in a different place, so you got a different read. That's right, see? You got enough black masses which are pasted down against the pc's face, he can wiggle his nose and he'd get a read on the meter, see?

Somebody's showing you that they can make an E-Meter read, why, laugh at them, man. Because, yeah, you can make an E-Meter read any day of the – you like – they'll go – and so on. But you have to have the GPM right down on you, man. And your havingness just has to be so that it's like strung wire. The pc's nerves, you know, you strike on him and he goes high C. You could play him in a symphony orchestra if you could get him under your chin. [laughter] Havingness can run down to a point where a physical reaction causes an action on the meter. That will come up here in a moment; I'll discuss that a little bit further.

But the point I'm making is, is you want an instant read. And it's the one which finishes up with the auditor's major thought. And it is right on the end, and it is no place else. It isn't prior to the end, it isn't after the end. It is right on. "Invalidated." All right, "-ated" read. See? The read starts with the last "-ted." The read that started with the "inva-" is invalid.

Don't compromise with that. Don't think you all of a sudden have observed something that I haven't seen. Of course, there – you could be using some type of meter – you could use a meter with a built-in lag that is reacting to the next-to-the-last question you asked. But that isn't true of a Mark IV.

Now, there's no compromising with this. The most amazing precision occurs on that – most amazing precision. The pc doesn't get it telepathically into the reactive bank before you say it. Nothing else is happening here. You say, "In this session, is there anything you have invalidated?" Read, see? There's no lag between the "-ed" and the read. You see, it happened simultaneously. And here's what's weird about it, is it always reads *exactly* in that fashion. If it reads late, it isn't a read. If it reads "invalida-," it isn't a read, don't you see?

You know, some of you, sometime or another, are going to find somebody around who hasn't had the benefit of your training; they're going to come rushing up to you and they're going to say, "But the pc always has present time problems." And you say, "Well, let's see." And you put the pc on the meter and you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" And you're going to find that the needle starts falling at the exact "e" end of "time" and that the pc has a difficulty with time. He'll say, "I never can get him into session."

Well, the more you louse up the principle I've just been talking to you about, the more prior reads you start monkeying with, the more latent reads you start monkeying with, the more out of session your pc's going to go. So an improper use of the meter and reading

against this Model Session can dirty up the needle and drive the pc further out of session than not using it at all.

Do you understand? This is one of these things that has to be used properly. If used properly, it's marvelous. It's something like gunpowder. You stuff it into the right end of the musket and point it in the right direction and it is marvelous. But you use it to light your pipe with and it blows your silly head off. And that's very true of this Model Session. Therefore, it has to be used properly.

Now, it is of enormous benefit to have a repetitive command Model Session. That's very enormous as a benefit. It can't be exaggerated because it isn't changing a process on a pc all the time; you just keep asking the same question that you ask over and over and over and you'll get the same – you get the thing cleared up that you ask for. You're not then clearing up some variation of what you ask for. Do you see? "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Well, you'll finally clear that up, see, because you're just asking him this. But the process is, "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" And that's a process, bang, bang, bang, bang, you see? But, of course, you ask the whole thing through each time.

Now, it has this beauty, is there's no variation in what you do. I mean, if you don't get a read you go right on from the point you didn't get a read. And if you do get a read you finish the sentence. If you ask him the question and get his answer and check it on the meter and you ask the question, and you know, go on and on. I'll give you some little examples of this.

This has another virtue: It is terribly easy to do once you find out that it works. It's very easy to do. It is so easy to do that nearly everybody starting in to do it has to do something else, because they know that anything that works this well couldn't be done this easily. It has to be done hard.

Now, if you think – if you think that the moisture has to come exuding from your brow and splattering on the glass of the E-Meter for you to look like you are auditing, go back on the track and pick up the old strong-man act that you used to do, you know? Where you took these ten-thousand-pound dumbbells, you know, and strained and your muscles quivered, you know, and you lifted it up over your head and the whole audience could sit there and say, "God, that's hard to do! What an expert he must be! Look how difficult this thing is!" See? And they keep talking that way until some little girl comes by and picks up the ten-thousand-pound dumbbell and puts it under her arm and clears up the stage and walks off. You see?

Yeah, everybody has to some slight degree a desire to demonstrate that they are an expert because what they are doing is difficult. Everybody has that desire to some tiny degree.

The real experts are the ones who fool you. I imagine if you were ever down and saw Sterling Moss in his heyday and you got a close-up of that boy driving a car you would have had the impression: Anybody can drive this car! Just anybody could drive that car. Anybody could drive that well. Anybody could drive a race, see. Gravel shooting out from underneath the tires, you know, and everything going on, but you just say man, that's just driving a car, you know? An old lady driving down Main Street, you know? Nothing to it.

And the fellow that came in last in that race, his knuckles – the bones of his knuckles have burst through the skin, you see? He has sunk his teeth – upper teeth into his lower teeth,

you see? His eyes are bugged out three-eighths of an inch. You say, "Man, he's really driving." He came in last, too.

Well, the funny part of it is, is the mark of an expert is ease – always. Now, remember that because you're going to fool students; you're going to fool people. They see you give an auditing session and it looks very, very easy. So they're going to go through this nonsense – all of you – some of you are going through this nonsense, all of you will go through this nonsense or have gone through it – and that is to say when you first sat down in a co-audit or to audit or took the book, there was nothing to it at all. You simply sat down and you said a few things to the pc, the pc answered these things and bong, and you got a good result. It's fantastic, you know?

And you go in to co-audit, you'll see a lot of birds sitting in co-audit, you know, and they'll be saying, "From where you could communicate to a head? Thank you. From where could you communicate to a head? Thank you. From where could you communicate to a head? Thank you." See, there's nothing to it, you know, just bang! bang! bang! They actually – there's no difficulty, they're just sitting there and doing it.

And do you know they have to go all the way around the dial to get back to that point?
[laughter]

The second you throw them a little more complication – see, they were all right. There was an Instructor standing there. Didn't know anything was to be worried about but of course, they aren't having any trouble either. Well, there isn't anything to be worried about. And they will go all the way around the dial before they come back to that ease.

So it looks very funny to see somebody sitting there. You really can't tell whether he's – it's beginner's luck or he's an expert. You see?

But in actual fact, you, time after time, will in futures be giving a demonstration of auditing or something like that. You'll be sitting down, some other people will be around watching you audit, you see. And you'll be doing a flawless performance of auditing and so forth and they'll all be fixed with the total impression that they could do that. They'll all be absolutely convinced that they could do that with the greatest of ease.

And sure enough, they'll take something like a script Model Session, they will ask the thing and they will get along fine and then the horrible unknownness of it all, you see, starts closing down on them. And are they doing right? Are they doing wrong? Which way are they going? And which way is up and backwards? And they just become all thumbs. You know?

People do this with golf. They do this with golf. They walk out on the links and they take a club, any old club, there's the ball and they haul back – 275 yard drive. You know? Knocks the whole top out of a tree at the far end of the runway, you know. And they say, "Well, there's nothing much about this game!" And spend the next twenty years trying to make half that distance. [laughter, laughs]

So the simplicity of this is a fooler. You enter into it with the idea that there must be something else to do. But you also enter into it with all the alter-ises wide open. And the expert has had the alter-ises impulses flattened. See, he has the – he no longer has an impulse that he's got to do something else or he's got to meet an emergency or he's got to be brilliant at

this particular point or he's got to be this or he's got to be that. These are flattened with the expert.

Your amateur goes along fine right up to the moment when the pc says something, "yeowll."

"Did he say yes? Did he say no? What do I do now? Should I? Shouldn't I? Let me see, maybe I'd just better avoid the whole thing. I'll go on to the next question." So on, so on and so on. Not quite right. You get the idea? He doesn't know.

So the next time he comes by this thing, he alters. And he alters badly. The pc said something different at this level so there might be something wrong with it. So this time he makes absolutely sure. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" So he's got the word "difficulties" and he knows the difficulties and the pc told him – has told him several times that difficulties are something he shouldn't really be talking about because it – that is a charged subject and that it's really all right to audit, you see, be audited by the auditor but difficulties is a separate and different subject. See? He knows this. So he says, "Well, let's put another one in here; let's – is it all right if I audit you?" That was an old one, see. So he says, "Well, we'd better go back to that one because the pc has so much difficulty with difficulties." And he gradually shifts things this way and shifts things that way and the next thing you know he doesn't have the benefit of the workout and he's having an awful time.

He discovers various things as he goes along, you see. He discovers things. And as he discovers these things he normally does something else. He actually has – a person who is new at it is nervous at discussing somebody's problems with them anyway and they're liable to find ways and means not to do so and they go into all sorts of variations. It – they never give it a chance.

Now, similarly, you get Q and A going about the same way. You say to the pc, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc says, "Yes."

And you say, "What is the problem?"

And the pc says, "Pretty – it's a pretty difficult problem. Nobody's ever been able to do anything about it. As a matter of fact, more auditors have broken their hearts over this problem than anybody else," you see?

The guy thinks, "Well, gee, you know, maybe this is something unusual here." So he says, "Well, you can talk to me about it," and leans back away from the meter and goes into a long and involved conversation with the pc. And if he's very, very new he'd probably listen to the earnestness and worry in the pc's voice and the tenseness in the pc and wasn't reading his meter right anyhow. Actually he didn't have a read on "Do you have a present time problem?" See. He just followed the red herring, not the path.

Or the pc with this tremendous buildup finally tells him what this problem is. That, "I'm in love with you." See, something like this, you know. God! The ruddy amateur – the grizzled veteran says, "Thank you. I'll check this on the meter," you know. [laughter] The amateur has gone all these years, you see, and nobody's ever said this before, and feels guilty.

Does this. Does that. Takes it up, discusses it at great length. All of a sudden says, "Well, when did you first notice these symptoms?" Q and A, here we go.

But it's just these little points, the particularly disarming points, the points that disarm the auditor, the points that hit him personally, the points which are calculated to upset him or worry him. On these points he'll go adrift, become unusual, do something else, flub, fail to handle the thing And if he gets into a habit of doing this sort of thing and if he never does conquer this impulse, why, he winds up with nobody ever getting better. So he says, "Well, Model Session can't be any good." How would he know? He's never used it.

Now, this session is built with great care, with a tremendous amount of data back of it. Now, I'm not trying to give it altitude, but I am talking now about the amount of data which is wrapped up in this. Actually, the first Model Session – the first discussion of Model Session was, I think, about 1958.

We said, "Well, you know, auditors say certain things, see, and it might be a good thing if we patterned those things and made it easier and made it sound more constant." And that was all there was to Model Session.

Then the next reason for a Model Session was if you used the same session every time it tended to run old sessions out. That's a worthwhile reason. So that was why Model Session continued on.

And then here at Saint Hill it became the earmark of a professional-looking auditor. Just no – no more importance than that, don't you see?

Ah, but it has moved up into far greater spheres than these earlier reasons. Yes, it is nice for all auditors to be in agreement on what they say in an auditing session. The R-factor on auditing comes up enormously if you use Model Session. And now, if you have every question of the Model Session is the beginning of a repetitive process which can be run as long as it is necessary to clean the needle, then there's every reason in the world to have a Model Session.

Now, this session just used exactly as it's supposed to be used without departure going on down the line will get you some very interesting results just by the use of it. You put this person into session and you take him out of session. You know, no body of the session at all. If you did that, let us say, every day for three days running, this person would be going around talking about "my auditor." See, if you did a nice, smooth job of that fact.

Furthermore, it has this unusual power, particularly gripped up with Prechecking or Havingness. But a pc's needle tends to smooth out if – on just repeated, expert use of this Model Session. Using nothing more than this. Your expectancy is that a new pc that you have might have a rather weird looking needle. You know? It might read five times before the end of the major thought and seven times afterwards. You know? You'd think the electrodes were better connected to the mantel clock than they were to a pc. You're not quite sure what's going on, but it sure has nothing much to do with what you're doing.

You're looking at the out-of-controlness of the pc. See, the pc actually isn't in-session. The pc is running on a kind of auto. They actually are not powerful enough to generate their own reactive bank. The reactive bank is just running on automatic, you see? And what you

say doesn't have very much to do with it. By the time you've audited him for about three days what you say has a lot to do with it. And you will notice that a pc sort of – a new pc quite often looks like somebody who is keeping himself three or four feet out of the water, and then he will go down to head level and swim comfortably after a while.

Well, it's actually their concern; they never work out what's going to happen. And the main concern of people is they don't – they don't know what's coming off. They don't know what's going to be demanded of them. By the time an auditor's demanded exactly the same thing of them for three days running they all of a sudden heave a horrible sigh of relief and get comfortable – just that factor alone, see? If all of these lines were gobbledygook that is what it – would happen.

Supposing you had a patter that was something like this: "How are you today? That's clear." See? "Have you been enjoying yourself this week? All right. Thank you. That's clear. Are you fond of clothes? Thank you, that's clear." Didn't do anything else than this, see. "Do you like fudge?" And then your end of session – your end of session rudiments were, "Have you been comfortable in the chair?" See? "Have you thought about anything? And do you feel like yourself? End of session."

Now, by some tiny little stretch, one or another portion of these might have been slightly evanescently therapeutic but I think you'd find all of those things rather wide. And yet if you did that to somebody for three days running and you used the same patter and did it exactly the same way, at the end of the third day they would trust you more than on the first day. Their trust would be higher because they'd know what to expect. They'd say, "Now, the next question he's going to ask me about fudge," you see? They know what's coming. Well, there – your R-factor's high, you see? Their expectancy. They're never startled, always that sort of thing. And they would feel more friendly towards you. And their case would be just as lousy as ever, but as far as you, the auditor, was concerned, they'd feel more friendly and you would be much more real to them. And if you were standing in a group of people and that pc came in the room you would look more solid than the other people in the room. Quite interesting. You would look more solid. There's your expectancy – just establishment of expectancy. Now, don't downgrade that as a factor in Model Session, see?

Well, this comes to this point, then, that the whole effect of Model Session, for various reasons, increases the reality of the session and increases the pc's ARC with the auditor. So therefore, don't make this mistake: don't expect any question, any one question in Model Session to suddenly straighten out everything that's wrong with the pc. See, anything more than you would expect one button to straighten out the whole case. You understand? Get them clear, get them clear, but the first time you run it you've got a dirty *bzzzz*, the needle is going *bzzzz* every few minutes - *bzzzzz*. And for to – unfortunately, every now and then, the *bzzzz* occurs instantly with where you ought to get the instant read, you see? He's zigging while you're zagging.

Now listen to me. This you actually have never heard very well. That *bzzzzzt* doesn't mean you can leave a question hot on an instant read if the instant read *bzz-bzzzed*, but it means this: that you shouldn't get so confoundedly optimistic about cleaning up the *bzzzzt* off a needle with any single rudiments question, by asking for missed withholdings or doing any-

thing else. You take the *bzzzzzzts* off and the ticks and the tocks and the clicks and the clacks with auditing, not with a part of auditing. In other words, straighten out and smooth out the pc mentally so that you don't get all these zigs and zags on a needle and *brrrt-brrrt-brrrt*. That takes auditing.

You will find that every time you run this Model Session the needle at the end of the session will be a tiny little bit cleaner. By the time you've run three or four sessions the needle will look pretty smooth.

Now, you'll get pulled out of the datum I've just given you by the fact that now and then you will have some fantastic luck. You know, every hundred thousand visitors at Las Vegas walk in and put a dollar in one of the slot machines, you see, and hit the jackpot. The machines are rigged so it's every one hundred thousand visitors, you see. And the thing feeds you back several hundred dollars in a jackpot. And it's very delightful because the silver dollars roll all over the floor, you know, and get into the spittoons and everything. And marvelous – you know, wasting money like crazy.

Well, you're going to hit this, see, you're going to go halfway down through a Model Session one day – discount the fact that you've been working on it, you see, for a week or two – and you go halfway down through a Model Session one day and you said, "Is there something you have failed to reveal?" You know? You're in the middle rudiments or something and "In this session, is there anything you've failed to reveal?"

And the person says, "*Uhhh, ohhh, uahh*, maybe I'd better tell you – I've been hiding it from you every session but the truth of the matter is, is I wear boys' underwear under my dress." And all of a sudden the needle's going this way, see? Up to this time this was needle motion. All of a sudden ...

Well, this sticks you as an auditor. Whenever that win happens you tend to get stuck in that win. Now, you just realize that you have been already stuck in that win a time or two, haven't you? You all of a sudden saw something like this happen, see. And so after that you keep going, "Let's see now, how can we find this lady's wearing boys' underwear?" See? "How can we – how can we ..." For a little while you kind of have the impression that every time you see a stiff needle that the – the person is wearing boys' underwear. [laughter] You actually get stuck in the win. And you go on and on and on this way and you'll start doing your Model Session a little differently. You know, you'll just be watching it very closely, see – trying to cover the thing, you know, clear up the whole case on any one of these questions. See, any one of these questions and this can happen. Next time you get somebody with a stiff needle, you know – oh, man! You just sweat over these things, you know? Which one is going to free it?

Oh, it isn't which one is going to free it. You didn't remember something about the boys' underwear case. There was something you didn't remember about that case and that was that you'd been auditing the person for a week. And what you did was walk it right up to the point where all of a sudden you apparently pulled it all on one button. But you didn't. You didn't. You had been preparing the case. What you got was a sort of an instantaneous improvement of the case.

Psychoanalysts just blow their brains out all over the world with this one. They – they'll have forty, fifty patients and on one of them, one day, they say, "Did you ever have sexual relations with your little brother?" or something like this. And the person will look kind of haunted and, "Yes." See? And right away they're clean, they pass their Rorschach, their Wassermann – they pass everything and they're just in marvelous condition thereafter. You'll find this poor psychoanalyst for the last twenty years has been hunting in every patient to find incest in their childhood.

Freud got hung with what he got hung with because he had a piece of luck. See? He had a piece of luck and here and there and so he just assigned that to all cases.

Well, it's quite a few things that a case is composed of. For us to be at 3GA, to have Routine 3GA and to have Routine 3GA rather fantastically bringing arms down and needles going clear is the confoundedest magic that anybody ever imagined could happen – just a hundred percent clearing. You haven't realized it yet because you haven't walked into too many cases, you haven't – but it's going to creep up on you.

One of your reactions is, when you first do this is, "Well, why the hell didn't I start 3GAing this pc when I first got my hands on him? Find the goal the first day, you see, and then write all the lists the second day and I would have had a Clear." And you kind of – then – so you try that. And you come a gorgeous cropper, you see. Can't keep the pc under control enough to keep him listing and can't do this and can't do that and they aren't able to blow anything and they're not in-session and all of these other factors are deleted from it, you see. So our concentration is on 3GA. See? It's on the doingness, the thing: find the goal and then list the goal and that is what makes a Clear. That is an inaccurate statement. It is good auditing with the technology of 3GA which makes a Clear.

The funny part of it is if you delete the good auditing you won't get a Clear and if you delete the 3GA you won't get a Clear. Oddly enough, you won't get a pc up to 3GA unless you've got something – you won't get all cases up to 3GA unless you've got CCHs and Prep-checking either. See? So it's all a piece. It isn't 3GA that is making Clears. It's CCHs, Prep-checking and terrifically good, accurate, smooth auditing.

Well, this Model Session, then, is a piece of clearing, to that degree. And all this does is tend to keep the session predictable and present time clean enough to be audited in. And that's what this does. It keeps the session predictable and present time clean enough to be audited in. And you get an undistracted pc if you go at it in this particular wise.

Now, I'm not trying to give you a sales talk on this Model Session. I'm merely trying to say, "Give it a chance." This Model Session will be released in this bulletin the 23rd of June. Probably be in your hands late tomorrow afternoon. You don't, therefore, have to copy off what I am about to say. So I'm just going to read it off so it will also be on this tape:

It's "Start of session." Of course, these – many of these things are the same as any old – other Model Session. "Start of session." "Is it all right to – with you if I begin this session now? Start of session. Has this session started for you?" If pc says, "No," say again, "Start of session. Now, is this session started for you?" Pc says, "No," say, "We will cover it in the rudiments."

Beginning rudiments: Goals. "What goals would you like to set for this session?" You notice there's no read on this so "for this session" can follow it. "Are there any goals you would like to set for life or livingness?" Same thing, isn't it?

Environment: "Tell me if it is all right to audit in this room." That got shorter, didn't it? Now, if you were to ask the pc repetitively, "What is wrong with this room?" I don't know that you'd ever get this rudiment in. If you have the pc's Havingness you run his Havingness if you get a reaction on the needle. Now, there's two things you can do at this point. One is simply observe the instant read. "Tell me if it's all right to audit in this room." *Clank!* All right. If that instant read was present you must run Havingness. Do you understand that? This one has to be cleared, too. You must run Havingness. Now, how long do you run Havingness?

If you don't have the pc's Havingness, you use old TR 10, see. How long do you run it? Well, you just better check this again a few times. "I'll check it on the meter. Tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. That is clear." See? "Thank you." We go on to the next one. You see how that rudiment's handled? Well, actually, there's one in the beginning ruds and one in the end rudiments that are handled the same way. But these are the only two things where you use any process other than the exact question.

Auditor: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" You find that will clear it up slicker than scat. See, actually it's a repetitive question. "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" Of course the trick is he's telling you. See? "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about? What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" If you ran that as a repetitive question you'd find out that you'd get – you'd get an auditor improvement.

Lay off this idea here – and you'll notice it isn't present – "Is it all right if I audit you?" because that violates a prime principle of auditing. It puts the pc's attention on the auditor. So somebody who thinks that one has to be used will find himself having to straighten up something; if he'd kept his cotton-picking mouth shut he'd never have had to straighten it up. That is asking for trouble.

Have you ever noticed that your attention goes very suddenly and sharply on auditors who drop ashtrays? Well, that's just like dropping an ashtray, that particular question, so it's been dropped as a question instead of an ashtray.

All right. "Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?" And "What was it?"

PTP: "Do you have a present time problem?" "What is the problem?"

Let me go back one moment and say about this, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" We mustn't lose sight of this old one. The definition of in-session is: willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case. So this is, of course, a very trick package. You're asking him, "Are you willing to talk to the auditor and are you interested in your own case?" We're asking him in the same sentence. Actually, that is a masterpiece of condensed statement. All right. And of course, every time you say your – yeah, "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" of course you're asking him to look at his own case and talk to the auditor about it. So actually, you put him in-session, put him in-session, put him in-

session, put him – and all of a sudden you ask and it reads and you're all set. You haven't got any read on it anymore and there you go. It's in.

Don't worry about your identity as an auditor. You realize – you realize it isn't really the pc that is difficult, ever. And from the pc's point of view it really isn't the auditor. See, it's his conceptions of the auditor.

Now, you want to throw all these into full bloom, just ask a pc, "Is it all right if I audit you?" Now, he's got to think over all the reasons why it isn't all right and he's thinking about you as a personality and he's thinking about all the O/Ws, so you've got marvelous opportunities to miss withholds. Instead of that, carry it over on this other line and it's fine.

All right, let's carry on with this. "Do you have a present time problem?" "What is the problem?" Now, you know, "What is your problem? What is your problem? What is your problem? What is your problem?" is an old process to run out problems. You know a pc will always give you a different answer. You know, that's an old one. So, you say, "Do you have a present time problem? That reads. What is the problem?" The pc tells you. You say, "I'll check it on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? That's clear. Thank you." And you're away into what else you're doing.

But you could keep this up this way: "Do you have a present time problem? That reads. What is the problem? Thank you." Pc tells you what it is. "I'll check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? That reads. What is the problem? Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. That reads. What is the problem?" You know, you could keep that up for half an hour? No pc under the sun would be able to get a read every time, though, for a half an hour, I'm sure. [laughter]

You just ask it until you run into this. "Do you have a present time problem? That's clean. Thank you." See? No last half, see? And the rule is in all of this: when there's – when it reads clean there's no last half of the question.

Now, of course, your middle rudiments is: "In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" And "What was it?" But now, that's a package question. The auditor who is lucky slides over this, this rapidly, see. He says, "In this session ..." It's just like you've asked four different questions, but you can get rid of it rapidly. So this apparently violates the instant read proposition. But, actually, this – these are the questions you're asking "In this session, is there anything you have suppressed? In this session is there anything you have invalidated? In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? In this session is there anything you've been careful of?" That's actually four rudiments.

Now, the second you have trouble with this, it breaks down into four rudiments. See? If it's all clean you're just lucky, get off of it and get out of there, see? Not any one of those endings read. If one of those endings read, the repeated question is the single rudiment question.

I'll give you an idea. "In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated? That read. What was it? Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have invalidated? That's clean."

"In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal or been careful of? That reads. What was it? In this session ..." and he tells you. And "In this session is there anything you have been careful of?"

But to keep the pc from ever getting confused I handle this this way. And you've heard me handle it this way. If he gets one read I give them the next ones in singles. See? I don't care which you do, but I find out there's you – there's a possibility, I feel, that he could get confused.

So, all right, let's give you an example: "In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated? That reads. What was it?"

Pc says, "Oh, so-and-so and so on."

And you say, "Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. Is there anything you have invalidated? That's clean. Thank you."

"In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? That's clean. Thank you."

"In this session is there anything you have been careful of? That reads. What was it? Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? That's clean. Thank you."

In other words, ride him singles. You get into less trouble that way.

All right. Now we get – of course there's body of session. Body of session is where the middle rudiments are used. And you start a process, if you're going to run a process, you start it the same way you always have, is: "Now, I would like to run this process on you (name it). What would you say to that?" See? It's the same wording. And then you get into your middle rudiments.

And then you've got end rudiments. Now, your end rudiments have had one or two additions here – with the half-truth: "In this session have you told me any half-truth, untruth or said something only to impress me or tried to damage anyone?" And the response to any one of those that reads is, "What was it?" And the same rules apply as apply to model sess – middle rudiments in the Model Session.

Now, the E-Meter: "In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?" And we get a departure here. See, there was a departure on difficulties. You have a different end question, "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" See, not "What was it?" And we get another departure here in order to get it as a process. You find out that, stretch your wits as you can, "In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? What was it?" That doesn't go, you see?

"How did you try to influence the E-Meter?" is the question we get answered. That follows the same rule, of course. "In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? That reads. How did you try to influence the E-Meter? Thank you. I will check that on the meter. In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? That's clean." Then we go on to the next rudiment.

And your question or command, "In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you? What question or command did you fail to answer?"

Now, that could require a little stirring around in your skull. Because you got a read on question and command, you'd better sort this thing out and drop the one you didn't get a reaction on. Now, I will confess to this: that particular rudiment is not as happy as I would like to see a rudiment. But "In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you?" We will find out that it will read question or command as an end line.

Give me your pencil. You know, you have just seen something change.

It's, "In this session have you failed to answer any question or command? What question or command did you fail to answer?" Now, please drop the question or command out. Did you fail to answer any question – or command? You'll get a clang or a clang. Well, ask the one that clanged. Okay? So it becomes, "What question did you fail to answer? What command did you fail to answer?" Another package rudiment. Okay?

All right. "In this session have you decided anything? What was it?" (Give me your pencil.) "In this session is there anything you have decided? What was it?"

Withhold: "In this session have you thought or done anything I've failed to find out about? What was it?"

"In this session have you been critical of me?" Now, we can't work that one around to the stylized wording of having it all end right on the end or it would read this way: "In this session, of me have you been critical?" And somebody would say we were "mein kampfing." They will want to put "of me yet."

"In this session have you been critical of me? What have you done?"

Now, that is the – that is the neatest package that keeps in the auditor's mind from here on, this one thing: that when the pc thinks a critical, it is normally followed with a "What have you done?"

He, of course, will say, "Well, I thought something." Well, that's doing something. We don't jog him up this way. But if this wasn't clearing you could keep asking a pc, "What have you done? What have you done? What have you done?" and he would come up with something eventually. So this one is bound to clear sooner or later. Right?

All right. "In this session was the room all right?" And of course, if the question reacts, why, you run Havingness.

Also, at this stage of the game, it might be very wise for you to get a can squeeze test. And if you had too little can squeeze showing on the needle at sensitivity 0, to run Havingness anyway. You never go wrong running Havingness.

By the way, the first rudiments – the first end rudiments ever used, I used at 42 Aberdeen Road – oh, no, Bay Head, New Jersey – to bring a pc back to the land of the living, having been way down the track someplace. And he took it as a process. See, I just kept calling his attention to the environment. And I'd been doing that on people rather consistently and that's the original action of havingness. That is where that – where all havingness came from. That's the first genus of havingness. And you find it's wise to end up the session by calling the pc's attention to the environment anyhow. See? So even if it didn't react, run some Havingness. Who cares? You can't make a mistake on that one.

You can always tell beginning auditors, "Well, there's one rudiment on which you cannot make an error and that's the end rudiment on, 'Was it all right to audit in this room?' Because whether it reacts or not you do – can do something about it or not." It's impossible, you see, to make a mistake on.

All right. "Have you made any part of your goals for this session?" And "Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention?"

And end of session: "Is there anything you would care to ask or say?" And notice that is interchanged because "ask" is actually – belongs in English construction before the exclamation point of "say." And I'll bet some of you have had trouble with that. Well, that's because they're out of order. All right, they're in proper order now. "Is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session? Is it all right with you if I end this session now? Here it is: End of session. Has this session ended for you?" And so forth. "You'll be getting more auditing." [laughter]

Now, we go into this just a little bit further here and we still have the end of process... If you're running processes noncyclical, is the same as it's always been: "If it's all right with you I will give this command two more times and then end this process." And gives the command two more times. "Is there anything you would care to say before I end this process?"

That, by the way, doesn't even apply to a hav – that doesn't apply to a Havingness command being run in rudiments. That you simply end. The less time spent on it, the better off you're going to be. Because all these rudiments and everything in Model Session is run to a clean needle. So you're going to clean the needle and then ask two more times. Oh no, you're not, not if you're wise.

All right. Now, I'm going to just give you a very brief and rapid list of the most flagrant errors that can be made in using this Model Session. And the first and foremost is not being expert on a meter. You don't know how to audit a meter and you're just making wise with a meter and you can't read it for some reason or other. And of course, everything else falls down, crash.

And the next error is, of course, fumbling with script and not knowing it. You see? Not knowing Model Session.

Three is asking a question a second time when it was clear the first time. *Huh-huh*. You say, "Well, is it all – are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? That's clean. I will check it on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Do you know that you will inevitably, I think almost always, get a read? Because you are alter-ising the clearness of the needle. And it will read your alter-isingness. If you don't believe that sometimes, ask the question twice in a row; ask a clear question a second time and then watch it and then ask – say to the pc, "Recall my asking it the second time. Thank you." And then ask it the third time and it's clean again. In other words, you can put an instant read on a meter by reading a clear question twice. It's quite spooky. You see, it now isn't responding to the bank; it's responding in a protest.

All right. Four is not asking the question a second time when it read on the meter. Of course that – that is just – you got an instant read, see – not ask the question a second time – you got an instant read, now don't check it. Now, that's murder.

You say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? That read. What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?"

And the pc says, "Well, I have a horrible hankering for butter cakes that turns on at 4:32 in the afternoon."

And you say, "Thank you," and go on to the next rudiment. You've missed a withhold right there, because he's probably got another one. And you'll find as a pc grooves in on this he will expect you to ask it a second time and you'll get the added disadvantage of the fact that it now adds up to a flub.

All right. Five: Not saying you could – you – this is another error: not saying you could not tell what the read was when you couldn't. You couldn't tell what the read was and you didn't say so. See? It was going *bzzzz, bzzzz, bzzzz, bzzzz* and you asked, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And then just as you said "dif-" it says, *bzzz, umph, bizzz, and biz, biz, brrrrp*. Now, if you ask the question a second time the pc may be under the impression he doesn't know what's going on and you've hung him with an unknownness. And you have to tell him what you're doing. You say, "I was unable to read that; I will have to ask it again." I've been saying, the read was equivocal – this mystifies the pc. You've got to tell him when you couldn't tell. Now, don't try to sit there and appear so wise and sage.

Never pretend on a meter reading. Just never pretend, man. If it was clear and you thought it shouldn't have been so you ask it again, you'll foul up every time. And never pretend that it wasn't, you know – never pretend that the person got a read when he didn't. This drives a pc up the bank, you know? Up the wall.

All right. And the next one is, number six, is failing to get in the R-factor by telling the pc what you're going to do at each new step. That's very important, telling the pc what you're going to do at each new step. Now, you don't necessarily say, "We're going to have to – we're going to start the beginning rudiments," and so forth. But man, from there on you'd better tell him you're going to start the middle rudiments. And you'd better tell him you're going to start the end rudiments. And when you sit down before you start the session, why, it's an awfully good thing to say, "We're going to have an auditing session." Very good. And when you start to get the body of session you tell the pc, "Well, we're going to prepcheck today." You don't clear these things on the meter. It has nothing really anything to do – it's just the R-factor. It wipes out his mystery about it all. And you can practically drive a pc round the bend by never letting him in on what's going on.

You simply sit down and you're going to run a Havingness session. He expects to have his goal found. *Baaaah!* Rudiments all fly out with a crash.

Part of keeping the rudiments in is keep the environment predictable.

And number seven: doing what the pc suggests. Oh, my God, that is horrible.

And number eight: adding unusual questions or remarks or making suddenly irrelevant statements. Always upsets a pc when you make sudden remarks or statements that have nothing much to do with anything. Yanks him out of session and so forth.

All right. Patter is what I have given you already on this tape – the way you handle these questions and so forth.

This does not take very much doingness. It isn't very difficult to get used to this thing. It is very easy to use it. Most of your trouble will be trying to do too much of it. Trying to make it too much something or other, trying to do something else with it. By that I simply mean adding four or five rudiments at the wrong places, questioning the pc's answers or any other of the bum ones which I just gave you. Okay?

Thank you.

Take a ten-minute break.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: TR 4, MODEL SESSION

A lecture given on 21 June 1962

Okay. This is the second hour of the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 21 June 62.

What question would you like to ask me about Model Session? Meryl?

Female voice: I wonder about something on one of those questions – what was it? What question have you failed to answer?

Yeah?

Female voice: I thought that you should never ask a pc a question that didn't give him the possibility of just saying "no." Like, "Have you failed to answer a question?" Remember, like in old Sec Checking, you know, you never just say, "Well, what did you steal?" You say, "Have you ever stolen anything?" So he always has gotten "no" for an answer – a choice. Do you see what I mean? Rather than the question simply implying that he must have done it.

Well, that's your second question.

Female voice: Well, then, how exactly does the first one go? Unlike this "failed to answer a question or a command."

"In this session ...," what is it?

Second female voice: "In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you?"

Female voice: That is the ...

"In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command?" is the way it goes.

Female voice: Well, that is still just the way it is then?

Yes. So...

Second female voice: Yes and then if you get a read, then use the second one.

Yeah. Your second question is not asked unless the answer is "Yes."

Female voice: I see. Yeah, I get that.

Now, the trick is here is your pc – I should comment on this – is your – the auditor always thinks that the – he builds up a facade here that the meter answers for the pc on the yes and no. And you'll find out in normal auditing that your pc will – after they've been audited

on a meter for a while, they begin to wait for the meter to answer anyhow. So – they do, to find out whether it's clean or not clean, which is perfectly reasonable. And that question which you just asked me is not answered unless the question was "Yes."

Female voice: I see. Mm-hm.

Okay?

Female voice: All right, fine. Thank you.

You bet. Yes, Ian?

Male voice: on "Failed to suggest," Ron, if you left out the middle rudiment, is there an optional one you can use?

That's a prep.

Male voice: You can't use it in the middle ruds?

That's a Prepcheck. If your pc is busy and consistently and continually desiring to suggest something, you've got a point now which is an interesting point of decision. See? It was one of these optional questions. If this is always hot on a pc, your pc is always about two-thirds out of session, this could be used, don't mistake this. If it were to be used it would be the first one. You'd say, "In this session is there anything you have failed to suggest, suppressed?" See? "Invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" But you'd find out that this rudiment would tend to drop out even in one or two sessions. Because it is so symptomatic of somebody being way out of session, it is not something that puts a person well into session, it's simply a symptom. The rest of the rudiments are not symptoms. They're ill in their own right.

Male voice: I have that but I was thinking ...

You always use it on a prepcheck.

Male voice: I was thinking chiefly in terms of auditing people like the mob we have here, professional auditors.

Yeah. Yes, yes. It is a bit trickier to put a professional auditor into session than it is raw meat off the street, see. It is trickier. There is no doubt about this. But I wouldn't Q-and-A with this fact. I'd just go ahead and put them into session. For instance, Kay Minor, last night – where is Kay? Oh, there she is. She'd evidently been run lately with the rudiments out. See? So she was sitting there a little bit – about half out of session, see, and toward the end of it she started to go into session. See? I think she would agree to this. And I don't know if she felt like that or not. But if I audit her again, she would be taking it much easier. See, audit her again with all the rudiments in. And then if I'd audit her again with all of the rudiments in, the test would have been made, is: Yes, I dare go into session with this auditor. Get the idea?

Now a professional auditor is to that degree harder to put into session because he knows what is being done right or wrong. It isn't that he is a tougher pc. He is not. Don't ever make that mistake. He's just tougher to get into session.

Why is he tougher to get into session?

Because he has a higher criteria. His critical sense on the idea of auditing – not critical as a derogatory thing – but he has more information to be critical about.

The funny part of it is, is the raw meat is just as critical, but never says so. You make mistakes and because Model Session is geared exactly the way it's geared, you'll get the mind reacting reversewise.

So you can expect that a professional auditor is harder for an auditor to put into session, perhaps in the first one or two or three sessions.

Now, if a professional auditor is almost impossible to get into session, then he's being handled with all the rudiments out. In other words, nobody is actually getting the rudiments in.

So, you've got some student now in HPA. He's the third week and he thinks, actually, that you read the thing off the tone arm. If you don't get a tone arm shift when you ask a rudiment, why, then it's clean. Well of course, a professional auditor can be audited out of session, to session-outness, out-of-sessionness, you see, much more rapidly than anybody else. Because he knows this is so dead wrong and he knows he's liable to be gotten into trouble. So his wariness goes up. See?

Does that answer any part of your question?

Male voice: It answers all of it.

All right. Thank you. Okay. Any other question? Yes, Peter?

Male voice: Ron, I had a question that really was last night's question ...

All right.

Male voice: ... on the cognition ...

Comm lag permitted.

Male voice: Thank you.

All right.

Male voice: On the cognition that you picked up. You said to Kay, "You cognited on something then," and I didn't know how you picked that up. You were running a Havingness Process and you said, "How is it going?" or something. "But you had a cognition on that, didn't you?" And I didn't know how you realized that.

Just tone of voice. Put it down to an irrelevant remark. Frankly, not good auditing. Irrelevant remark. But it's not bad, merely because it was absolutely germane to an acknowledgment. But it's skirting along the thin edge, man. See? It's – if you can't handle those things with a clash-bang – it's just an effort to get the pc acknowledged – an appreciation of something

Once in a while you'll hear me say, "That was very interesting," or "That was amusing." The pc's laughing about something, I'll say, "That's very funny." Understand? That's just part and parcel of the skill of *thorough* acknowledgment. See? Unnecessary – unnecessary. It isn't vital. Probably shouldn't even do it. Pc's laughing like hell so you sit there like old stone

face. [laughter] See? Actually you could sit there like old stone face and get away with it and sometimes get away with it more often than by laughing like hell. You all of a sudden find they were really crying. [laughter] So, frankly, Peter, it's a tightrope walk. But any remark of that character is simply in the interest of further acknowledgment of the pc – has no other value. That particular case the pc said, "Well, I'm not in that, you know, thank God!" and so forth. And I just say, "That was a cognition, wasn't it?" See?

These things have a tendency to boomerang on you. Well, let's ask the pc. Did the pc mind that?

Female voice: No, I enjoyed it.

Yeah. See? But you're walking on a thin edge.

I'll tell you what the irrel... what irrelevant remark really is, is the pc is sailing along on an even keel, no particular action is going on and you all of a sudden say, "Wow, that needle just fell half a dial."

And the pc says, "What needle?", you know, "What – what – what – what happened? Why? Well, why did it fall half a dial? What happened to me?" See? All right, that's an irrelevant remark. It's a sudden remark and that should be eschewed madly.

But if you can appreciate what the pc is doing sometimes, so the pc feels quite well acknowledged – and it's just a trick under the heading of TR 2 – little TR 2 trick. That's all. You're commenting on something – it takes me by surprise to that degree because every once in a while somebody finds a trick I do and calls it to my attention. I've been doing it for years and never recognized it as a trick, but that is one of them.

The pc starts crying and they keep on crying for a while and so forth, you go on with a hard-boiled tone of voice and they are not acknowledged and they will cry harder. Mmmmm. They say, "And my father and my mother both died in the blitz," you know? And you say, "Yes," and they go *oouuh*, thud, you know, *bmmm, bmmm*. They get stuck in whatever they're in, you know? And the pc's saying, "Well, my father and my mother, they died in the blitz." And you say, "Rough go." You don't say, "Okay," you say, "Rough go," you know. Pc feels acknowledged and smooths out of it. The course of existence is not suddenly shifted by the auditor.

The pc has to have a certain feeling that the auditor is with him. If you want to make a pc go back down track, use the pronoun "we." Where are we now? Pc will lead you if you use "we." It's quite amusing.

These are little points of trickery. Not necessarily splendid auditing. You can sometimes make mistakes with them, so forth. But put it under the heading of a TR 2 and you'll know exactly what that is.

People have trouble with TR 4. The basic reason they have trouble with TR 4 is they don't understand what the pc is saying and then they don't acknowledge it adequately and so forth. And everybody wants a new TR 4, TR 4. Well, actually, it isn't TR 4, it's TR 2, it's TR 2 that is sour. And you've got to understand what the pc was saying. Well, this could include what the pc is doing, and unless your voice records some comprehension of the mood or ac-

tion of the pc... Pc says, "And they had forty skeletons strung up in the sky." And you would overdo it if you said, "My God!" See? Just overdo that like crazy. But if you say, "Yes," you do it the wrong way, too. Would be quite in order to say, "Mm-hm!" or "No kidding! All right, thank you."

I very often will pull such a gag with the pc. It isn't a gag because I don't put a sufficient – I don't put myself in such a vice that I fail to respond to what the pc is doing, see? I'm perfectly willing to be an effect of the pc to the degree of acknowledgment. I'm not an effect of the pc beyond the point of acknowledgment. The pc couldn't make me change the course of an auditing session with bulldozers, caterpillar tractors, winches, wrecking cars or anything else. But on point of acknowledgment, yes. The pc knows then he's having an effect on you and he'll stop trying. Turneth away mightieth thises and thats.

But you can – you can make a mistake on something like this, you can make a mistake. It's not easily handled, I wouldn't kid you to that degree. Pc says, "Well, they were all dead, they were all dead. Yup, that was about the saddest day I ever had; it was pretty gruesome."

And you say, "Yes, I bet it was," something like that, and you intend simply an agreement.

And the pc takes it, because he's all geared up for a derogatory, he takes it for a derogatory. He says, "Somebody's making fun of me." See? The tiniest inflection offbeat.

The safe course is to say, "Yes." Just a simple acknowledgment.

But if you're very good you can start playing around with that type of acknowledgment and you'll find out the pc thinks you're very *simpatico*. Well, actually, it's under the heading of understanding but it isn't something that you do – frankly, this kind of thing isn't something that you do as a practice. It is simply you know so well what you are doing – you know what you're doing with the pc, you know your tools, you know what is happening and that sort of thing, and in this framework you're terrifically comfortable and so you can add on top of it now that you – you're also free to be appreciative or interesting. There's nothing forced about it, see? You see, nothing would happen. Dynamite wouldn't disturb your use of your tools or where you're sending the pc, see? So on top of that, of course, you can be human. Pc then tends to overlook the fact that you're a dedicated monster down underneath the surface, you know? Get off of that process? God, no, man.

Pc says, "Oh, boo-hoo-hoo, this process is driving me mad and my head is just splitting. You ask me just one more command ..." This sort of thing never happens to me, by the way. "But you ask me just one more command," you know, "and I'm just going to go up in smoke!" You know? Something like that.

I just ask one more command, you know? The probability is, is I wouldn't even acknowledge it at all. I'm a past master at just letting entheta fall on the floor with a dull plop. Pc says, "What the hell is the matter with you? Why are you going into this? Good God, how many mistakes can an auditor make!"

I'd just give them the next auditing command. I don't even – don't even give it the TR 4, see? It would just pass through the wall two feet to the right of my head, see. And they let up a new scream and – about something or other – and do the command.

But if a pc is in there working, I acknowledge him well. And if he's not, I just throw away TR 4.

There probably is some more to know about TR 4. But I rather tend to think it would be when you were absolutely expert in handling a session, knew completely that your control of the session would never be moved, knew implicitly that – exactly where you were going and your control of the pc was perfect. If all of these things happen I think you'd tend to relax in session and enter into that type of response. But if you relax to the point of entering chit-chat into the session, you destroy the thing completely. So it is actually relegated only to TR 2. It's just a little more on TR 2.

Hey now, that's quite a commi... that's a cognition, you know. Pc says, "Good God!" you know, and "You know catfish are very often twenty feet long. I got et by one once and that means that catfish are never necessarily small!" And, hey, you know?

You say, "Well that's – guess you're finding it out, huh? Good-oh." No further than that.

"I'd like to catch one of those someday. Heh-heh." Irrelevant remark, see? [laughter]

Tiny borderline between these two things, a tiny borderline. You keep all such remarks in the line of ack and now and then you'll be sorry you opened your cotton-picking mouth. But most of the time the pc will feel he is talking to somebody, providing you know your business well enough so that that is never contrived. You see, you feel like saying, "Ah, well, heck," you know? "All right," you know? Puddle has just accumulated, you know, beneath the E-Meter so you have to turn on the bilge pumps, you know. "Ah, come off it," you know? "All right. All right, you'll be okay," you know? That sort of thing.

The funny part of it is the pc's grief charge is acknowledged. See, you've acknowledged a doingness on the part of the pc. And if you said just, "Yes, okay, thank you," oddly enough, most of the time you would be all right, too, you see? But if you say, "Yes. Thank you. Mm-hm. All right," the pc tends to go out of session.

So the pc does something, you don't remark on the fact the pc has had a cognition because you are interested in the pc cognition. You're interested in the pc's attitude and you acknowledge the fact. Get the trick? TR 2 only. Okay?

Male voice: Mm.

You bet. Didn't make to – mean to make such a long and drawn drag-out of it. But you called to mind something I do that I myself had never analyzed. Thank you.

Any other question? Yes, Ian?

Male voice: Ron, if the preclear comes in and sits down you – and there he is in session – you've got to prize this case off your lap – whereabouts would you take up Model Session to start? You're not going to throw him out of session by saying, "Is it all right if I start this session?" He thinks it's started.

All right. You start the session in a quiet tone of voice. That's the only – that's the only surrender you make on Model Session.

Male voice: All right.

Don't Tone 40 it.

Male voice: No. Otherwise you go through the beginning ...

You go through everything just straight on because there isn't anything now... Pc comes in and he's got to do an awful lot of goals and he's got all this goals and he's talking about his goals and he's going into this and that and so forth. All right.

Experience demonstrates that he wakes up somewhere along the line later and goes much slower if you haven't properly started the session. So what you – the only compromise you make is just to look at the pc, and he's saying, "And these goals so-and-so and so-and-so and I've got this list and I was up half the night writing this list and here it is," you see, and so forth. And you say, "All right, okay. Start of session." So on.

You might add this reality to it. This would be a trick I might use in the R-factor, "All right. Good enough. We're going to take – we're taking it up. Well, let's get into it. Let's get going right now, now then. All right, you've got it; let's get going right now. All right. Start of session." And rip off the beginning rudiments and go right on into it and you won't blow the pc out of session.

Your question is well put. It's never actually been asked. You would handle that factor in the R-factor and by softening up the way you started the session. All right.

Yes, Jim?

Male voice: I found it necessary a couple of times to handle the withhold prior to the appropriate moment for asking the question about withholds ...

Mm-hm.

Male voice: ... in beginning rudiments.

Mm-hm.

Male voice: Otherwise the pc is kind of sitting on something waiting for the appropriate question to come up. Is it all right to do that?

Frankly, the pc will give you a withhold under "difficulties." Havingness won't function too well under it. But in actual fact, by experience, if you take them in that order, you'll find out that you'll have a gain by doing so.

Male voice: Mm-mm.

Now, grabbing the withhold out of order of the Model Session, see – grabbing the withhold out of order was something we were doing. However, there's very little advantage in doing so; very little advantage in doing so. Particularly on a pc that's been audited two or three times at least, you see? He knows this is going to come up. Now he's liable to originate the withhold.

Male voice: Mm-hm.

That's right. Then you merely handle it with TR 4.

Male voice: Mm-hm.

But you don't give it any credence with the meter. You got it?

Male voice: Yes.

So any time a pc interjects and tells you something, for God's sakes give it the treatment, see?

Male voice: Right, but not necessarily check the rudiment question.

But don't now, because he gave it to you, check it.

Male voice: Quite. Okay.

See, always be perfectly happy about the thing. Also, you realize, to the degree that you don't use two-way comm in a Model Session you will tend to succeed better. Two-way comm during Model Session tends to slow down the progress of the session. Two-way comm in the body of the session, for sure. But two-way comm in the beginning rudiments, middle rudiments, end rudiments areas tends, more than anything else, to slow things down. But it's not forbidden.

Male voice: Mmm.

Now, you could handle it something on this order: Your R-factor at the beginning – the pc is all jumped-up. Now, instead of saying, "Well, the session is going to handle this," you say, "Well, what's gotten into you?" See? No meter.

Male voice: Mm-hm.

See? Get him talking to you at least. And he says, "Oh, well, hell, I've got so many withholds you wouldn't be able to count the things," and that sort of thing, and so forth. "And I've had an awful rough time of it and I haven't had any breakfast, dinner, lunch or supper and it's terrible and, the weather is bad and besides, I've got a headache," and that sort of thing.

You let him run on, very short. And then let him have the business, you know, with a terrific ack. See? Acknowledge it. Acknowledge it. Now start the session. Now get these points together in order. And some order will establish itself in his confusion.

So there is an area where this could come about. It could come about before session, just in an ordinary friendly discussion. But there must be no meter connected with it. If the pc volunteers a withhold or tries to straighten out something with you – he says, "Now wait a minute before we get on with this, I was out with your girl last night, you know, and I – really this is weighing on my mind so that I know I couldn't go into session." And so on.

You say, well, give him a cheery aye-aye or give him anything you want to say. You see? But no meter treatment.

Male voice: Right.

See, you don't ever dignify an out-of-orderness, see, by checking it or anything of this sort. That's actually Q and A with the pc.

Now what he's done, actually, is get the session started in his direction.

Male voice: Mm.

Now any of you, sooner or later, are going to run into a pc who is going to prevent the session and can keep control of the session with conversation. Therefore, you must actually learn to turn the spigot off with a good ack. You know, there's an awful lot of auditing time wasted under that heading. Pc's talking and talking and talking and talking and you never can get your session in edgewise. Well, blow him out of the water with a Tone 40 and get the session turned on and the orderliness of the session, the inevitability of where you're going, all of a sudden puts the pc under control.

Now, if the pc is able to introduce on you, Jim, an irrelevant step, he to that degree has taken the session out from underneath your control. Okay?

Male voice: Right.

And they will try to do it.

Male voice: Mm.

Okay. Anything else on that?

Male voice: Yes. Not on that exactly ...

All right.

Male voice: ... on Model Session.

Right.

Male voice: It seems to me now we've eliminated any necessity to vary a question when the meter reads and the preclear says "no," ...

That's right.

Male voice: ... by getting in first. I wanted you to confirm this.

You do not ever vary any of these questions. Forget varying the question – it came from old Sec Checking – you don't have to do it anymore anyhow. The only question that is varied is a What question – and that sometimes has to be tested in its variation till you get it to read. But on a rudiments question, no, you do not vary it.

And what's the rest of that you said?

You've eliminated any possibility or any need of varying the question ...

Male voice: By getting in, "That reads, there is a reaction on this in this session."

Oh, well, when you get a read and the pc says, "No," and the meter says "Yes," you acknowledge the meter and to hell with the pc. See? At that particular time, don't ever worry about this making the pc wrong. Because hell, he's wrong anyhow. See? The pc [auditor] said, "Do you have a present time problem?" *Clang!* You see? And the pc says, "No." And you say, "What is the problem?" You see? But you say, "That reads. What is the problem?" And the pc says, "Well, you're – you're right, I do have a problem." See?

Now, your rightness, all of a sudden, shows up and his wrongness doesn't necessarily show up, and he gets rid of it and he hands the thing to you. But never have any qualms whatsoever about crossing the pc's "No." Pc says "No" – you say, "Yes." Not snidely. He says... "Do you have a – do you have a present time problem?" And the pc says, "No." And you say, "Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha, ha-ha-he-he-he-heh." I wouldn't advise that particular approach. But you just tell him, bang, right now. Just tell him, bang, right now, "That reads."

As a matter of fact, I don't contradict – I know that there's a trick in this. Thank you for asking this question. There's a trick in this. Your "That reads," doesn't contradict his "No." And the best way to handle this is never pay any attention whatsoever to the pc's "Yes" or "No" in rudiments. Don't ever answer it. Don't ever pay any attention to it. Only answer the meter. And you'll never make a feeling in the pc of countering what he has just said. That's a little bit of a – magic involved in it. He sees – he says – "Do you have a present time problem?" He says, "No," and you say, "That reads." He often will interpret it, if you've said to him in contradistinction to what he said, "That reads," he will argue this as a disputation. If you weren't paying any attention to it at all, whether he said yes or no – "Do you have a present time problem?" He says, "No," and you say, "That reads," you're just saying it reads here. You're not saying he was right, he was wrong.

Male voice: Mmmm.

In other words that statement he made fell on the floor. You can't depend on that, as you learned in Sec Checking and that sort of thing and in Prepchecking, you could never depend on the pc's yes or no anyhow. The meter's always right. The pc is not necessarily always wrong. See? You don't run on that basis. But where there is a difference between the pc and the meter, you pay attention to the meter. So on the yes or no point of Model Session, never even listen to the pc.

The pc also will very often louse you up on your second question, by the way. You say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

He said, "I beat my wife last night and she won't speak to me today."

You say, "Thank you. I will check that on the meter." Omit your second question. See? Just skip it. You will find out that this looks a little bit ragged at first but you'll eventually get into it. The pc who is really comfortable in the session will eventually settle down and wait for you to ask him the question. He'll let you run it. It's the eager pc that is jumping that one all the time. But nevertheless, just drop it out of the lineup.

Well, thank you for asking that question, Jim.

It's just answer always – talk to the meter after that first question. "That reads." "That's clean." That – just say that to the meter. You never even heard his "Yes" or "No." Don't pay any attention to it at all. Then you'll never be in a dispute on the thing

"Oh, did you say no? I'm sorry. I didn't hear you. I just – looking at the meter here which read. What was the problem? What is the problem, rather – What is the problem?"

But he says, "But I said no. I said no!"

"When did you say no? Oh, yeah? You said no. All right, thank you. Thank you. Very good. What was the problem?"

"Well, you're making the problem."

"All right. Very good. Very good. Thank you. We will check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? That reads."

"All right." And he'll tell you, you see, whatever it was.

He – you're just making him confront to that degree.

Thanks for asking that question, Jim.

Male voice: Thank you.

All right. Anything else? Yes?

Male voice: Ron, how do you handle it when a pc, in the middle of a session, asks you a question?

Asks you a question? All depends on what's the question about. I usually answer a pc's questions.

Male voice: Uh-huh. Well, say it's about some auditing acknowledging.

What?

Male voice: Say it's about some auditing.

Well, give me an example.

Male voice: Well, such as, "How do you run CCHs on an unconscious person?"

Female voice: [inaudible comment] [laughter]

Man, if a pc asked me *that*, [laughter] I would say, "Thank you very much." I would say, "Thank you, very good. Thank you very much. Thank you for asking me. We're now going into end rudiments." [laughter] Get end rudiments in and I'd give him a tenth of a second break and get beginning rudiments in and get him in session, man. It's – it'd be a terrible symptom of out-of-sessionness because he's not interested in his own case, you see.

Male voice: Well, you – you – you don't think this would suddenly come up as a result of him uh ...

It would only come up if he was out of session.

Male voice: Would it?

See, he's not interested in his own case.

You got – you got what in-sessionness is? It's interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor. Well, when a pc has totally lost track of what you're trying to do – I'm not making fun of your question, see – when he's totally lost track of what he's trying to do, when he hasn't a clue where you're going anyhow, his rudiments are wildly out, he'll start asking you irrelevant questions and chitchat and things of this particular character. First chitchat that

a pc ever gives me, I start sliding the rudiments in with a coal shovel. I want to know what the hell happened. By the way, it doesn't happen to me. I don't get this trouble. Why?

Well, I don't get this trouble because I pick up an out-of-sessionness long before the pc does. Long time before the pc does. He didn't find out about it for an hour. He wouldn't. And get it corrected. And therefore, you never get an irrelevance to the session.

An irrelevance to the session – You say, how to handle this thing? Well how to handle it as a question? Well, by all means, acknowledgment, acknowledge it. It's an origin on the part of the pc. He has said something. He's made some noises in the air. Yeah, yeah, handle it by all means.

But so as not to ARC break him up, and then realize that a question that far from any basis of anything you are doing, my God, at least your middle rudiments are out. Something is out here, man. The banana peels have been scattered all over this walk. That would be it. And so what you would *do* about it is *get the pc in-session*.

Male voice: Mm-hm.

As far as answering a pc's questions are concerned, I thought you were going to ask me some question of the type that pcs *do* ask when they are in session. Pc's sitting there steaming away and the steam's coming out of both ears and he feels this mass coming in on him and so forth. And he's saying, *Whoow!*, you know, he's very interested in all this and he's – "What's the tone arm saying?" You know? "What's the tone arm reading?"

And I say, "4.25. Thank you."

And the pc says, "4.25 – God, it sure feels like it in here!" [laughter]

He says – he says, "What are we going to do now?" He says, "What are we going to do now?" You know? He says, "I'd like to find my goal today. What – what are we going to do now?"

And you're going to say, "Well, it's twenty minutes from session end. We're going to have to run end rudiments. We'll try to find your goal next session." Whatever it is. "But I'm not going to make a botch of it. Anything you'd care to say?" You know?

The pc says, "Oh, well. All right." The pc says, "My God," he says, "What are you doing?"

And it suddenly dawns on you that you put in no R-factor on this whatsoever. You were supposed to be running 3GA today and you're prepchecking. And you just say what you're doing. You say, "I'm prepchecking. I'm sorry I didn't tell you." Cover it up that way.

Never be – never think that by admitting you were wrong, you lose control of a session. That's another trick. You don't. Do you know you only lose control of sessions by demanding to be right? When you didn't understand – the pc said – you say, "Point out something." And the pc does this, you know, and you say, "Well, I didn't see what you pointed at." See? You don't say, "What did you point at?" like, "What's all this clumsy motion you're making with your hand?" That knocks him out of session.

And you say, "I." Get the Chinese into it, see, the Japanese, "Blind, insignificant me, failed to perceive what wonderful, radiant you did." [laughter] The pc relaxes himself straight into session. There are many methods of control, as women could tell you.

But pc asks you a question – basically answer it if it has anything to do with his case or this session. Answer it. If it doesn't, why, give him a cheery aye-aye and then try to size up whether or not this pc is in-session or out of session or what's going on here, see? At least get your middle rudiments in. Do something. Size it up. Use it as a word of warning.

Male voice: Mmm.

See, that is a word of warning. He isn't in-session if he asks you something like that. Okay?

Male voice: Yes. Well, a question that follows on, somewhat, is that the havingness is up at the beginning of middle rudiments and the beginning of end rudiments but goes down when the rudiments are finished. In other words, you don't get the swing of the needle. What does this mean?

How would you know?

Male voice: How would I know?

Yeah.

Male voice: Uh, finishing Havingness, running end rudiments, having time at the end of the session and run some more Havingness. And when you start, the swing is down.

What are you doing? Finishing off the body of the session with Havingness?

Male voice: Well, you might get through your end rudiments ...

Another male voice: It's a Havingness session.

Male voice: ... so fast you've got another five minutes up your sleeve.

Another male voice: It's a Havingness session.

Male voice: It's a Havingness session.

Oh, it's a Havingness session.

Male voice: Yes.

And you think you have observed here that the havingness was well up and went down?

Male voice: Yes.

By the time you hit the havingness at the end?

Male voice: That's right.

Nothing peculiar about this.

Male voice: Mmmm.

Havingness slides all over the place. I don't think you've noticed this consistently. You have noticed it on one pc and that pc is being inquired into. And actually – oh, I really shouldn't answer this question – it'll make you gun shy of asking them. I don't want to do that. The answer to the question, unfortunately, is a symptom of very rough auditing. It's a symptom of unconfidence.

I already made this test years ago. ARC break and havingness are interchangeable. In the presence of an ARC break, havingness goes down. When an ARC break is cleared up, havingness goes up. Those two things operate hand-in-glove. When havingness goes up, ARC breaks disappear. When havingness goes down, ARC breaks appear. You sometimes get an ARC break just because havingness is down.

Now, if there's anything rough at all about auditing, you'll get a dwindlingness of havingness. You see? If you're failing to get a rudiment in expertly, if you're not old smoothie himself, you see, in snapping these things off the line, you can expect the havingness to drop.

I'll give you an example. You say, "Did you – in – in – in – did – in – yeah. Did, er – did – did – this – this session – is there anything – any que – is there any – que – in this session, a question or command – uh, let's see, now – no, no, I got this – I got that wrong now. Wait a minute. Is there a question or command I haven't a... no, no, that's not – right."

You could pull something like that on a pc, give him a can squeeze test, see – here's your test, see; you've been auditing him smoothly, see – give him a can squeeze test and he gets a full dial drop at sensitivity 0 here. Then say your next rudiment in that garbled fashion. Quite sincerely garbled, you see – no gag about it. And – or do this, "In this session is there any question or command you have failed to answer – answer with me?"

And the pc says, "I don't think so – I don't think so."

And you say, "Question, man, question, what question, what question – question. I said question, question, what – what question? What question didn't you answer in this session? That's what I want to know."

And the pc said, "Well, I don't know of any. I don't – I don't know – I don't think of any – right at the moment."

And you say, "Good. Thank you very much. Squeeze the cans." [demonstrates something, laughter]

Now, it doesn't have to be this flagrant. It just has to be that the pc's confidence in the auditor – actually, confidence in the auditor is proportional to the smoothness of the auditing from the pc's point of view, you see? And little bits, almost microscopic to somebody else, are rough spots on the road and you'll get a havingness drop.

Now, you find this out that if you smooth up on a pc the end rudiments – smooth up your approach with this pc on the end rudiments, see. Smooth it up so – oh man, is it glassy. You come down to the body – into the body of the session, you open up with your end rudiments, you go through to the end, you test it again. Your havingness, if anything, will have increased. See? That's what – confident, flawless handling. See?

I've also been interested in this. Don't think it's necessarily you, you understand. Because a pc, early on in his auditing, tends to be more critical of the auditor than later. And if you take a pc who is having any kind of a rough time, casewise, and if you ask that pc every five minutes if you have made a mistake, the pc will have – find one that you have made. You're doing a flawless job of auditing, if we could theoretically put it that way, and ask the pc what mistake you have made in the last five minutes, and the pc will find one that you have made. It'll be a mistake such as, "You turned your head on your side when you asked – on its side, slightly, when you asked me the question." See, there'll be these little, microscopic things.

But these are all symptomatic of a very nervous pc who is not well grooved in, who is having a hard time anyhow and who has been roughly handled in life and has possibly not been too easily handled in earlier auditing.

So, as your pc is well audited, this factor drops out. Let's keep your auditor constant, see; your auditor is always the same. And the pc havingness after the fifth session with that auditor will stay up, whereas in the first session would have gone down. Auditor's equal factor, see. You got your pc's change.

Now, similarly, your auditor is auditing better and better and handling things more and more expertly as the session goes along, you're going to get the reverse – you're going to get the same effect happening. As your auditor gets better, your havingness stays up. See? If you can give – if you give a rough session, if your handling of the sessionness is rough, you can always expect havingness to drop.

I'm sorry to have to give you that answer.

Male voice: No, that's all right. I like to hear it.

All right. Okay. That's the answer to it. All right. Yes, Esther?

Female voice: I'd like to know more about the importance of the tone of voice of an auditor when noticing something about the E-Meter like, let's say, all of a sudden you get a free needle – the auditor never saw a free needle, "My! Free needle!" Or, let's say, "Well, in this session have you tried to damage anyone?" The needle is null. "Fine! It's null!" Well, what effect can that have on ...

All right. You're asking me if tone of voice ...

Female voice: How important is it?

... how important is tone of voice? It actually isn't tone of voice, honey. It is irrelevant remark, which is already at the end of the bulletin there in Model Session. It's irrelevant remarks. Now, you can make a remark without saying anything.

Female voice: Yes.

And it's still a remark.

Female voice: Just by the expression.

Yeah. All right. You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" You say – you say to the pc, "Do you have a present time problem?" The auditor wouldn't do this, but he said, "Do you have a present time problem?" ...

Female voice: Yeah.

"It's clean!" [laughter, laughs]

Female voice: I had that experience quite a few years ago. I had a free needle for a day and a half and the auditor was saying, "God, I never saw anything like it!"

Yeah. He did? All right. Now, that is a remark.

Female voice: Yes!

And it's a whole series of remarks. They are understood. They express themselves in the tone of voice ...

Female voice: ... startled.

... and so on, and they are all bad. That's – that's very sour. That's a very sour thing to do. It is making a remark with a vocal expression.

"Have you ever been raped?"

And the pc says, "No."

And the auditor says, [demonstrates some facial expression] "It's clean," you know. And well, he's made a remark, hasn't he? All right. And then anything like that is a remark – an irrelevant remarks.

Now, this is as bad. You're running – you're running the pc and you say, "Look around here and find something – *Hey!* That – that – that needle just dropped a whole dial!"

And the guy says, "Huh? What? Who? Where? What does this have to do with anything? Which way did they go? Who – who was – who was that?"

See? And it enters a whole chain of stuff. This all comes under the head of the auditor putting the pc's attention on the auditor. And of course, the pc goes out of session because the attention comes off the pc's bank onto the auditor.

Female voice: And the E-Meter.

Therefore goes out – and similarly, E-Meter. And therefore the pc goes out of session with a crash. And you can knock a pc out of session with any of these irrelevant remarks.

Oddly enough, if you're too different even in voice tone you can do the same thing. You can say, "Well, I'm not going to make any irrelevant remark." All right. [in a monotonous, robotic tone of voice:] "Do you have a present time problem? That is clean."

And the pc says, "What's this?", see. [laughter]

And once more you've achieved yanking the pc's attention out of session.

Now, there's something more serious about this. A sudden yankingness of attention off of a bank and onto the auditor – the auditing environment or the meter – a sudden yank in this

particular line – causes those things which the pc has sort of been holding out from him with a thin, frail straw – see, he's got a straw punched into this mass out here and you all of a sudden scream behind his back, and he goes, "*Beeeeeyaaaaah*, what the hell!" You know? And this – he lets go of this straw and the mass will hit him right square in the puss. And after – you'll find it's an awful hard time digging the pc out underneath all of this mess now.

And you say, "Well, how did he get so caved in?" Well, it's something like being mystified. You're in the mines, you see. And the mine domes are all held up with pillars, you know. And you go down there with a bazooka or a sledge hammer or something of this sort and you knock all these pillars down. You see? And you say, "What are all those miners doing buried under all of that coal?"

See, it's just as idiotic to be amazed about that as it is to say, "*Good God! What the w – well, look at this meter! Wha – oh dear! Huh?*" You know?

And the pc says, "Where am I?" you know?

And you say, "Well, what's my pc doing buried under all that coal? You know, the needle stick now and – and I – what am I going to do?" And it's a hell of a thing to dig a pc out from underneath. It's one of the most serious things an auditor can do is a sudden shift of a pc's attention.

One of the ways you can do this is get him awfully absorbed in question one and then before he gets a chance to answer it ask him question two. You say, "Well, did you ever have a mother?"

[mumbles:] "*Mother, wonder if I ever had a mother. Mother – mmmothermmmother-mmmothermmmmmm ...*"

And you suddenly say, "Well, any parents at all?" [laughter]

And what he's put his attention on down here is "Mother" all of a sudden goes on him, *snap!* Because he's holding it out with his attention, you might say, and his attention goes off of it suddenly and it's got spring to it and it'll – it'll give him the sensation of being hit.

Okay. Well, thank you for mentioning that, Esther. It's all under the heading of irrelevant question. It's irrelevant question, irrelevant remark, irrelevant action. It has nothing to do with anything, and it's all very damaging. The only place it's allowable at all is when you're trying to acknowledge the pc. Then you can make a little bit of a remark. And you can answer the pc's question when they appertain to the session. Always answer him, don't leave him in mystery.

I neither inform him when he doesn't want to be informed or withhold information from him when he wants it – about a meter. I never obtrude a meter on a pc. Never obtrude a meter on a pc unless the pc has already got the meter in the middle of the field. Pc says, "Is my needle dirty?"

And I say, "Yeah."

He'd say, "Oh," and go on back into session, see.

He says, "Have you been auditing an awful lot of pcs lately?"

And I say, "Mm-hm. Thank you. Yes." And just let that one go by, see? It didn't have anything to do with the session. It's none of his business.

Pc says, "Are you doing this because you hate me?"

I pick up the missed withhold. Get in the mid ruds – something.

Question will come up, sooner or later ... That answered your question, didn't it, Esther?

Female voice: Yes.

Yes. Question will come up, sooner or later, do you ever use the middle rudiments while using the beginning or end rudiments? The question will come up sooner or later.

I can imagine a situation where this should be – where this could happen. I could imagine. But I couldn't imagine an auditor who had a pc well under control having to do it.

Using a consistent, skillful auditing approach, getting the pc day after day, session after session, well into session – carrying it along and so forth – you'll find out, gets away from having to take any unusual steps at all. Actually getting all of the rudiments in, getting something done in the body of the session and getting the pc, you know, out of session at the end with the rudiments, you'll find out that that, skillfully done, answers in very short order – just a very few sessions and any need for anything tricky – it'll smooth out the pc's needle, give the pc better confidence. It'll cut back the pc's incidence to tantrums and so on. Actually not because you've done anything but be consistent. Not because you've only done that which is necessary to do. Only because you've been predictable. Just those factors alone will keep the pc from blowing up.

With what a relief some pc who's had a very Q-and-Aing auditor, all of a sudden finds out that the pc will go on in spite of being blasted out of the chair – I mean, the auditor will still go on.

Let me give you this. This pc has on many occasions gotten ARC broken and had an auditor quit – had the auditor just quit, see. Wow! Then the fel... auditor left him and he's stuck in it and so forth. Well, that's all what it would be. But it has an additional effect beside from a bank effect – he's kind of afraid the next auditor will do it, see?

So you're now – now he's got an auditor and, he goes, *blaaaaaow!*, you know, and he splatters all over the ceiling and he knocks everything off the table and he screams and so forth. And the auditor asks the next auditing question. So he screams a little bit and the auditor says, "I'll repeat it. I'll repeat the auditing question," and does so. So he answers it. And all of a sudden sits back with a tremendous sigh of relief and goes right on, just walking along beautifully.

What's happened there? His confidence has come up. His reality's come up. And he finds out he can trust the auditor to audit him. That's all that's really happened. He realizes he's going to get some auditing.

And the funny part of it is, you can sometimes be quite rough. You can say, "Sit down there! Sit down in the chair! Now pick up these cans! I'll repeat the auditing question."

And the guy says, "Wow, you know! That's terrific. That's real good. You know? You – that's great."

And if you did the reverse and did the kind thing, why, he'd just be – he'd just go all to pieces. See? He'd get worse and worse. The more you tried to do something about it, the worse he'd get.

I'm not saying be tough with such a person. I'm just talking about predictability and predictability alone will hold somebody in-session regardless of whether you're doing anything with the mind or not. It's a factor which you mustn't neglect.

And therefore, the more irrelevant actions you take or the more unusual things you do, such as getting in the middle ruds while you're doing the beginning ruds, the more unusual things that you're doing, such as getting in the end ruds while you're getting in the middle ruds, see, anything that you're doing that's the least bit off-base runs you at the risk of seeming unpredictable. And it actually works up to more of a curse than it does a cure.

What you should concentrate on is predictability of saying the exact auditing question, doing the exact textbook response, see. Going on that way just absolutely exactly and give that a chance to work. And you'll find out in two or three sessions one of the roughest pcs you ever had is sit – sit in the pc's chair, you know, and he just begins to smile like the Cheshire cat, you know? Needle gets smooth. Case starts to move. He starts to blow things that he never blew before. And the only thing, perhaps, that you introduced into the whole thing – you understand getting rudiments in outside of this doesn't really introduce anything at all except getting the pc into session, the auditor real, the session predictable, things smooth, taking off anything that happened in the session.

But it's all predictability. And get it under the heading of predictability. And as soon as you understand it from a standpoint of predictability, then you'll see that it itself has a virtue and it itself does something. Now the person has confidence in you so then he dares go into session, so he dares blow something. Otherwise they're sitting, you know, like a gopher on top of his mound, you know? Watch, you know? And they don't go into session so they don't blow anything.

Predictability alone permits them to go into session.

Now, when you add to that the tremendous strength and power of the buttons you are using in beginning, middle and end rudiments, how can you miss? But the first factor you must strive for is predictability of use – that you must strive for. When you've got that, then you'll find out the better you can make that, the less unusual you have to be and the more you will do for the pc.

A very skittery pc and a very nervous pc is best handled with a simple predictability. The more nervous they are, the more predictable you should be. The more dispersed they are, the more steady you should be. And you'll find out that'll work just like absolute magic. That has nothing whatsoever to do with the buttons you are using.

By the time you have audited a pc three or four sessions, no matter what you are running, if this person isn't swearing by you and if this person isn't deeply in-session every time they go into session and so forth, then your handling of this must be unpredictable to that pc.

And you are actually not doing anything odd. What you're doing will be unpredictable. You'll be doing something off the rails here and there.

One thing I wish to apologize to you about is those who just learned the first Model Session, I wish to apologize for having to give them another Model Session to learn instantly. But there is this one point, there is this one point I would like to make. I wouldn't do it for worlds, see, I just wouldn't do it for worlds unless it made it that much better.

Now, we're winding up to go for broke here on clearing and there's the course and direction that we're steering. I don't want to get well into this and then have to change horses. You see? So I'm trying to change horses here so we can hold it stable from here on.

Everything I'm trying to do is in the direction of a greater stability and we're just now achieving the results, broadly, by auditors who are well trained. And I don't think there's a person that we can't clear. If we can get our hands on him, we can clear him.

All right. But it all depends on the consistency of application of what we are doing. We know all the rules. It depends on whether or not all those rules will be applied.

And along with this goes predictability. And you'll find out that I am less and less violating this particular factor. I've only violated it up to the point where I find out we have a very nice workability and there you'll see it stopped.

You haven't heard a thing about Prepchecking for a long time. I did find we had a hole the other day. We find – didn't have our Havingness Processes, all of them, on one sheet of paper. I was quite amazed that we didn't have them all down and so I've got to fill that in, and here and there you'll find one that is filled in or needs filling in. But basically I'm trying to – trying to create and hold a standard here.

And don't be too dismayed when you find something isn't quite as standard as you thought it was, because I'm always willing to learn, I'm always willing to improve something. But I'm also very careful of improving things that are working. It's only where we need improvement that we keep putting them in.

So I hope you'll be very successful with this new Model Session. I hope it will answer everything up the way you think it ought to go. Use it though, just as it's written to make a predictability come along with it.

If you have tremendous difficulty, consistently and broadly, with any one of its lines or any one of its wordings, I guarantee you, I will change that. But that would be the only reason I would. Okay?

Thank you very much.

Good night.

E-METER QUALITY

A lecture given on 26 June 1962

How are you tonight?

Audience: Fine, thank you.

Good. Good.

Male voices: How are you? How are you?

Oh, a little bit quivery, but I'll be all right. Okay. This is what?

Audience: The 26th of June.

The twenty what?

Audience: 26th.

Twenty-sixth.

Audience: Hm-hm.

The devil it is.

Audience: Uh-huh. Sure it is. Yep.

What planet?

Audience: Earth.

Oh, all right. I got it, then. [laughter] That's coming up to present planet.

This is the first lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 26 June AD 12. Now, there are many things I could lecture you about this particular week and probably will. But I think it's most important to give you some sort of a rundown... Did you get a bulletin today on... This – today's bulletin?

Yes. HCOB June 25th, 1962. The whole crux of auditing today stems around the sensitivity of an E-Meter. The expertness of its handling, the sensitivity of the E-Meter. First thing I'd like to call your attention to that – is that if the operator can't read one, why have an E-Meter? And if the E-Meter is no good, why have an operator? This is very much to the point.

Now, we have HCOB June 28, 1962, oddly enough on this 26th, because that's the Thursday bulletin going out and it has to do with how to smooth out needles.

Now, an E-Meter needle can become rough. That doesn't mean it continuously goes *bzz-bzz-bzz*, little patterns, while the pc is on it. That means it goes tick and sweep and tick-

tick and *bzz-bzz-bzz* and then tick and then sweep and then *bzz* and then tick and then – you know. It is *active*.

Now, the varying degrees of activity, of course, are a gradient scale that run from a clean needle, which is to say it acts when you speak – the auditor, see? The needle reacts when the auditor speaks. Now, that is a clean needle. The rest of the time it is doing exactly nothing.

And that gradient runs up through one that goes occasionally tick and tock. Auditor didn't say a thing and the needle ticked.

Now, a clean needle almost always reads only on an instant read. You don't get prior reads with a clean needle – very seldom. It clicks right where it's supposed to click: right at the last vowel or consonant in the statement said in the major thought. HCOB 25 May: A clean needle reads right. And then as the gradient scale of dirtiness is entered into and spiraled down, one of these needles that goes tick and tock without the auditor saying anything at all ... It's twitchy, you know; you get prior reads on the thing. The guy is sort of segmentalized mentally.

You say, "Have you ever been PDHed by a cat?" And it goes "Have you – " *Blam!* see, "ever been – " *tick! tick! tick!* "PDHed – " *bzz! bzz! bzz! bzz!* "by a cat?" *Klok, klok, klok, klok, klok, klok, klok, klok, see?*

You know, you can prove to anybody the cat PDHed him, you know? You can say to the fellow, "Did you ever know a cat?"

Fellow says, "Yeah, I had a cat once. Name was John Brown."

And you say, "Uh-huh, all right. This cat ever inflict pain-drug-hypnosis on you and give you an interspacial implantation?"

And the fellow will say "No."

You say, "I'll prove it to you." "Has the cat, John Brown, ever inflicted pain, drugging and hypnotism upon you?" It'll go click, click, *ploonk-thlunk-thu-thud, bzoo-boo-boo-boom, fah!* In fact, it'll read every place but the exact instant read. That'll be blank. Most auditors – most auditors in the old days didn't bother with that missingness, so all sorts of wild tales could go around, including John Browns, the cat.

Now, you check this over and you say, "Pain." It goes *clank*. You say, "What about pain?"

"Well," the guy will say, "I don't like it!"

"All right. Thank you. Thank you. Pain." Doesn't read. "Drugs" – *clang, clang, clang, clang!* You say, "Well now, what about drugs?"

"Oh, I don't like them!"

"Did you ever give anybody drugs?"

"Oh, yes. Well, I'd – I mean – yeah. Well, now that you a – make me admit it, yes."

"All right. What about drugs?" Doesn't read. You say, "Hypnotism" – *ping, ping, ping, ping, ping, ping, ping, ping, ping!*

You say, "You ever been hypnotized?"

"No."

"Did you ever hypnotize anybody?"

"Well, I tried to." *Ping, ping, ping, ping, ping, ping.*

You say, "All right. What about hypnotism?" Doesn't read.

Needle can be smoothed out to a point – just by taking these segments of it, you see – can be smoothed out to a point where you can finally ask him if the cat has ever inflicted pain-drug-hypnosis on him and, of course, it doesn't read.

Of course, the cat never did inflict pain-drug-hypnosis on him. But he had a reaction to pain and a reaction to drugs and a reaction to hypnotism and he'd have a reaction to John Brown the cat if he'd ever kicked John Brown the cat, see?

So you could make an awful liar out of a meter. But remember, the only needle that you could make a liar out of is one that goes sort of hunt-and-punchy anyhow. It's pretty hard to make a liar out of a clean needle. It only falls on an instant read. You say, "You ever been PDHed by a cat?" No reaction. The guy isn't edgy, you see?

All right. The somewhat dirtier needle, you say, "Have you ever been PDHed?" *Clank*, you know? "You – been – PDH –" *clank*. "Cat" – no read. Latent read on something like "ulp." See, the pc thought, "ulp" or something

Now, that's a not extraordinarily dirty needle or a messy needle or a mucked-up needle, but it sure isn't a clean one.

Now, we go down into the nether regions a little bit further and we get a needle that goes little tiny rock slam, tick, tick, tick. Now, this kind of a needle reacts often enough with enough different reactions that when you say something to the preclear, the reactions on the needle – the reactions that are there on the needle when you ask the question – are so numerous that one of its actions coincides with your instant read. And you get equivocal questions all the time. You don't know whether the thing said yes or no. Because it's so active, it's got so many different things happening all the time that quite often when you say, "Do you have a present time problem?", why, the instant read might or might not be there, but you can't read it because the needle is already so twitchy and scrubby, you see. And you say, "Well, I'll have to ask the question again," or something like that and hope that the moment you finish the sentence "Do you have a present time problem?" happens to be unused space. Get the idea? Sort of like trying to get in transatlantic telephone calls or something like that. Sometimes you can connect and sometimes you can't. All right.

Now, that's – isn't the most extreme needle. The most extreme needle is in constant and continuous motion. And I don't care whether the motion is tiny or large. But you would never be able to get an instant read on one. Never. Because it is just in motion.

You don't know whether it's reading on the auditor, the pc or the bank or the electric light circuit. You haven't a clue what it's reading on, but it's just going *bzz, btz, tick, tick, tick, tick, bzzzzz, brrm-tick-tick, boom, srr, dit, dit, brb, brb*. Where's there any blank space on this needle to squeeze an end of sentence into, see? There isn't.

That needle is an impossible needle. Fortunately smooths out on more elementary Havingness and is the only thing that'll smooth it out because of course you can't find out what's wrong. You can't find out what's wrong with the pc because, of course, you can't read him on the meter. You could say, "Do you have a present time problem?" Well, what – what would this be all about? Yeah, maybe he has. Maybe he hasn't. Maybe it's on the meter. Maybe it isn't. But of course the meter isn't doing anything that has anything to do much with the session but is just in constant motion. Moves all the time, all the time, all the time. Always moving. I've seen these, by the way, on various types of people.

Now, it isn't necessarily true that the cleanliness or dirtylessness or dirtyliness, I guess it is – the cleanliness and the dirtyliness, yes. Finally figured that out.

English is an interesting language. You know, English gets in our road all the time. You know, there isn't any word that combines "he or she?" And every once in a while, in trying to put auditing commands or wordings or something together, you run into this lack of a... You've got a neuter pronoun, a masculine pronoun and a feminine pronoun, see and there is no pronoun which is both masculine and feminine. Because you can't say "it" and mean "he or she." Somebody would be offended.

They've worked it out in the farm country; it's *'um*, or *'em*, depending on what farm country you're in, you know? "I see *'um*," you know?

The difficulties of transmitting thoughts, of course, are from the major thought to the symbol, the recorded symbol, into a relay in somebody's mind, into the thought again. That is what is happening. You are actually not recording "he," "she," "it," "been," "does" or anything else directly on the reactive bank. It is not arriving in symbols; it's a symbolized form. That is why you can get a goal out of a pc that was originally expressed in Phoenician and you can find it in English, which you yourself ought to think is rather peculiar when it comes right down to that. That's why you can audit a pc who speaks a different language.

But of course, on a meter, which is registering thought, a constant agitation and a no-registry of thought and a bunch of other things of this character give us an impossible needle.

The dirtiest needle would be that one which was registering the least thought and generating the most thought. It's autogenerated reactive thought. And that is the "doitiest" needle there is – constantly generated thought but it's autogenerated. In other words, you're watching a circuit go zip and zap, see?

All right. This circuit gets to going boomity-boomity-boomity-boomity-boom and it's flipping from one part of the bank to the other part of the bank and taking shortcuts through the middle of the bank and around the edges of the bank and wrapping itself around other demon circuits and curtains and occlusions and all that sort of thing.

That's what you see happening on the dial here. That needle is just going *bzz, brp, bzz, bzzzz, brrp, blp, thr, click, boo, frmp, thud, tick, krk, tzz, zzzzzz*. Well, how are you going to get a thought in edgewise?

You know, most people have a hard time getting a word in edgewise with somebody who talks too much. Well, it's the auditor trying to get a thought in edgewise into a reactive bank that is *bzzzz* too much. It's doing its own think-thunk, see? It draws its reactions and restimulations from itself continuously.

The auditor has no impingement on this bank. The bank itself is running at a high rate of autogeneration. Probably a bird lighting on the window ledge would have more effect on this bank than the auditor screaming at the pc, see? It's a problem in communication. It's also a problem in electronics.

But that is basically the dirtiest needle there is. It's in constant motion, but along with that you get the fact that that person's mind is autogenerating restimulations. Its restimulations are quite often not from the exterior environment at all. There aren't even associative restimulators in the exterior environment. This person is totally introverted and he is just autogenerating restimulation.

You see, he thinks of a cat and then a circuit thinks of another cat and another circuit, then, regenerated, thinks of a tiger and another circuit, regenerated then, thinks of tank cars (for some reason or other – circuits are not quite sane, you see) which makes another circuit think of milk.

Now you've had it. Cats give him a mushy taste in his mouth. But there isn't any cat in the environment. Nobody said "cat." He didn't read "cat." Nobody mentioned them. There weren't any cats around. Where did the cat come from?

Well, that's just an autogenerating circuit of some kind or another which pushes up an image at random. He's had sufficient restimulation in the past to last him all the rest of the trillennia. See, he had the warehouses full.

Now, of course, if you went out extensionally enough, you would find out that that morning when he got up, he was thinking about ice cream. And that is how it all has been happening ever since.

Well, how was he thinking about ice cream? Well, he dreamed a dream about ice cream. And having dreamed a dream about ice cream, that's enough. Why did he dream the dream about ice cream? Well, he was short on B1. There is nothing around here to restimulate ice cream except something on the extreme track. Well, this guy is all the way on the back-track. You get the idea? See and the restimulators are on the back-track and the physical universe doesn't exist.

So you get the needle going *bzz, bzz, bzz, bzz, tick-tick, tick-tick, bzzzzzz, tick-tick-tick-tick*, you know?

Now, oddly enough there is a worse situation than that. Now, you say, "That's impossible!" No, no, there's a worse one than that. It's called a stage four needle. It is the same restimulation going on all the time. This doesn't even change its mind. And the needle goes up,

up, up, up, up, up, up and it sticks and frees itself and falls. And then it goes up, up, up, up, up, up, up, up and sticks and frees itself and falls and goes up, up, up, up, up, up and sticks and frees itself and falls.

And you know, you can't get a reaction on that as an auditor. You can't get a reaction out of the pc by even kicking him in the shins. It's been tried. Guy with a stage four needle. He's stuck in one totally insulated channel. He doesn't even get cross-restimulations, don't you see? Nothing is going on, really, except this one thought is probably going through all the time.

You ever see that newspaper electric sign up on Times Square? There it runs around and round and round? Well, just imagine that thing has one line on it: "You are a good boy," see? And it goes round and round the building, you see? "You are a good boy." "You are a good boy." "You are a good boy."

Well, that is actually nuttier than somebody thinking two or three thoughts, don't you see? "You are a good boy." "You are a good boy." And he as a pc or as a person, actually, is way back below "hide," reading this sign. And you'll get it on the meter; the sign is on the meter. And it goes up, *bz*, up, up, up, up, up, stick, fall, up, up, up, up, up, stick, fall. Nothing varies it.

Now, there's such a thing as a reverse stage four, God help us, which is down, down, down, down, down, down, stick, *swoooooop*. Down, down, down, down, down, down, down, down, stick, *swoooooop*. And it just goes on like that, on like that, on like that, on like that.

That's all that's happening. We didn't know the "reverse four" existed except we found one. It had been branded a free needle.

Somebody asks you sometime, "What is the pattern of a free needle?" Shoot him for me, will you? Yeah, because the regularity of this swoop down and the rapidity of recovery, which was going on and on and on and on and on, why, everybody thought the person must be – have a free needle. A free needle is nothing if not free. And it has no pattern. It just floats. And it doesn't go up and then go down. And it doesn't go down and then go up – a reverse stage four.

Well now, those are fixed situations. That's a fixed thought. Now the fellow is – can't even be in a confusion, see? "You are a good boy. You are a good boy. You are a good boy. The *Herald Tribune* now brings you the news: You are a good boy. You are a good boy." One thought, see? And that thing will play out – I don't know how many trillennia that'll play out before it wears out, but I think it's been a long time.

All right. Now, there's another condition. (These are chronic case conditions – what I'm giving you.) There's a condition of a needle that doesn't move and doesn't react. You can fortunately – that has been gotten around by your meter. So we don't much have to comment on the case because you can jack the sensitivity up to 16. You can get some reaction out of this boy.

But theoretically there could be a case that couldn't be sensitized into a read. I have not seen one. I have seen one that on the old Mathison was a totally motionless, non-reading needle, but not the Mark IV.

Now, that's a theoretical thing and that would be – that would be the same low scale of reaction where he'd just be stuck in a ridge; he wouldn't even have "You are a good boy. You are a good boy." It would just be the "Y" of "you" as it comes around the corner of the building is just stuck there forever. He doesn't want the rest of it to come around. He's got it stopped. He's afraid of what it might read. It's just all shut down.

Now, these are conditions that you will run into – just a general sort of a basketload summary of conditions of – meter conditions that you'll run into. I've not said anything complicated like the sensitivity knob can be adjusted and you can do this and you can do that and you can do the other thing to recover these things. But anything that – that's all I want to drive home to you – anything that isn't a clean needle isn't all right.

Now, this is a big point I'm trying to make with you here. I've talked to you sort of randomly about this and you all knew this right up until this point, but the lightning is about to strike, so brace yourself. This you might not have noticed or coordinated with all this. The only reason you are running CCHs, Prepchecking, Havingness, any of these things, putting rudiments in – the only reason you are doing this is to get a clean needle. And if you've got a clean needle, what are you doing it for?

Now, you see, from this point on you can never come around and say, "Well, you said to," see, to me. You got this? I see no lightning struck with you. Is this a new thought? Is this kind of a new thought?

Well, the only reason – that I'm – that's with exclamation points – the *only* reason that you are running rudiments, Havingness, Prepchecking or anything as a preparatory step is the relative dirtiness of a needle. You're all – that's all you're trying to do is clean that needle up.

And when the needle is clean, whatcha doing? What are you doing now? You're doing exactly nothing. There's absolutely no point in it. I don't care how fast this needle is traveling in sweeps back and forth and how much trouble you're having adjusting the tone arm trying to keep the needle somewhere on the dial; that has nothing to do with its dirtiness, you see?

When it clicks is when it instant reads. That's the only time it clicks. That's a clean needle. See? You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" – click. Yeah. He's got a present time problem, see? It didn't click on "present" and it didn't click afterwards. And you could actually sit there for a minute and nothing would happen with the needle; just nothing would happen. It would just – well, it could be falling and rising because of the breathing of the pc or something like that. It could be going over here and hitting the pin and you'd have to adjust it one way or the other at sensitivity 16.

But there are no sudden little jerks or burrs or reverse courses. It doesn't rise and then turn around and go the opposite direction with a – with a sudden hitch and that sort of thing. It's just there. It reads when you say so. That's a clean needle.

And man, if you got a clean needle on the pc and you keep the pc in Model Session, you keep your middle rudiments in, you can do 3GA like [snaps fingers] that, man. There's just nothing to it.

There isn't any reason to continue doing anything with a pc beyond the point of clean needle preparatory to a Goals Assessment. In fact, you're taking your life in your hands doing so. Because you might drop the E-Meter on his head, or something happen and you wouldn't get another good chance at a – at a Goals Assessment, you see?

You're cleaning up the needle. Now, let's go into what is the best operation to clean up a needle. Well, in fish and fumble, I have cleaned up some needles quite markedly at one time or another and hit the middles of circuits and done a lot of other things. But by and large, the best method, the very best method I know of for getting a clean needle on a pc is to put the pc into a state of confidence. Confidence equals predictability as per an earlier lecture. Predictability – confidence. The pc can predict what's going on, the pc will become confident.

Therefore, you do a very predictable session. And you pull some of this and some of that and something else. It doesn't matter whether you're prepchecking or a rudiments and havingness or something like that. But that isn't important. What you are doing in the session isn't important compared to being predictable. You must be very predictable.

First session pc didn't know what was going to happen. Second session he's got some kind of an idea. He knows you're not going to bust down in the middle of it. Third session pc has got it taped. His nervousness vanishes. His rudiments have been put in three times. He's had some Havingness, some Prepchecking or something else run. It's all predictable as far as he's concerned. You're a predictable auditor. And from that point on, with one slight reservation which I will go into in a moment, your pc's needle should just get cleaner and cleaner and cleaner.

Now, it is a mistake in most cases to try to sort out the *bzzzts* and the ticks and the tocks and the prior reads and so forth. And it is definitely a mistake on a case which is going *bzzzzzt* all the time – a total unreadable needle; a complete, utter bottom rung of a dirty needle; total agitation continuously.

You, of course, have no choice about such a case. This case cannot get the rudiments – have the rudiments put in. What are you going to do? What are you going to pick out of this garbage can and straighten up? It's all garbage. The only thing you're going to get out of the garbage can is garbage. And it's an awfully deep garbage can.

Unfortunately, this person needs most 3GA. And this case cannot possibly have 3GA run on it. What is wrong with the case is the case has changed his purpose line or the case's purpose line – basic purpose – has been too often shifted, which of course gives us all sorts of conflicts. Everything is alter-is and conflicts and that sort of thing.

There isn't much you can do with that case, short of CCHs. But the CCHs would have to be very gently run and you wouldn't be able to run the CCHs in Model Session because of course you can't get the rudiments in.

So you handle that case very gently, very easily and *terribly, terribly, terribly, terribly* predictably. You don't do anything odd or peculiar. The rule *is, the worse off the case is, the less random you get.*

That is the colossal blunder made by the alleged psychiatrists on this particular – what planet did you say this was?

Female voice: Earth.

The Kruegers and other people who have no credentials to practice in the field of the human mind – they shouldn't. They really – people should realize they have no credentials to practice. We've never given them a certificate, have we? Well, therefore the man is practicing without credentials.

And you know what forfeits their credentials? Because the crazier the patient, the crazier the treatment. All they do is Q-and-A with the patient. The only possible chance that those patients have of getting well is total predictability.

Now, they all know this and their manuals are full of this: that people who are not treated get out of the insane asylum *weeks* ahead of people who are treated. And they all know this. So they go on treating them.

If somebody ever dumped on your head a hundred thousand loonies – somebody might, you know – and said, "Here, well, heal them up *u-huh-huh*. The state's tired of spending eighty thousand pounds per minute per psychiatrist on these people." About the only thing you could do is find the quietest abandoned army camp you could possibly find and get the quietest possible attendants you could possibly find and spread these people out so they can't annoy each other. And just let them have the predictability that the next couple of minutes will be quiet. Just work on that as a predictability. Not even telling them so, you see?

And then you should have some motionless figures around that they can look at and that will be there tomorrow. And then just don't change anything – change nothing. And, you know, an awful lot of them would go sane?

You, by the way, permit no mail to enter this area. You keep the phone lines beautifully cut. The worst-off ones will worry about their families for the first month or so, you see and then they forget them. It's about time they did.

And you would probably produce the highest ratio of "deinsanitizing" that anybody had ever produced on this planet. Just practice restraint, boys and girls; just don't *do* anything, see, beyond that. Just let them be. Let them exist. Let them sit around and look at a rock. If I had no boulders in the vicinity, I'd import some and put them on pedestals. You walk down this street, you find an awful lot of seats sitting around a boulder. The boulder is on a pedestal. You'd find an awful lot of these people sitting there looking at them.

But what's wonderful about it: it's going to be there tomorrow. That's what they finally start marveling about. And you have entered some predictability into the situation.

Food, rest, predictability, is actually the only treatment anybody has any business giving the thoroughly insane. They have no business giving them any other treatment.

You actually have no business auditing these people. In the first place, their auditing environment is liable to be too unpredictable and they'll make it unpredictable enough, man. Remember, they're a total bundle of alter-is, so their whole impulse is toward change, toward randomness. They're alter-is from the word go.

All right. You're going to do something about it, why, let the – let the confusion blow off, see? Give them a stable datum of some kind, let the confusion blow off and they'll be all right from there on.

Because let me assure you of something: The number of those needles on the actually insane that you're going to get to read are so slight, they're going to be very few. Most of the insane – I haven't had very many insane on a meter, but their needles are in constant motion, those that I have had on a meter.

Now, that doesn't mean that an index of insanity is a constantly moving or totally stuck needle; that is not true either. Because you as an auditor, by sticking your foot in your mouth often and repeatedly in Model Session, can set a pc – and this comes the rest of this horrible lecture – you can take almost anybody and put ticks and tocks and *burrs* and *bzzzts* on their needle.

All you've got to do is don't get the rudiments clean. Let that be your motto and the needle will depart further and further and further from a clean needle and become more and more and more a dirty needle. And the way you would do that is be unpredictable in a session. Forget to put the goals in, you know, and forget to do this and do that, and don't clean up a rudiment and all of a sudden change your mind in the body of a session and decide to prep-check when you were going to run Havingness. But no more than start to do that than start to go into fish and fumble, you see?

Yeah, just keep that up. Keep that up. Just audit left-footedly routinely, continuously and you could take a very clean needle and in very short order, in a week or two, you'd have the thing going *bzzzt-um-a-dit-duh-whum-oom*. The guy would sort of feel like he was nuts, too.

An auditor auditing badly can dirty a needle up. This doesn't say that he is driving somebody insane. The needle does not give an index of sanity or insanity, because this is the other side of that horrible picture: you could probably, in your hundred thousand insane people, find quite a few of them with perfectly clean needles. And you could set them down and get a list of goals, find their goal and list them on out to Clear. Because remember, insanity is a specialized condition. It is merely the sensation of having to reach and not being able to.

You can always turn on the sensation of insanity on somebody by saying, "Get the idea that you must reach but you can't reach and you must withdraw but you can't withdraw." If you can get him to get the first pair and then get him to get the second pair, too, for a second he'll feel like he's stark, staring mad.

Insanity is more a sensation than anything else. But as close as you can get to this sensation is get a total unpredictability. Now, you can almost produce the same thing. It doesn't work well. Aw, I don't know; get in the army sometime – get in the army. That'd be a good approximation of it. You go out and the notice board says, "All troops will *report*" see, "All

troops will *report* at eight o'clock." And this is crossed out and it's "six o'clock," and then somebody blows a bugle and it's five-thirty and you were supposed to have been on the move an hour ago and somebody stops you and says, "What are you doing here? You're not supposed to leave until noon."

You keep this up long enough and you get yourself some interesting states of mind. The thing that the guys probably do is say, "Oh, to hell with it. It doesn't matter," and so forth and "We're apathetic," and all that kind of thing.

But they're approaching the same thing. And after somebody had been subjected to that treatment for a while – let's say their needle was clean – well, their needle would tend to get dirty. Get the difference?

Now, the same guy – you set him down on the beach and you tell him, "All right. Now you keep watch out to sea. We don't expect anything to come. We don't expect anything to happen, but you just keep a watch out there," and go away and forget him for about three weeks and let no sergeants near him or any evil things like that and come back and put him on the meter and he'd be reading a clean needle, see?

He could predict, you see? He knows he's going to be sitting on the beach tomorrow, too. He has a certain amount of Havingness, which is your other *clue* to all this.

Now, running Havingness tends to key out circuits. And you notice I always use this word *tends* to. I don't say that it *will* key out circuits *always* because that's not necessarily true, because sometimes circuits in the process of keying out go through the pc. All kinds of interesting things occur on mental masses.

But Havingness tends to key out circuits and predictability tends to key out circuits and smooth out needles, and so forth. So let us take the gross values: predictability on the part of the auditor and havingness on the environment. All right. If you combined those two things, an auditor would be running a smooth, easy, gentle string of CCHs. He runs these various drills and he makes nothing complicated about it and he's very easy about the thing and he's very pleasant about it all and everything goes along fine. And what do you know? Some circuits start keying out and the guy's predictability comes up and here we go. And you notice all of a sudden that you're getting yourself a cleaner needle.

Now, if you're *not* getting a cleaner needle on this character doing the CCHs only, either you are not being predictable or this person needs to confide in you.

So you've got the other side of the coin which is Prepchecking. Frankly, Prepchecking is a very high-scale mate for the CCHs. If you were being more factual, you'd run the rudiments and Havingness session along with the CCHs. You know, you get in the rudiments and do the Havingness and then you would do CCHs, see? And it'd be my recommendation that if you were bucked in to somebody who was really, really a *rough* needle and things were pretty grim (just rough needle is good enough; you don't have to say how bad the case is and so forth) and this needle was awful hard to straighten out, stop getting so extraordinary. Don't be a psychiatrist. If you're not having any *luck* straightening out a very dirty, rough, mean needle and you've audited the pc for a while – I'm talking about four or five sessions now of whatever you're doing on the pc – and it's not getting better, it's getting worse, well, you're just up

too high – too high a level of randomness for the pc. That's – let's not say what's wrong with his mind, just beyond this point of the havingness and the predictability is above this pc's ceiling.

All right. Let's say – I'll give you a good example of this – you're running CCHs and Prepchecking on somebody and the needle was getting rougher. Be pretty hard to imagine how this was happening, but let's say you've run into something like this, see? I'd drop the CCHs back to a Model Session and Havingness. And I would make sure that in the CCHs I cut out *any* complicated action of any kind.

Don't wind books around your head and bang the pc in the chest with them four times and that sort of thing. No. Just pick up the book and turn it around and hand it to the pc until he can do it, see? In other words, the dirtier the needle, the simpler you get.

There is your direction of change.

Now, when should you make up your mind that you *should* change into a simpler thing? After about three sessions. Now, if you're doing a good, interesting session – you're doing a nice session that's very predictable and that sort of thing – the weapons in your hands are sufficiently good that they should start smoothing the needle out; doing CCHs the way you're doing them, doing Prepchecking. And you should start getting the things pretty smooth. This should start looking easy to you and the needle starts to look better and that sort of thing. You find out that you'll get this chain up and that chain up, because – now I'm not kidding you – the getting the chains released and that sort of thing assists this condition. Providing you do get the whole chain, see. I mean, you do a good, thorough job of it.

An hour of thorough auditing, you know, is worth a thousand hours of clumsy auditing any day of the week.

So, anyway, your concentration is in the direction of a clean needle. And if this is not appearing, the thing to do is to get *simpler*, to get more *basic*, not more *heroic*.

Now, if a needle is getting dirtier as you audit the pc, suspect the following – at once suspect the following, in this order: suspect the *meter*. It isn't getting the rudiments in. The rudiments are out and the meter is not reading them. Suspect the meter. There's something wrong with the meter. We're assuming, of course, that you know how to audit and read a meter and that you are doing a standard job of Model Session. And you're doing the best job you know how and those rudiments, as far as you can see, are cleaner than clean.

Well, don't be so baffled. First suspect is the meter. You may have a disconnection in your leads – E-Meter lead. Your battery may be down or the meter might actually have a mechanical fault in it. Suspect the meter and check it out from one end to the other. Make sure that meter is okay.

Now, supposing that you were stuck. We've assumed you're trained, you know how to do this and you're going to clean up your middle ruds and Model Session rudiments and so forth. And this needle is getting dirtier. And you're sitting out there in West Keokuk – now that's worse than being in Keokuk; that's being in West Keokuk – and you're a long way from another meter.

There is something you can do. You will notice this is occurring: Whenever you ask a rudiment and you get a clean needle, the pc had an answer for you. And it will run up as many missed withholds as you have rudiments. This is the liability, by the way, of a bad meter, a bunged-up meter or something of the sort, see? Sounds grim, doesn't it? I see some of your hair standing on end.

Now, listen. I'll go over this test. This is a very important point of this lecture – very important point. Your meter is not doing well – I'm going to get you a meter standardizer and I'll get a little thing built that you can get for a few pounds and it'll tell you whether your meter is smoking the proper petrol and so forth. You know, like these motor analyzers. I already designed it. The letter went out today – I mean, with everything. We're going to get one of these things shortly.

But in spite of that, not even one of those may be available, you see? I mean you may really be – you may be in the south part of West Keokuk. [laughter]

And you make this test. And you say to the pc, "Do you have a present time problem?" You see your meter is clean. Now you say to the pc, "Is there anything you wanted to say about that?"

And the pc says, "Yes. So-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so."

Well, running a rudiment that way, that's the type of response you get. Well, let's start in at the beginning of the thing, you see? "Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room," see – that type of rudiment. Clean, see? You say to the pc, "Is there anything you want – you thought of to tell me about this?"

Pc says, "Yes, I can't stand green wallpaper."

You say, "All right. Thank you." Go on to your next rudiment. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" That's clean. Or he says something and you check it again, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" and it's clean. Now you've cleaned it up, see? When you got it clean, say to your pc, "Was there something you thought of after that last question there that you wanted to tell me?"

And the pc says (this one, too, see), "Well, yes. As a matter of fact, it so-and-so and so-and-so and such-and-such and such-and-such and – uh – I – uh – ha-ha – have grave reservations in disgusting [discussing] reincarnation with you because you look so reincarnated to me."

Then you say to the person, "Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?" You get a read. You clean it, usual way. And then you ask him again, "Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?" See, your meter's clean. And you say, "Well, is there anything you thought of then to say to me?"

And the pc says, "Yes and yes and yes and I did this and I did that and so forth and I thought of saying this to you, too."

You say, "Well, thank you very much." And then, "Do you have a present time problem?" And it falls and you get the problem and all that sort of thing or it doesn't fall – doesn't

matter – take it up to clean needle and say, "Well now, did you think of anything else you wanted to tell me?"

And the pc says, "And so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so."

Well, listen: Don't think that you just got a gabby pc. Your meter isn't registering on that pc as far south as you've got to go to get the rudiments in.

You follow it? In other words, your meter doesn't go as far south as you've got to go to get the rudiments in. *So even though the meter you're using is clean, you're auditing a pc with the rudiments out.* And that is the *only* thing that'll dirty up a needle.

Prepchecking without cleaning up the What questions, you understand? Stacking up the missed withholds in all directions here.

Of course, you're auditing with the rudiments out. And you're auditing with a whole, big stack of missed withholds. So it merely means that your meter isn't reaching as deeply as the pc can *reach into his own reactive bank.*

In other words, you can audit with an insensitive meter. You're almost taking your life in your hands. But you can take the curse of it off, if you find this sort of thing is occurring and you're in the south part of West Keokuk – on the other side of the railroad track – you can add this additional caper, this little additional action. Because when you do add that addition – the only reason you add it is because when you *do* add it you find out consistently that the pc has always had *another* missed withhold, has always had *another* problem. They were not registering on your meter. That means your meter is being insufficiently sensitive for that pc.

There's a limit to which a meter can go. It may even be that you can find a pc that just doesn't register on meters worth a nickel. And it may be that when pcs get very close to Clear they're not banging enough read on the meter to get the rudiment in when it's out.

Some interesting things could happen here, don't you see? Completely aside from the fact that you've dropped the meter and it's gone down the steps striking every fifth one with great regularity. See, some other oddities happen here. So we won't bother with the oddity. We'll merely say the meter isn't reaching as deep as the pc is reaching.

Now, it isn't necessarily true that every pc has a withhold just because he wanted to say something else. You put him on a drill like this, he's liable to start dreaming up things to say to you just to be accommodating.

The answer is, is how comfortable is this pc after a session is over? Is this pc really relaxed at the end of a session? Does this pc really feel fine as silk at the end of a session?

Well, here's the 18-inch gun on the thing. A pc after a session where the rudiments are unobservably but actually out, feels as roughed up as a violin being used for a canoe paddle. And a pc who has finished a session where the rudiments were *well, well, well, well*, thoroughly in, feels like a cat that's just been fed fish. He feels sleek. He feels smooth. Big difference.

If your pc doesn't feel very smooth at the end of a session, there's only one reason why. The What questions, the rudiments, are not clean. If those things are clean all the way down, the pc feels wonderful.

Now, there's a certain point of tolerance. But it's not very great.

Now, if your meter – here's another point – if your meter is never detecting and your meter never, never, never detects anything reactive on the pc, it isn't sensitive enough.

The pc never has to think and you never have to say, "There, there, there. What's that? What's that? What's that?" you see? "That, that."

"Oh," he says. "*Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh yeah, ha-ha. Oh, yeah, hmm.*"

But if your meter is clearing every time on this basis – "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Oh, yes. I – actually I meant to go for a ride last night with two boys and I didn't and now I don't know whether I should have or not."

And you say, "Thank you. I'll check that out on the meter. Do you have a present time problem?"

And it reads and the pc says, "I'm – uh – rather uncomfortable in this chair."

And you say, "Thank you. Do you have a present time problem? That's clean," and so forth.

You know, you never had to steer the pc's attention. He knew all about these problems. Quite interesting. Pcs often do know all about these problems, but if they knew about those analytically, what are you using the E-Meter for? This pc actually isn't reading the deeper problem.

Actually, if you said then to the pc – it cleaned, see and you ran this other drill I was giving you for when you – when you think your meter is running far, far too shallow. You say, "Is there anything else you thought of to say to me?" you see, something like that.

And he, "No. I just had a feeling like it isn't quite all right. I don't quite know what it is. Oh, well, yes. I just realized I – uh – *h-aah* – I'm thirsty."

And you say, "All right. Well, thank you."

The meter didn't go as shallow, you see it went too shallow. It didn't go down as far as the pc goes. It's something like finding the bottom out in the middle of the ocean with a short piece of string, you see? And you never get anywhere near the bottom.

Now, this condition can exist when your meter is out of whack, when it's insufficiently sensitive, battery is down, something like that and possibly could exist on some pc as he's moving forward toward Clear. You may hit bottom as far as the meter is concerned, but that isn't bottom. See? And you may have to introduce this other drill, which is clean it up *thoroughly* on the meter and then ask the *pc* if there's anything else. Got that? It's just as a standard drill. Doesn't matter whether you're prepchecking or anything else.

Oddly enough, you're still going to get the readings adequate for goals. They're still adequate for goals; you can read goals that way and so forth.

But there is the story of meters. A meter out of whack early on in auditing or a pc who finally suddenly gets Clear enough to know more about his reactive bank than the meter does and you won't get registries on the reactive bank, but the pc will know all about it. See?

Go ahead and use your meter. But you have to append the additional magic phrase. Got the idea?

And this other one – I want you to learn this real well and get a good subjective reality on it: Run a pc with the rudiments only partially in, you know, and the pc winds up rough; run a session with the rudiments very thoroughly in, the pc winds up very smooth.

The other datum is, if you've got a dirty needle on a pc, use the most predictable things you know how to do. And do those things very gently without any vast changes of pace or anything like that. Get predictable with this pc and you'll see that needle start straightening out.

Why is the needle dirty? The needle is dirty because the circuits are pulled in. Why are the circuits pulled in? Because the pc is way back on the track and very low in havingness. How do you get the circuits off the pc? You pull the pc out of the circuits and up toward present time by running extroversion-type processes and by raising the pc's havingness to key these circuits out and so forth.

The worse you audit the pc, the less his havingness is going to be, the more the key – you're going to get circuits keyed in, so therefore the dirtier needle you're going to get. Those are the mechanics of the thing and the only reason you're cleaning up a needle is so you can do 3GA.

You got it?

Audience: Yes, thanks. Hm-hm.

All right. Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.

PREPCHECKING AND THE TIME TRACK

A lecture given on 26 June 1962

Okay. The problems of auditing. Well, this is the second lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 26 June 62. I'm going to talk to you about Prepchecking.

Prepchecking is a very easy activity. There is nothing very difficult about it except trying to understand it. You sometimes can try to understand it so hard that it becomes quite difficult. Prepchecking is based on one of the simplest fundamentals of Dianetics; which is that every type of incident which had relationship to one another tended to form up in a consecutive chain on the time track.

You should understand the time track as consecutive occurrences in time. You live, you live, you live, you live, you live. Those are all different items in time.

All right. Let's put it this way. You make a picture, you make a picture, you make a picture, you make a picture, you make a picture. Those are all separate items in time. But pictures classify themselves after construction, into chains. You've got a chain for most anything. You've got a breakfast chain of all the breakfasts you didn't like. And you have a lunch chain of all the lunches you didn't like, particularly those. And you have a supper chain for all the suppers you didn't like. You see. Now, you have an eating chain of all the eating you didn't like, you see. But inside this chain you have these subdivisional chains of the breakfast chain, the lunch chain and the supper chain. Get the idea?

Now, when you get so general that you have livingness you didn't like... See, these are – these are pictures you didn't want and therefore suppress and submerge and get the hell out of the road and try to do something with, you know.

It's something like the artist in the studio, he's got this potentially beautiful model. She's standing over there on the platform and he takes all of this clay, you see, and he slings it together and he makes something that looks like a combination between a giraffe and a custard pie, you know. And he says, "To hell with that thing," so he says, "I'll work on that later," or something. But that's very unsatisfactory, so he tries to push it out of the road. Well, suppose this was made up of stuff that he didn't know how to squash it after he had made it. Supposing he'd just forgot that. Well, he's got an unwanted picture there. He's got an unwanted statue. So let's say he hangs some curtains across the thing or puts it back in the corner, you know and pushes it out of sight and hangs some curtains over it and says, "Well, we don't have to pay any attention to that."

And he takes – and he says, "Well, let's have another go at it," you see? "Let's have a much better go at it," and he gets all this clay and stuff and he makes himself up a new statue of this model, you see. And it is mostly feet. And he says, "Well, *heh-heh, ha-ha, ha-ha, ha-ha.*" Not knowing how to unmock this thing, you see, we'll get some more black material and we'll drape the thing and we'll shove it over in the corner.

Well, this can continue and is a perfectly successful activity up to this point – when he runs out of studio. He got no place to stow these things. So he probably tries to push them all together into various classified piles, classified into "things we don't look at." Now, actually if they're hanging up, they are a violation of purpose. That's not in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*, but that's how a picture gets there. That's how a picture persists. The alter-is is a violation of purpose.

A guy intended to hang somebody and got hanged. Violated his purpose. But that really is a fairly close activity and won't trouble him as much as going out to shoot the mayor and electing him. Now, that will trouble him. And he'll have this beautiful picture of this election. You'll run into it in the bank, you know? And you can't find anything wrong with it, you know. So he elected a mayor. Eventually, you dig around for a while and you discover well, hell, he wanted to kill the mayor, not elect him and he wound up electing him when he intended to kill him. You run out that basic purpose with regard to the mayor and the picture will fold up. The pictures are held in place by violation of purpose.

Now, the place they hang up in is the mind and they get into classifications of chains. And every chain has a basic and a basic-basic. Now, every chain has a basic. Well, that means that there are tremendous numbers of basics. You probably have a basic on the subject of bad food for every lifetime you ever lived. But there is only one basic-basic and that is the first time on the track you decided food was bad, see. And that's hung up because you weren't eating and intended not to and then did. And you'll get a basic-basic.

Frankly, there is no basic picture on a chain. There is no basic *picture* on a chain. There is a basic *purpose* on a chain which the chain *violates*. And that is what hangs the chain up.

That is even more esoteric than you need to do adequate Prepchecking. You need that to do 3GA but the mechanics are still true otherwise. The only thing you need to know to do Prepchecking is the fact that there is such a thing as a time track and that a time track has classified chains on it. And by chain is meant a consecutive series of incidents: He ate breakfast and didn't like it; he ate breakfast and didn't like it, see? Well, that runs from this lifetime, the first breakfast he ate and didn't like, up to the last time he ate breakfast and didn't like it which is probably this morning. See, he got a nice chain there. Well, now basic for this lifetime – actually when you say basic, you needn't add for this lifetime because you mean that. You mean somewhere near this lifetime, you see. Could happen in the last two or three lives. Sometimes these chains overlap a lifetime. You'll find yourself occasionally prepchecking back past this lifetime. Perfectly all right.

And basic, then, is the first time this happened on this particular chain. This chain is not united particularly with other chains and will free by finding that one basic. You can get

rid of this whole concatenation of not liking breakfast by finding the first incident where he didn't like breakfast in these finite periods like the last life or two, you see. Now, there is a chain and they are pictures. And the only thing which holds them all in place is the basic. You needn't particularly play around in Prepchecking with the purpose because you're going to get yourself into 3GA a long time before you're ready to be in 3GA. You start running back to find the purpose back of not liking breakfast. *Oh-ho*. The violated purpose.

"What is the violated purpose of not liking breakfast?" Well, it's a *woooooo*, and then he's back a thousand years *woooooo*, and it's back ten thousand years *woooooo*, and then he's back a hundred thousand years *zzzzz*, and then he's back a trillion and he's two trillion and fifteen trillion *yawhoooo*. There it is. Oh, yes, yes. You finally get it back down to the bottom and find out that's not his goal. What's happened during all this period of time? All you've done is beef up the bank all the way.

So you don't bother much with these basic purposes and that sort of thing as a relationship to chains even though that's how they exist and how they persist. The only thing you're interested in is the first time. The first time. Well, that is a very, very reserved statement, (quote) the first time (unquote), see. Honest, he's been having – a first time he didn't like breakfast here for trillennia, see? Every GPM has a not liking breakfast chain in it or something like that, you see. Back we go – back, back, back. But for our – for our purposes and for the edification of the general public and the pcs and so forth that you start auditing early on, you say well, that is the first incident. That's what we mean by basic. That is the basic incident.

That doesn't mean the first incident ahead of all such chains. That just means the one ahead of the chain that is close up here to present time and fairly accessible. So that's what you're after in Prepchecking. Because the mechanics exist that if you pull the basic, the rest of the chain will go, *bzzzzzt*. You can discharge a chain by pulling the basic on that chain.

The basic on the chain generally hangs around childhood, oh, maybe a few years ahead of this life. It's fairly recent. You can expect it quite normally to occur two, three, four, something like that. Sometimes you startle yourself by finding a basic in the prenatal area in spite of the fact that the medicos at first objected seriously to prenatal engrams and their objection to them has not eradicated them. I thought you might like to know that. They still run into them. They now, by the way, heal people by healing their prenatal proclivities, you see. Johns Hopkins University has issued many learned papers about prenatal influence now and not any one of them has got the story straight yet.

As far as past lives are concerned, you rather inevitably run into past lives. You start Prepchecking and everything is going along fine. This person's never heard of past life, never heard of living before and all of a sudden you find him in 1868 with the basic of the chain of hating wool. You know, what's he done to wool? Something like that. He's an Australian sheep farmer, you see. And he has – he's out there and he's sheep farming and so forth. And you all of a sudden find out the reason he is sheep farming has something to do with his having killed a man in England with a woolen scarf. That happened in 1868 and he finally gets it straightened out that he started sheep farming in 1870. And this doesn't seem to be quite right

to him, but he eventually straightens it out and all of a sudden he has no wool allergy. See wool doesn't do anything to him.

I didn't mean to step on any Australian toes here with regard to that sort of thing. Just for the benefit of it, as far as Australia is concerned, Australia is – shouldn't feel sad about it because that's what happened to everybody on this planet, you know.

Anyway, you've got a situation there, don't you see. And the basic on the chain doesn't pull in this lifetime. And the pc will go back and he'll go back and sometimes they go back two or three thousand years. Seldom much more than that. It would be quite unusual if they did, but you'd let them if they did. And they all of a sudden pull this basic. And it's some overt. They did something. And you pull that thing and *bzzzzzzt*. The rest of it will go.

Actually no charge can remain in a chain after the basic has been pulled out of unknownness and put into known category. The electronics of the situation is you're not going to get a *read* on a chain if it is no longer charged. And what charges it up is what keeps it in place. And that is the basic on the chain is an unknown zone or sphere. There's something unknown about the first incident and it remains charged up until that becomes known at which moment the electronics of the chain convert and the chain is desensitized and remains so thereafter.

And it is quite tricky. The pulling a chain is a permanent activity. Chains don't charge up again as long as you have the basic on the chain. Therefore in Prepchecking, you always test the What question for charge. You test the What question. Don't test the Zero Question because a person's reliability and responsibility increases. He's going find new times when he used wool for strangulation purposes, you see? Or something. He's going to find brand-new times and so forth, but it'll be on the Zero.

"Have you ever killed a man?" See, something like this. And no, he never killed any man. You've got this What question, see? Finally you find that he has an impulse to strangle people, particularly on sheep farms. For some reason or other this doesn't make any sense, you see. And you follow this on down and you pull the basic on the chain. Well, now that particular activity is going to desensitize. That'll never charge up again. But he's going to get more responsible and realize that by his reckless driving at some time or another or his failure to repair a car or something like this, his extensional responsibility is all of a sudden going to make him realize that he's killed somebody else. At this time the Zero is flat. You raise his responsibility and the Zero unflattens. But the What question flattened, remains flat. There is the curious difference.

Now, the anatomy of the mind then, is that chains consisting of similar incidents plot from a basic which can be reached up to present time. And Prepchecking is simply an effort to reach one of these chains and trace it back down to its earliest basic that can be found. That is to say – I beg your pardon – to the earliest incident that can be found, which is its basic for this finite fairly recent chain. And get the unknownness off of that incident at which moment the rest of the chain should go *bzzzzzzt*. You find out there's no real necessity to come back up a chain again once you have gone down it and blown the basic.

You test the What question and the What question is now flat. It is completely null and doesn't register anymore. It's gone. And the whole magic of it consists of finding the basic.

Well, therefore, the system called Prepchecking consists of a method of locating chains of sufficient charge to aberrate the conduct of the individual. And then provides a withhold system – it's called originally – a little system which knocks out the basic and removes the charge from the basic on the chain so the chain will fold up. So whatever else we say about Prepchecking and whatever else rote activity we get into about Prepchecking and however involved we get with Prepchecking, please don't lose sight of what you're trying to do.

You-uns is just trying to find a chain of antisocial activities on the part of this pc that are considered somewhat less than optimum; and you're trying to run that chain on down to its basic; and you're trying to knock that basic out and so get that chain to fold up. Now, whatever you are trying to do, you are trying to do that. And you will discover you have some remarkable successes doing things like this.

You find this person just cannot stand their mother-in-law and you say this is normal and natural. Nobody likes his mother-in-law, you say. Now when we investigate this thing a little bit further we find out that his mother-in-law does all the washing and bakes him pies and cakes that he particularly likes and is always giving him money and is very pleasant to him and is quite proud of him. But he doesn't like his mother-in-law. And this starts to get senseless. This starts to get stupid. It's ruining his whole life. That's all it's doing.

Well, all right. We prepcheck this thing – not because we pick upon it as a particular wrongness – we just happened to collide with it and run into it while looking for overts on the part of the pc. There we all of a sudden find the similarities and so forth that he has associated up with and the overts and the missed withholds connected with this mother-in-law and we find they all lie in a chain. It is not the mother-in-law chain, see. It is the – a female chain or an elderly female chain or it is some other characterized chain. But it is – it's better called, "Doing something to older women," chain. You locate that, pull the basic on the thing, *bzzzzt*, comes up to present time and he goes home and he kisses his mother-in-law and says how nice she is. She hasn't changed. He has.

Now, this could get more serious. He could get so upset about his mother-in-law and that sort of thing, he's perpetually sick. And you sometimes won't be able to figure out just why the pc became so mysteriously well. The pc had constant and continual earaches. Constant and continual earaches. Well, there's no sense in going in and trying to audit his ear or find a wrongness. You just do a more or less standard job of Prepchecking. All of a sudden you find out he hates his mother-in-law. You run this out, overts against elderly women, see. And you find out when he was a little boy, why, he pegged a rock at some elderly woman and hurt her in some fashion or another. And this all associates out and magically turns out that this woman was not his mother-in-law and somehow or another. And his crimes were so-and-so and such-and-such. And they all fold up and he doesn't have an earache and he likes his mother-in-law. Very mysterious.

How did all this occur? Well, it could only occur because of misassociation. He's reactively making identifications: A=A=A=A. Prepchecking is all out of *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health* man, I mean this is – this is wild that something like – like Banquo's ghost coming to life, you know. It's right out of the old book. Except this is how you run it

with an E-Meter and you don't bother much with the engrams. The engrams all rip up anyhow and you don't pay any attention to engrams anymore, but you can get the whole chain, don't you see? Chains are described in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*. Basics are described. Basic-basic is described. Also by the way, 3GA is also piloted out in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*. The basic purpose of the individual. That's what you're finding when you're finding goals.

So anyhow, not to show you how right I was – just to show you that you're – just to show you that you're dealing with fundamentals. You aren't dealing with a whole series of chains. You're dealing with a peeled-off series of fundamentals. This is very streamlined auditing, man. When you get down to Prepchecking, why, you find yourself looking at all the parts that you saw in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*, except you don't bother to run anybody through engrams or put them into engrams or explore still pictures or get too nosy about what the pc is looking at or anything because you can actually just run on down and pull the bottom of the chain and the chain goes *bzzzzzt*.

Now, there's been a reformation in Prepchecking. Originally we prepchecked on the basis of take the last incident in order to settle the individual on the chain or reveal the chain. We ran the withhold system on the last incident – the nearest to present time. And you see, that was the one we found.

All right. We have what's called a Zero Question. All right. That Zero Question is some highly generalized question that is liable to get the pc where he lives. It is arbitrary. If it operates on the pc, good, we use it. If it doesn't operate on the pc, we discard it. And lists of these questions exist in what we used to call Sec Check forms. They are found in HCO Policy Letters. The best of them are Form 3 called the Joburg and Form 6A as far as Scientologists are concerned. There are many of them, however. They exist. Though, there's been a lot of them put out in Info Letters, people have been real busy making up Prepchecks. They've done a real good job of this sort of thing.

So you've got lots of Zero material. I suppose at some time or another we'll be so rich that somebody has been a bus driver and we just look up in the – *der* master textbook on *der* subject of Prepcheck Forms. And it will say "Bus Driver, Type B." You see. And "How many fares haven't you turned over to *der* company?" You know? In other words it could be quite stylized. You could even bring it out for dynamics. Do a Dynamic Assessment on somebody and then you'd get a Dynamic Prepcheck and all of that.

But there's a danger in being *too* fundamental in Prepchecking. There's a *danger*. You start doing – you start doing assessments and you're going to run into the GPM and the GPM is nothing to handle with a Prepcheck, let me assure you. So you want a shallow draft sort of look. That isn't to say you don't want shallow incidents like I ... "Well, the reason I hate little girls is because that – I was at a party one time and I took my index finger and I touched the little girl on the shoulder and that's my overt act." The hell it is. He's done worse than that. He can do – he can come up with better than that to show for a whole lifetime for heaven's sakes, you see?

But comparatively speaking, we are not going to do 3GA and then a Prepcheck, don't you see. We're going to take something that's relatively light, you see. And we get it out of these forms.

"Have you ever stolen anything?" Well, on the whole track, look at you, man. Look at you on the whole track. Aw. Think if you – if you try and clear this question up for the whole track. Oh, wow! You know, "Where'd you put that planet, man?" You know. But we ask this question as a Prepcheck and we find out that he's been stealing pennies out of his mother's purse and he's been stealing lollipops and he's been stealing copybooks off of his teacher and he's been – he's been purloining this and that for quite a while. And it's finally wound up into the fact that he'd better not reach certain items in this lifetime.

So we ask him the Zero Question, "Have you ever stolen anything?" Of course, we don't know that he's stolen something or not stolen something. This is minor. This is just a test question. Zero Question equals test question. And it reacts on the meter. It goes bang!

Well, we say, "That reads. Now, what have you done?" And he says, "Ah, well, stealing things. I ..." He says, "I – I – I stole an icebox once."

And you say, "Good. Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. Have you ever stolen anything?" *Clang!* Well, you've had it, see? You gave him one chance, you see. You gave him one chance to clean it. And if it didn't clean, you got your paws on a chain. Chains never consist of two incidents.

Sometimes there are isolated, single incidents that clean up just, boom! Well, you don't want to monkey around with those and beat the pc to death, but they clean up just on utterance. Pc says yap-yap. They're gone. That's it. They don't read. But you say, "Have you ever stolen anything?" a second time, he goes clang! Oh, well, come off of it, man, there's a chain here.

Now, what is it a chain of? Well, probably it might be four chains. It might be six chains. Now, he says he stole an icebox. And this is the way you prepcheck now. You take that incident and you don't run, "When did it happen? Appear?" and so on. You don't – you don't do that with that incident. He just tells you that incident. You try to clean it on the meter. It didn't clean and now you put your What question around that except you dabble and dab and monkey and fumble and fool around trying to get this What question to operate like that *clang!* you got there on that "Have you ever stolen anything?"

"Have you ever stolen anything" fell about two E-Meter divisions with a very fast *chop*. Well, you want a What question that falls two divisions with a very fast *chop*, see? So you're just going to have to be inventive at this time and this is the weakest part of a Prepcheck system. This is where the auditor can make most of his mistakes.

You say, "What about...?" All What questions begin with "What." "What about?", they say. Isn't even very grammatical and it isn't very sensible, but you find out it works fine. And nearly all Zero Questions begin with "Have" or have "have" as their third word. Like, "In prison have you ever ...?" See? It's a modified have. So your What question: What about? All right. Now you've got to find out what about what? Well frankly, you're like a fisherman who is blindfolded standing on a stream. He does not know even, really, if the stream exists using

tackle to catch fishes that he does not know the type or identity of, you see? So this is a sort of a – of an interesting activity. He's got to form a What question all on his little lonesome. So with great genius our new HPA student says, "What about stealing iceboxes?" See. That's genius. This is just brilliant, you see, because he only stole one icebox. He's stolen lots of things but only one icebox.

So now let me show you how the guy's made it tough for himself. This thing is at the *top* end of the *theft* chain. See? It's supported *all* the way back to the age of *two* when he used to steal safety pins off his nurse, you know. It's supported all the way back there by *all* that charge and *all* those incidents. My God! He's stolen iceboxes and opera hats and he's stolen women, he's stolen all kinds of things, you see. And this auditor says, "What about stealing iceboxes?"

"Oh, *th-blah-blah-blah, this-that, uh-aw-yeah-blah.*"

And the auditor says, "Are there any earlier times?"

The fellow says, "No, there aren't any earlier times." So he checks it on the meter. "Any earlier times you've stolen any iceboxes? Well, there are no earlier times... All right. When was that that you stole ...?"

Oh, no. This isn't going to – this isn't going to give. This isn't gon- ... He can sit there now and grind on it for the next couple of hours. I'd say he could probably spend four or five sessions on it.

"When did you steal the icebox?" See. "Is that all there is to it? What might have appeared there? Who should have found out about it?" And the What question – it sort of dies a hard death. After several sessions it sort of dies a hard death. Both auditor and pc finally get tired of this icebox. [laughter] It was sort of cold and clammy to begin with and didn't get any more entertaining as we went along.

Well that is what could be classified as asking, formulating, the wrong What question. We want to know something that will give a chain. So this is what we do. We – of course, in a test question, you say, "What about stealing iceboxes?" but we're wasting our time, you see. We want to know about, "What about stealing furniture?" see. "What about stealing appliances? What about stealing equipment? What about stealing heavy things? What about stealing massive items? What about stealing property that didn't belong to you?" That doesn't read. "What about stealing white objects?" Sheer genius. Didn't work either. [laughter] Finally the auditor remembers what the pc told him – that is he stole the icebox and hid it in a barn. So, "What about stealing and hiding things?" Clang! "Oh, that was good, huh-huh." We got the same clang. And we say, "Have you ever stolen anything?" Clang! "What about stealing and hiding things?" Clang! Hey, hey, that's all right. All right, now.

"All right, now – what a – what about, stealing and hiding things, huh?" Oh, the auditor, he's got it easy now. In this new type of Prepchecking, he has it very easy. He wants the pc to get windy. That's all. He just wants the pc to go on and tell him all about it. That's good, yeah, well yeah, all right, fine. The pc just tells him all about it. He doesn't ask for anything earlier; he doesn't steer the pc in any way; the pc tells him all about this question. Actually, the pc may give him three or four overts. He doesn't challenge the pc, he doesn't stop the pc.

Because listen, if he stops the pc he's got a missed withhold right there in the session that's going to go all – fly to pieces.

See, he did, he sort of shut the pc up while he found the What question and that sort of thing. And it was a little bit lengthy and he did it and that's fine. But now that he's found it, now he wants to know about stealing and hiding things. And the pc's – well, the pc's been sitting there kind of ready to tell him, you know, about the Ford car and the house and the battleship and the bass drum and the giraffe and all these things that he's stolen and hidden, you see? And the guy goes on and on and on and on.

And only when the pc runs down, the auditor – this is the time the auditor should encourage – he should understand the encouraging acknowledgment. Girls know this better than men. Girls are experts at this sort of thing. I know a girl, stone-deaf she got through her whole life, married eight millionaires and all she knew how to do was give an encouraging acknowledgment! [laughter, laughs] It's the invitational, "Hm-mm." You know? "Right. Right. Right. Right. All right. Hm-mm, hm-mm, good, good. All right, all right, yeah." Of course, the girl adds the "Gee whiz!" to it, you know, a little bit, but you don't have to add that.

Pc runs down – doesn't matter whether he gave you one, four, six, eight – doesn't matter what he gave you, take it. You've got this What question, you've written it down. That's the main thing. It's got to be on your board. It's got to – registered along with the "Have." And after that you let the pc answer that What question in full. And now start pushing for earlier. And you don't even have to read the meter, man. See? You're not reading the meter during all this time. Give your eyes a rest.

You know he's not going to tell you the earliest. Because if he could reach the earliest all by himself, it wouldn't be a chain. So he can always answer the question, "Is there an earlier incident?" And you shove him back to the earliest incident you *can find*. That is, he's always going to tell you "the earliest," "It is the earli-est." The pc's always using "earli-est," and the auditor is always using "earli-er." See, auditor never says "the earli-est," "Tell me the earli-est incident." "Tell me the earli-er incident," you know, because he'll hang the track up.

And he gets the pc back to the earliest one that the pc can be coaxed back to without a meter and without anything. See? He gets him back there. And he gets that *earlier* incident – pc says it's the earli-est, it's not. That incident is the barrier.

That incident that the pc can reach without much assistance is the barrier to earlier memory. There is always a barrier incident. It's a barrier to earlier memories. It's not particularly a technical term, I just want you to get the idea that there's a fence built about a third of the way up one of these chains. And the pc can get back there dead-easy. That's to the age of eleven. He can get back there awful easy. But somehow or another, at that point it all folds up and that one's pretty foggy.

So it is at this point that the auditor now brings out his withhold system. Now, he wants to know when that *early* – the pc says "earliest" – he wants to know when that "earliest" incident, when it was, wants to know is that all there is to it, he wants to know what might have appeared there and he wants to know who should have found out about it and didn't, so on. The When-All-Appear-Who system. And he works that over, one time, two times.

And when he's got that far – I'm just giving you this in the rough, not by the rote procedure of the HCOB June 24th, 1962 – he wants to know if there's any earlier incident. Well hell, of course there is. See? He used the withhold system to blast the track open so the pc could remember earlier, see. And he runs the pc on down and the next thing you know they've got their hands on an incident about stealing and hiding things from his little sister and driving his little sister berserk and plenty of overts. And finally we find out that he'd steal and hide things – it's usually got a – the basic on this thing has usually got a hell of a curve in it, somehow or another, you know. And he finds out that he stole and hid things from his little sister so that she would get beaten for losing her toys.

And he sort of sits there stunned for a little while and he says, "I do that? No, I couldn't have done that. Yes, well, I guess I did do that." And, having arrived down at that level, then we get the withhold system being operated again, very strenuously and we get that thing gone over two or three times, he develops new material out of it and he gets his own overts out of the thing, he gets disentangled and so forth. And then we test this What question. Does it still bang on the meter?

"What about stealing and hiding things? Bingo! See, still reads. All right, so we go back into our song and dance again and we get an earlier incident. And we find out Little Sister be damned, you see. As far as stealing things is concerned he used to steal bottles of milk at the age of eighteen months. And we actually have plowed memory back to that point.

The beauty of this is the withhold system, the When-All-Appear-Who system, has the power of opening up track. And it will open up more damn track, if you'll pardon my French, than any psychoanalyst ever hoped to see. And it's nothing to get somebody to remember at the age of eighteen months, see. Well, stealing and hiding things, he used to drive everybody nuts. He'd crawl across the floor and open up the icebox and he'd steal his own milk bottles out of the icebox. And he'd go around and he'd hide them all over the house. And there was nothing but sour milk being poured all over the house. And this turns out to be an overt against himself in some fashion, an overt against his mother, an overt against everybody in sight, don't you see. And it finally – we picked up the icebox, he finally tried to do this all over again, you see, because he'd just got through stealing an icebox, see? But now we find out what he was stealing out of the icebox, you see and that happened at the age of eighteen months.

And there'll be some wild and extraordinary curve on this one, too, somehow or another. There'll be some kind of a starvation terror. Has to do with his ulcers or something like this. We get that thing all worked out, we work that out again and then we test this question, "What about stealing and hiding things?" And we find out it is dreadfully flat now. There is nothing left in it. It hasn't got a click to its name at a very high sensitivity and so we get the middle rudiments in, zing-zing-zing! "In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" Boom. We get those in and then we read the What question again. And maybe there's a little tick on it, on the What question. And the pc says, "Well, I – uh – one thing I – I – I didn't tell you, I – I didn't tell you," he says, "Uh – I actually, uh – steal sour milk. Heh-heh," you know or something like that.

Just ask the What question – flat. That's the end. That's all. That's all there is. That's even a chain.

So, we go back to the Zero Question now. And we look down the throat of the Zero Question and we say, "Have you ever stolen anything?"

Now, if the Zero Question reacts we do exactly as we did before: we get an overt and we go on and we do everything for him. And we'll find this time we're on an entirely different chain.

We keep that cycle up until there's nothing left of that Zero Question. And then we go to the next Zero on the list, regardless of what it is. "Have you ever raped anybody? Have you ever eaten waterbuck?" you know? Doesn't matter what the Zero Question is. And we work it the same way.

Now, we're not necessarily looking for fantastic amounts of crime. We're not looking for quality. And we certainly are not looking for sordidity. You can very often find pcs who have read a book by Freud and – or comic books or anything – and they've read these things and they've got an idea that if they recall certain types of incidents, which they make up and say enough about it and fill in enough words, somehow or another something marvelous will happen to them. And you never fail to find somebody who's been psychoanalyzed, trying to apply the formula of psychoana – analysis, you see, to clean up a chain or something like this. And man, in that particular case, when you find this, man, you better tackle those middle – the middle rudiments with those beginning of the end rudiments. You know, the half-truth, un-truth? Otherwise you're mucked up all the time. So just add the half-truth thing to your middle rudiments and spit out that four-way one.

And they'll try to give you all sorts of very sordid, down-to-earth modern literature-type chains that haven't got a single thing to do with their overt. Now, it is so much so that you can assume that if you were to tear into a case without an arbitrary standard, such as a list of Zero Questions, that the case will present to you the least aberrated chain. The case will inevitably give you the least aberrated chain, which is best known to them. And if released, will produce the least possible change in their case. This you're sure of. Because that chain is safe. And the pc is always for security. Good roads, good weather and security and no bank turned over and we will be all set. See, what he'll give you – he'll give you something that he has already made up his mind is aberrative.

Now, if he's made up his mind about it, he knows about it. And therefore, so help me Pete, it probably has very little to do with his case. And there's where you get sucked in on Prepchecking and sent over the falls. If you sit there and the pc, "All right, now what have you – what..." If you approached it – if you approached this: "Well, what do you think is wrong with your case? What overt have you done in life that have affected you or influenced your life most singularly?"

"Oh," the pc would say, "I – I – I think it's all the – all the terrible things I have done on the second dynamic."

Now, you could approach it just like that, see. You know, "What do you think is wrong with your life?"

"What I think is wrong with my life is this series of overts."

Just – you could take your meter right at that moment and say, "Have you ever palmed this off on any other auditor?" "Has anybody ever tried to clear this up in Sec Checking" "Has anybody. ..." – "Have you ever persuaded anybody to audit this with repetitive processes?" see, here we go, man. This is Brahms, "a la preclear." It has absolutely nothing to do with the pc's case.

Therefore, I very earnestly recommend to you, lists of arbitrary questions. "Have you ever stolen anything?" "Have you ever raped anybody?" "Have you ever shot anybody?" "Have you ever fiddled the company's books?" I don't care what it is. You go right on down the line and you just take what falls. And you could actually prepcheck the rudiments. Use those as Zero Questions. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" *Blang!* "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" Set that up as a Prepcheck and you'll get someplace there, too. You can also set up any type of activity, such as finding goals or auditing. Well, as far as that's concerned, you know the fellow's driving buses. As long as he doesn't tell you what's wrong with him is because he drives a bus, you're always at perfect liberty to pick up driving buses, see? "Have you ever – have you ever sinned in buses?" see.

The trouble with you is your sales resistance is low. That's the main trouble with you where the pc is concerned. The pc gives you the most interesting story you ever heard in your life as what is wrong with the pc. "I've just told auditor after auditor about this and they've handled it, but they've ARC broke me so much that I really have never been able to really handle this adequately, but if I ever really got this handled adequately, then I know then, that everything would be ..." oh, let's play it on Nero's violin. It sounds so much better. He *knows* about it, therefore it isn't what's wrong with him. See, it is the *unknownness* that makes it wrong.

So of course, if you can open up some chain that the pc has never gone "ulp" on, why man, you're going to tear up track in all directions and the pc's going to say, "*ooh!*" Pc's got ulcers, he knows what caused his ulcers. It was being rammed in the stomach with a pogo stick at the age of six. You could say to him, "How many people have you told this to, pc?"

"Oh, just most every ..."

It – you always get taken in on the idea that you're the first one, you know, that he's ever told this to. You've got a virgin complex or something. [laughter, laughs] He's told doctors and his mother and his sisters and his brothers and his last three auditors, all about this pogo stick, see. Well, look at the evidence. Look, he's told about it often enough to have run it out long since. Well, you can't say that, well, it's just held in place by something else. You can't say that. If he got that close to it, that it was the pogo stick, if he just got that close to it, he wouldn't have ulcers. Because it's almost impossible to maintain an aberration.

How people keep their Goals Problem Mass balanced is the – is the glory of all time. You know? There's supposed to be certain rocks in the world that hang up on the tops of mountains at very delicate balances, you see. And man, that's nothing compared to the GPMs.

Well, similarly, an aberration has a hell of a time being maintained. You hit the thing and it'll slip. So, let me tell you, that if it is as advertised, it ain't. [laughter] So you don't pay

any attention to it. That means you – that doesn't mean that you never pay any attention to what the pc is telling you. But as far as – oh, yes, always pay attention to what the pc's telling you – but you get him telling you about things that you want him to talk about, not that he wants to talk about, you see. And you – the balance and the delicacy of auditing is getting the person to talk to you about things that he doesn't know he should have talked to you about, preventing him from rambling on about things that won't increase the stature of any session and he doesn't find out about it. He doesn't realize how thoroughly he's being steered. Now, that's the delicacy of auditing.

Some people can jump in onto the seat of the fire truck and open the sirens wide open, you know, go dashing around the corner and so forth. And the pc almost inevitably knows he's being taken for a ride, you see? Now, the adroit auditor, who's very straightforward and doing his stuff very well, actually does have the pc going down the road and driving. The pc knows he's driving. They're going down the road at a hell of a rate of speed. And the pc thinks it's all his own idea. And the pc starts to go up the wrong road, starts to turn to the left, you see and the auditor has him turn to the right and the pc never notices. He just goes right on with the story, he just goes right on down the line and he's – that's it, that's the way it is.

Naturally, he'll tend to bounce off of things that are aberrative. He doesn't like to confront them. They are not as-ised, so therefore he hasn't confronted them, so the probability is, is he doesn't want to confront them. Well, you don't get any place by forcing him to confront something. You've got to let him discover he is confronting something. There he is standing there and he says, "Well, here's all these damn statues I made. Hey! Hey!" He says, "Hey! Hey! There's three statues here and they're actually of a beautiful model and so a-ha! Look at that! Heh, look, I put some black flat covers over them. Hah! That's pretty clever of me to find them again."

Man, you've been heading him down corridors and beating him over the head with a baseball bat every time he tried to dive out the window and you've finally moved him into this room, you know. And even had to put horse blinkers on him, you know, so he could only stare in one direction. And he found them. That's quite ideal, this session. Pc's very pleased with it all. Very often the pc suddenly looks at you after he's discovered them and realizes, "Hey! How'd you know these were there? These are – this is pretty clever of you," see? Well actually, you always look clever when you use a standard Prepcheck, Model Session, steer the pc into the chain, that sort of thing. You always look clever to the pc. Sooner or later he begins to realize that you know where you're going.

Well, you know where you're going because you're traveling on a series of fundamentals. You're only trying to pull up the basic on a chain of incidents which were wrong conducts on the pc's part. And he knows they're wrong conducts and therefore he's got these things buried. And you don't want to make the pc guilty or something like that, but you really hit pay dirt on one of these things. You can't – you can't have it good all the time. But you sometimes ... My God, there'll be an incident within the last year and the pc, "I stole a car last June! You know, I ... What the hell? I – I didn't remember it till just this minute. I'd never thought about it! Wow! Gee. Hey." He's found something. There was something lived there that he – been haunting him for some time, because it wasn't the car he stole in June. The top

of the chain is closed off. How hot do you suppose that chain is, huh? Boy, that chain's as hot as skyrockets. The top of the chain is gone. Most people know the tops of the chains.

"Aw," they say, "Yes, I have this peculiar, peculiar penchant, I – I borrow money from my friends and don't pay it back," and so on. "I – I know that's what's wrong with me. I know I do that."

You've said, "Have you ever borrowed any money and not paid it back?" Some Zero, you see. "Oh yeah, I – well, I – I do that, yeah, I know I do that."

And you say, "All right, well ..."

He says, "I just – I just borrowed – borrowed some money just the other day" and so forth, "and I didn't intend to pay it back. Yeah, I know all about that."

See, they know the last one. You ask them again, "All right, have you ever borrowed any money and not paid it back?" and it goes, clang! And you say, "Well, any earlier times this happened?"

"Well, yeah. Yeah, you know, there are – there are quite a few." And he starts reeling them off and so forth. "And the first time I ever did it was when I was twenty-five."

Maybe so, man. That's the earliest time, that's the earliest we can get him back to, so we run that particular crime and incident. And what do you know, it might blow the chain, too, but, probably it'll not. And we finally get the thing back. We've opened up track he didn't know a thing about. And that's when you're really getting someplace.

Now, a Prepcheck that is terribly successful usually runs as a short story of this particular character: The guy's been doing something he knows is wrong. He can't account for it. He's got a lot of motivators, people do things to him on this particular subject. This worries him. And you run back down the chain of doingness of these things – it's always what has the pc done, you see, it's not what has been done to the pc. You never buy anything that's been done to the pc. Nothing has ever happened to the pc in Prepchecking we don't care if the car flew around and cut his head off, nothing happened to the pc. You understand that this as unreasonable as that sounds, that's how it has to operate. You let a pc give you a lot of motivators, his needle will dirty up. It's a bum thing to let the pc give you motivators. He's pulling in circuitry.

And, you start charging down the line here. This pc – and he didn't know what it was doing and so forth. And he's opening up track. And then we all of a sudden get to – we get to something that he's always thought of as a motivator. This is quite common. He's always thought of this as the motivator, you see. He's thought about this fellow who threw his tricycle downstairs. And that was a pretty terrible thing, to throw his tricycle downstairs. He remembers this. He remembers this. It's always stood out in his mind, you see, throwing that tricycle downstairs.

And there's something goes just before this which gives a *volte-vis* and a reverse that would make O. Henry green with envy. It's got a short story twist on it at the beginning of the chain. It'll be something on the order of: it turns out that it wasn't his tricycle being thrown downstairs, it's his young friend's tricycle being thrown downstairs – after he threw the young

friend downstairs, you see? And it sort of turns out that it wasn't the young friend who threw the tricycle downstairs – it all got kind of mixed up, actually. But it was he who threw the tricycle downstairs so it landed on *top* of the young friend! And he thinks this is all fine, but it's still kind of active on the needle. And then we find out that he's convinced his mother and his young friend's mother that his young friend had done it!

And this will all be sort of obscured at the bottom of the chain. And he gets this all straight and all of a sudden the thing goes *zzzpp*.

You'll find out that it's characteristic of a very thoroughly aberrated chain, that the incidents are all in juxtaposition. The later ones are always earlier and the earlier ones are always later and it's all mixed up and it's one of the symptoms of the thing – the pc starts to straighten out and keeps saying, "Oh, well wait a minute! Wait a minute. Wait a – wait, wait, wait, wait, that was – that was the year before! That was – that was the year before." Well, this is – you know the track's straightening out and you're winning all the way, see. He never realized it was the year before, right up to that moment. He thought it was the year after.

See, he thought he went to the university and then joined the ambulance squad. But as a matter of fact he joined the ambulance squad and then went to the university. How he could lose this much detail from his life is quite a mystery, but they manage it on these chains. So that the time factor is all scrambled on these chains.

So when you say earlier and earlier, you sometimes get an answer from the pc which apparently is – oh very innocently – earlier in the pc's mind, but actually is much later. And it suddenly transpires that this was at the age of eight and he had already been down to the age of five. And all of a sudden he gets it back to eight and he finds the earlier incident of five.

Mixes in time is a good indicator. If you're on something hot, time will be mixed up on it.

As far as the earli-est is concerned, let the pc use that because the earli-est probably happened two hundred trillion years ago. And the earli-er only gets down to what you call basic.

You're normally dealing in these things with locks – Dianetics: *Modern Science of Mental Health* – you're dealing with locks. You're not interested in moments of pain and unconsciousness, you're interested in locks. And you're interested in only overts: Things that the pc has done to others; damage the pc himself has created or herself has created. A resurgence of responsibility happens as a result of these things. A lot of interesting things occur.

Of course, you realize that Prepchecking – Prepchecking is a method of straightening out the life of an individual, making him feel less harassed and haggard and a lot of things like that. But Prepchecking is not something that can be gone on with forever. You cannot forever prepcheck a pc. You will never clear a pc with Prepchecking. In fact, somewhere up in the hundreds of hours you would start to run into an increase of bank by reason of Prepchecking because you're off the pc's goal.

You see, a hundred hours of this – they'd go a long way, man. That'd go a long way – a hundred hours of Prepchecking. And you start taking it over – you're demanding things of it

which it won't do, which is to clear somebody and it won't clear anybody. But it'll straighten up somebody's life. It'll make them feel much happier and a lot of things will occur, highly beneficial. You'll get a smoother needle; you'll get practice in auditing and sessions. They suddenly realize that things can happen. They can talk to the auditor better and circuits key out and things. You get a lot smoother, but don't expect it to go the lot. Don't expect it to go the whole road because it won't.

It will do more than any psychotherapy system which has ever been developed on this planet for straightening out sanity. It will do more by a factor of maybe a thousand to one. It is fabulous from this point of view. If you were to walk into the field of psychoanalysis with a Prepcheck system and just to do Prepchecking in the field of psychoanalysis, my God! The people – their eyes – eyeballs would fall out and roll around the floor, you know? Because it would be for the first time that anybody dealing with memory had produced a lessening of insanity or neurosis on the part of the individual. In fact, there hasn't been any psychotherapy dealing with this lifetime and dealing with the various quirks and aberrations of human beings as they are recognized to exist or thought to exist by modern science, before Prepchecking. There was none.

So it's a – it's a kind of a first all by itself. Of course, the earliest forerunner of this was a very spotty sporadic, "If you did it, boy, was it wonderful. And if you didn't do it, wasn't it horrible?" You've – it was the Straightwire taught at 42 Aberdeen Road at Elizabeth, New Jersey. And you just remembered somebody who had the similar illness and spotted when it was and sometimes – most of the time it would blow and the guy would lose his unsimilarity with that individual and he'd break up the identification with the person. And it was quite remarkable when it worked. But you had to be awfully clever and it didn't work all the time. Well, this'll work all the time.

Now, what is it – what is it good for? Why is anybody teaching it to you in the first place and that sort of thing? No. It's a very good thing to know because you can straighten out an awful lot of things with human beings. Because it won't clear somebody don't underevaluate it, see. It'll sure make things smooth. And if you don't know how to prepcheck, you'll be stopped with a lot of cases. You'll just be stopped in your tracks because the needle will be so dirty. And you can smooth it out just so far with consistency, with Havingness, that sort of thing. It goes just so far and then it sort of hangs up. And the individual's got a lot of withholds and a lot of things from you and you can't quite get rid of them. And they give you the *same overts every session* and you know, recurring – recurring overts. They give them to you session after session after session – same overts.

And you'll wish to God you had something like Prepchecking to straighten out that pc and grab him up the last few rungs of the ladder to where you can run 3GA on him. That is actually the purpose of Prepchecking. But, of course, it has much wider horizons and applications than that.

And if you were to be a very clever auditor and did nothing but prepcheck people they would be – and did a very good job of Prepchecking – they'd fall around your neck and think you were solid magic. And if you are a good Prepchecker, of course, you are solid magic.

Thank you very much.

Rudiments

A lecture given on 28 June 1962

Thank you.

Well, is there anybody present who has their rudiments in?

Different voices from the audience: Yes.

Yeah? Yeah?

You look so sad about it! Okay. This is the what?

Audience: 28th.

Twenty-eight of June AD 12. I have absolutely nothing to talk to you about. You are all doing horribly. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course lecture number one.

You know what you're doing? You know if a – an E-Meter – this is a general talk about rudiments – much as I hate to mention it. If an E-Meter got any more sensitive, you wouldn't be able to control it. You're right up there at about zenith on the sensitivity of a meter of that type in a Mark IV. So, you haven't a prayer of doing anything about the – sensitizing the E-Meter to read more sensitively on the person because the electronics of the E-Meter have to be sensitized and the lightness of the needle have to be sensitized and that sort of thing, in order to get a more sensitive read.

So you can't go more sensitive on an E-Meter than sensitivity 16 on a Mark IV. The thing is going to fly around so much you won't even be able to keep it in the middle of the dial. You agree with that? It's already a little bit rough to keep it in the middle of the dial on sensitivity 16, because of course, as you deal with rather aberrated people the needle is fairly stiff. But as you move it on up the line to people who are not quite that aberrated, you still have to have the increased sensitivity to get the read. You won't know that the read grows less, the less aberrated the person is and the needle grows looser. Oh, isn't that horrible. The needle grows looser and the read grows less. So, I think to a very marked degree it's up to your TR 1.

Now, let me tell you exactly what happens on an E-Meter and why you have difficulty with rudiments, when you have difficulty with rudiments. Let us consider here an E-Meter on a totally ARC broken pc. It won't read. You see, that is a known condition. It won't read. But have you considered the gradient of this? And that is, the more ARC broken the pc is, the less the meter reads. Now, it should go by some other kind of a gradient, see? It should be that the more – the more the ARC break, why the greater the response of the needle. And this does not happen to be true. Actually the greater the out-rudiment, the less the needle response is. And that's the little hill you're walking up. And that's pretty grim.

All right. Now, let's apply this to a session. And we find that you very often find your second, third and fourth or your third and fourth of the beginning rudiments out. See? They're out when the needle – when the meter and the session are checked. When the session is checked, your rudiments are checked of the session by an Instructor or something like that, it's most commonly the later rudiments that are out rather than the earlier rudiments, right? Well, now why is this? It's because when you don't get a rudiment in, the later rudiments don't read well.

Now, sitting right up at the top of this is the room. An auditor can make a number of blunders and one of them is not checking what he's trying to put right. And that is a general blunder that gets you in more trouble than probably any other single action. You're trying to put right, "What about stealing ladies' boudoir tables?" See. So, you get the middle rudiments in and then you omit reading off and checking "What about stealing ladies' boudoir tables?"

If you have made this mistake two or three times and caught yourself at it, let me assure you, you will never make the mistake again. Because, after you've gotten the middle rudiments in on a What question, the What question very often is still hot. And, all you've got to do is leave a hot What question sitting there and your meter from then on is not as operative as it was before. Do you follow that? By the omission here of this What question, on checking it up and straightening it out, your meter becomes less operative. Now, that's quite, could be quite obvious you see when you apply it to a Prepcheck.

The pc says, "*Hm*, I can get away with this. *Hm*, out of session. *Hmm*, missed withhold. *Hmm*, ha-ha," see? "I didn't tell him at all about those ladies' boudoir tables I stole in Siam – ha-ha-ha-ha-ha." See? He might have told you up to the time when you didn't discover them and then you gratuitously inform him that the What question is clean. He says "What goes on here?" You see? Well, actually failure to check what you're straightening out before you do something else is the secret of inoperative meters in a session.

Now, you essay to get the havingness rudiment in right at the beginning, see? You essay to get this in. And how many of you run the Havingness like this – how many of you run it like this? "Is it all right – look around here and tell me if it is all right to audit in this room. That reads." Can squeeze test. "Put some beingness in that object, put some beingness in that object, put some beingness in that object." Can squeeze test. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

Ohhhhhhhh. You went in one door and you never left by that door. You never went back and said, "Look around here and tell me if it is all right to audit in this room," and read it on the meter. See, the omission of that step now starts throwing your remaining rudiments in the beginning rudiments out. Very simple.

Do you know that can squeeze is absolutely no guarantee of any kind that the pc is willing to be audited in that room? Did you – do you know about that? Well, that's a fact. Indicates exactly nothing, except his havingness is up, which was not the question, see. The question is, "Look around here and tell me if it is all right to audit in this room." You see how that omission there then starts the snowball of error.

Now, we say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And the pc has an answer but you don't ask for it. *Ohh*, so you say, "That's clean," and you go on to your next

rudiment. Oh, it's almost, why bother? See? This session is a dog's breakfast by this time. And sincerity of the auditor and the strain upon his face is absolutely no index of the degree the rudiment is in. A rudiment is in if it's in.

Now, you would be amazed how many answers the pc has, you'd be amazed how many answers the pc has he never gets a chance to give you. And every time he doesn't give you an answer, whether it is vital or not, you have a missed withhold. How many missed withholds make a session? That can get pretty grim.

Now, he only starts doing this, by the way, and the meter stops recording this after you've already flubbed. One flub on meter – metering the rudiments – begetteth a nonreadable meter. The more you flubbeth, the less you will getteth. See the dwindling spiral till finally the meter is totally inoperative and then it's all missed withholds from there on. You have nothing else but missed withholds.

Now, that's your – that's your difficulty with the meter. It isn't the sensitivity of the meter. It isn't that – so long as you are regarding a Mark IV – it isn't any other oddball action that you're taking. It's just that you failed to get a rudiment in and then the next rudiment is harder to read, doesn't read as much and then the next rudiment doesn't read at all, see? See, you didn't get one in at all, so the next one of course, you don't get all of that one in. And then you're going to get less of the next one in and you're going to get much less of the next one in. Then you get down to nulling goals or something, see, and you've got a – you've got an un-reading E-Meter.

So, you get your session all wound up in a ball. And you get, frankly get into a situation there where you've got the *non compos mentis* thing – it – I don't know – You'd do better if you just read the sparkle in the pc's eye as you said the goal, you see. You've driven him out of session.

Now, there might be several methods by which you could get rudiments in. The one which you are using at the present moment is simply to ask the pc the question, find a response, take whatever the pc says and then test the question on the meter. And if you find a response, take whatever the pc says and you test the question on the meter and if it is clean, you then leave it. That is the system which you are using at the moment.

Now, that system is perfectly adequate so long as you never miss. The frailty of the system is, missing. The pc's a little ARC broken, you haven't got anything going anyhow and you ask him a question, a rudiments question and then you don't get a response and you say the needle is clean and from there on you've had it. See? Now, that's the frailty of that system.

Now, here's another system, here's another system. Your patter would go this way: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? That reads. What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" Pc says, "So-and-so and so-and-so." And you say, "Thank you. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Do you agree that that is clean?" Now, that gets you off the hook slightly, see, and probably is a much smoother approach.

Now, here's an entirely different system which is the same system that used to be used on Sec Checking and it goes like this: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" You see, your meter is – you're not watching your meter. See? "Are you willing to talk to me

about your difficulties? Thank you." Whatever he says. Until he says, "No." And then you look at the meter and you say, "I will check that on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? That reads. What is it? That. That. That." He tells you. You say, "Thank you. Thank you. I will check that on the meter. There is *another* read here."

Listen, by the way, if I ever catch any of you or practical passing, "That still reads" as a statement, I'll have your thetan, because that's a wipeout of the statement of the pc and puts him on a stack of missed withholds. You mustn't ever say, "That still reads. That still reads. That still reads. That still reads." That's says *flunk, flunk, flunk, flunk*. See? What you should be saying is, "There's another read here" or some such statement, see? *Another* read and you notice it quite honestly. You've cleaned up the reads you got but now you have another read. So it's much more honest. And it makes the pc feel like at least he's gotten rid of part of it. Otherwise if you keep on saying, "It still reads. It still reads. It still reads," the pc feels like he hasn't said a word to you. And he blows up eventually.

All right. Now, your missed withhold problem doesn't arise there with this system for this excellent reason, is you've got the pc talking to the auditor about his case. So, therefore by asking the question without recourse to a meter and asking him the question without recourse to a meter and asking him the question without recourse to a meter until he says, "No," you now have him sufficiently in-session with you, you have him sufficiently in-session with you and of course the meter reads. You get the trickery of it? You'll always get a more fundamental read if you do that. And then you – but you'll have to steer because the one you find that time will be totally unknown to the pc. You've plumbed the bank, so you'll have to steer it.

You'll say, "There. There. That. That. That, what are you looking at there?" and he tells you.

"Oh, yes," he says and gives you the thing.

And you say, "Good."

See, there's another system.

That system has disadvantages particularly to an auditor who can't leave the middle rudiments alone. Some auditors have middle-rudimentosis. They null five goals and get in the middle rudiments and they null five more goals and get in the middle rudiments and they null five more goals and get the E-Meter over their head.

You know when you get in the middle rudiments? You only get in the middle rudiments when everything is null. You're getting no reads of any kind whatsoever on any goals. You know in reading goals you usually get a tick on the first one. See? It's when those first ticks are missing that you get in the middle ruds and then you go back to when they started to miss.

It's the first consecutive "X" is what you go back to. It's the rule of the first consecutive "X." In other words you get in your middle ruds when you don't get a read anymore. That's all. That's simple, isn't it? You're not going to go over several goals without getting a read. Let me assure you this is impossible unless the middle rudiments are out. You understand what I mean, don't you?

All right. Prepchecking, of course, it's preordained when you get the middle rudiments in on Prepchecking. You get the mid ruds on Prepchecking every time you flatten a What question. You get in the middle ruds and test the What question. That's when you use them on Prepchecking.

But in nulling of goals they are usually overused. The poor pc suddenly says, "You know, I've always wanted that goal," as the pc – as the auditor starts to read it. "Oh" the auditor says, "He's talking. God almighty. What are we going to do. It's terrible. Terrible. Send for the marines." And gets the middle withhold – the middle withholds in. [laughter] Your situation – your situation, of course, is ludicrous. There isn't any sense to it at all. You're getting reads on the meter, what more do you want?

Now, that a pc closes his eyes is not a good enough reason to get in middle rudiments. That a pc says something about his goal – now, listen – pc says something about the goals you're nulling, he says, "Oh, oh, I invalidated that one." Now, look there, that isn't a good enough reason to get in the middle.... Because look, he's interested in his own case, he's interested in his goal and he's talking to the auditor. You want to cure this situation? You can cure it. Just get your middle rudiments in every time he does it and you've cured it. It'll get grim in short order. So the pc *talks* about his goals. So he says something about his goals. So where's your TR 4! Don't park it under the chair, use it!

Now, your TR 4 is the only thing you greet that with and you keep right on going, man. You just keep right on going. Your TR 4 is *all* you use at this point. If you fail to use TR 4, you might find it necessary to put your middle rudiments in. You understand? See? You might find it necessary to use your middle ruds if you fail to acknowledge what the pc says. Because you're stacking up his missed withholds, you see, by the barrel load. He says, "Gosh," he says, "You know, I hope that one stays in, you know."

And you say, "To catch catfish. To catch – to catch catfish. To catch catfish."

And he says, "Uh – is that one still in?"

You say, "To run rum runners. To run rum runners. To run rum runners."

The pc says, "Where is this guy, where is he?" Don't be so afraid of a pc's comm. When a pc doesn't comm, that's the time to get worried. Not when a pc's talking, man, don't get worried about that. Don't ever worry about a pc talking to you about his own case, because that's the definition of in-session. That the pc is trying to hold his rudiments in, is not a good enough reason for you to put them in. Why Q-and-A?

He says, "Oh, oh, I think I suppressed that one."

You say, "Good. Thank you." And go on and read it. He's interested. What state do you want him in? Frozen disanimation?

No, that is not when you get in the middle ruds. You get in the middle rudiments after a What question and before testing it again, you prepcheck the middle ruds but in order to get a goals listing or anything else going, you do lots of use of the middle ruds here and there. But amongst them – amongst them is not introducing them extraneously to keep the pc from talking. And don't introduce them any oftener than is necessary. And in a goals nulling you actu-

ally only do it when you're getting blank-blank-blank, blank-blank-blank, blank-blank-blank, blank-blank-blank. Hold it. You look this over a minute and you haven't got a quiver on that meter. Your read disappeared. So you, you went blank-blank-blank. That's out. Blank-blank-blank. That's out. Blank-blank-blank. That's out. Blank-blank-blank. That's out. Hey wait a minute, this meter isn't talking. Now – now, let's just get in the middle rudiments. Get them good and clean. And then go back to the first consecutive "X." And that's, "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. That's in." Ha-ha. You notice after you get the middle ruds in that this thing will now start reading again.

It's very strange to read a goal three times without one of them ticking, you understand? It's a missingness of ticks that tell you when to get in the middle ruds on that.

Now, in listing you get in the middle rudiments when the guy simply says, "I can't think of another blessed thing." Now, I can give you the mechanical law that every time you change from one list to the next list you put in the middle rudiments and so forth. But it isn't any law. That is just an effort to give somebody something to do when he can't think. Truth of the matter is you put in the middle rudiments in listing only when your pc says, "That's it, there isn't another single one, not from here to Halifax and back again is there another one."

And you know damn well, this list, this particular list you're working on has lagged 110 behind the other 3 lists and man, you've got to get that list up there. So you just put in your middle ruds and you'll find he will go right on listing it up to 110. In other words you can boost listing with this thing. And the index then is the same as otherwise. Your pc isn't giving you any so you put in the middle ruds. Similarly with goals, pc says, "Well, that's it. We listed 65 goals and I have no other goals and I never thought of another goal and never in my life have I ever had another goal." And so forth. You put in the middle ruds and he gives you another 65. You see?

That's the use of the middle ruds. They're boosters. You use them to boost the E-Meter when it stops reading in nulling. You use them to boost the listing of goals or items. And to test the flatness of a What question in Prepchecking and that's the total extent of their use. You can overuse these things like crazy you know? So, a pc talks. I only – actually I – there is one other comment I would make. When the pc starts to snore I usually would think it was time I got the middle rudiments in. But of course – of course I might not put in the middle ruds. I might just kick him and go on nulling. Say, "Hey! Reveille!"

"Oh! What's that? What's that? Oh!"

"Okay. Sit back. Relax, but not quite so far." [laughs] And "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish," you know. Going to sleep isn't a good enough reason. Thinking about something else isn't a good enough reason. It's only when the meter stops reading.

You realize that a guy can be practically snoring and not even knowing what goals you're reading and your meter will still read. On that right goal, too. See? I've made test after test out of this thing and it has been phenomenal. The ones that are supposed to be in are in. You can check out somebody's goal with him practically asleep. See, you're dealing with the reactive bank, not the analytical mind anyway.

So, you can use middle ruds to drive the pc out of session. And of course, they will get harder and harder to get in, because it's a no-auditing situation. No auditing is occurring while middle ruds are being put in. So, therefore the system which I have just given you – the system which I have just given you of calling it off without looking at the meter and calling it off without looking at the meter, asking the question, "In this session have you suppressed anything?" You know, no meter, see. "In this session have you suppressed anything? Thank you. In this session have you suppressed anything? Thank you. In this session have you suppressed anything? Thank you. In this session have you suppressed anything?"

He says, "No."

You say, "All right. I'll check that on the meter." And you say, "In this session have you suppressed anything? That reads. What is it? That. That."

Be sure this time you have really walked him into the reactive bank. See? He isn't going to know. It was really why it went out. See? In other words you put him in-session before you do this. See, and it makes the meter read. That's the one you wanted anyhow.

But the other way to, you're not liable to get it unless he's very thoroughly in-session already and of course, why are you putting the middle ruds in is to get him in-session. And then you take up the next one, "In this session have you – in this session is there anything you invalidated? Thank you. In this session is there anything you've invalidated? Thank you. In this session is there anything you invalidated? Thank you."

And he says "No." Finally, "No." See? Now, this has a liability that he sometimes says "No," and then says "except." So you shouldn't be too quick on your uptake on that "No" you see. You know, get a really "No" before you go charging on.

This session – this action also has another liability to it. And that is, is he hasn't given you half the answers and you find yourself pinned to the meter running this against the meter – running this against the meter. Well, I'd only run two of them against the meter before I laid the meter aside and went back to my first system. Don't get yourself caught, in other words.

"In this session is there anything you've suppressed? Ah well, that reads. What was it? That. That. That. That. That." And he finally comes up with it. "I'll check that on the meter now. In this session is there anything you've suppressed? That. That. That. That. In this session is there anything you've suppressed? That. That. That."

Oh, to hell with it, man. Come on down to this level. See? Check it. Be happy to check it a couple of times. Check it even three times. Perfectly all right. But don't let yourself get pulled into the fourth, fifth and sixth. In other words, if these things are still hot, why, he's got some other answers. See? And just take it off the meter.

You probably won't get into that mess very often because it usually cleans on one or two. But you could get some kind of an endless mess going here. I foresee it. "In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Yeah, that read. Yes, what's that? That. That. That. That. All right. I'll check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you've suppressed? That. That. That. That. Thank you. I'll check that on the meter." See? "I'll check that on the meter. I'll check that on the meter." What are you doing, a Prepcheck in the middle of a session or something wild going on here? So, I'd tend to come off of it and just put the meter

aside and say, "In this session is there anything you've suppressed? Thank you. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Thank you."

And he finally says, "No, there isn't anything else."

And you say, "Good, I'll check that on the meter." And check it that time. It'll probably clean. Got the idea?

Otherwise you will run into latent thinks and again run into some missed withholds. You'll see how that is. Right after you've said, "That's clean," he'll think of several. Of course, you pull this reactive one and you can expect that if you pull one or two reactive ones, some others are going to fly into the air. You might even find it sensible only to check once before you go back to the repetitive treatment. That would depend on your experience and that's more than I know about it just now.

But in this system you for sure get the pc into session. I'm not particularly recommending this system to you. I'm not particularly recommending it, because it has a horrible liability when combined with senseless unneeded ruds. Now, if you want to blow a pc out of the water good and quick, use this system on the middle rudiments while finding a pc's goal or listing or something else, because of course it amounts to no auditing. Amounts to no auditing at all. So, maybe you could combine the two systems. "In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of? What was that? That. That. That. That. That. All right. Thank you very much. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish." See?

So, this system – this system I would believe you would find very valid in the beginning rudiments, rather invalid but usable on the middle rudiments and awfully time consuming on the end rudiments. I believe it's most favorably situated to the beginning rudiments and there is where I myself would use it. And I'd be sure everything was grooved.

But I wish to forward to your attention the fact that there is a problem there. I'm giving you these different systems and so forth of getting the rudiments in just because you might find them much more useful than the one which you are using. Now, it would be up to me to say well, that *is* the system but I'm not in a position to say there is an exclamatory is-ness in the handling of this. You want to get them in and perhaps an auditor's – this is the variance you see – an auditor's TR 1 is pretty shaky on this pc, not particularly shaky in general, but on this pc, the pc just never seems to get anything the auditor says. Well, let's groove it. You get the idea? You say, "All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about? Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?"

And he gets that and he gets that and he gets that and then he asks for his meter read and *bang!* He can make this pc read that way. See? He gets around these other difficulties.

Now, when you look at this you'll see that you have a very large number of pcs in terms of – types of pcs I should say – pcs are different one way or the other. But all pcs agree on certain fundamentals. And that is that auditing must take place. Auditing is scarce and it must take place and it must be effective.

Now, you use this type of system on middle rudiments, you're liable to have a pc biting your head off. "In this session is there anything you've suppressed? Thank you. In this session is there anything you've suppressed? Thank you. In this session is there anything you've suppressed? Thank you. All right. I'll check that on the meter."

God, you know, this is in the middle of goals nulling, you know, and he's coming right on down the line you know, he's going to get it and he sees the clock going tock-tock-tock-tock and session time running out so that one flattened all right. Nothing happened then. And then you say, "In this session is there anything you have invalidated?"

"No!" *Boom!* What happened, you know. Honest, the explosion will occur that fast. See, you're trying the man's temper. Or you got this girl, she was – know exactly where she was going, you see – knew exactly where she was going. They were going to get down and get them all at least nulled once you see, this session, and all of a sudden she's sitting there looking at the auditor and the auditor's saying, "In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Thank you." And she notices the auditor isn't looking at the meter. Maybe she was not aware of having her rudiments out. And maybe the auditor has injected a missed withhold into the situation all on his own.

He was doing the middle rudiments because the pc had dropped one can down to his side and it was sort of trembling as it hit the chair. See? And instead of saying, "God damn it, pick up that can and put it face up on the table where it – so I can read this meter," the auditor goes into middle rudiments, see? That's not doing what is happening, see? Doesn't give the pc a direct order but tries to use the middle ruds to get around giving the pc a direct order about something, don't you see?

The – the pc keeps scratching his nose with the can. You know? Try to read a goal while he's doing that. Well, it'd be no good whatsoever getting in the middle rudiments because not one of them is, "In this session, have you scratched your nose with a can?" I mean it is not one of the middle rudiments. You just say to him in no uncertain terms, "Put your hands in your lap and stop fiddling with that can and we will get done a lot quicker here."

And he'll be all for that. "Oh, oh, yeah, oh, oh, yeah." [laughter, laughs] Very cheery.

In other words, there is a point where rudiments waste session time. You exceed this point and you don't *gain* from the rudiments but start *losing*. In other words, up to a certain point getting the rudiments in make your meter read *better* and then beyond that point, makes your meter read *worse*. And that has a lot to do with how much auditing time is being consumed which is the weakness of this repetitive command system.

So this repetitive command system would be absolutely wonderful and I recommend it *thoroughly* for getting in the rudiments on somebody who is very nervy and who is only receiving anyhow a rudiments havingness session. And I'd run it – beginning ruds, middle ruds, end ruds – I'd run them all the same way, see? Crowd it to it. Because what is it? You're trying to get his needle smoothed out and get his rudiments in and get some Havingness run.

All right. Prepchecking, Prepchecking, I'd run beginning rudiments, I'd grind them out man. I'd grind them out but good. You know, repetitive question you know and so forth. Get those beginning rudiments really in on Prepchecking. Take your middle rudiments and give

those a lick and a promise after the What question, but make sure they're in. See? But just the packaged read. End rudiments, just knock them off, packaged read. See? Not give a lot of stress and strain to them. Well, you can do that with a Prepcheck session because you're releasing withholds all the time and the session is interesting to the pc.

Now, do you realize that a Routine 3 is a different sort of auditing? Routine 3 is actually not as interesting to the pc. Did you really realize that? Basically it's not as interesting to the pc as Prepchecking. It's not getting into something he remembers vividly. It's going somewhere else. It's not as interesting.

Oh yes, it's very interesting to him writing his goals. He's happy to write down his goals. He's very interested in that. But beyond that point it is merely anxious. You see there's a difference. Pc with his list being nulled all the way down, he's much less interested than anxious. You know the last half of that list of that – of that nulling. You know? Man, he, he, "What's the goal going to be?" you know. "What's the goal going to be? Or is it all going to go null? Or wha – wha – wha – what's going to happen?" You see.

He actually realizes, basically, that his whole life is hung on this thing by the proverbial thread. He reactively knows he's going for broke right here. He knows that this is an important action. And he responds to the importance of the action, not the interest of the action. It's terribly important, oh yes, yes. You muff this one for him, the next few trillennia he's right in the same mud he's in, but worse. You get this one – he's free as a bird. And down below consciousness he really knows this. See? So frankly, frankly he's not as interested as he is anxious. See? There's a point where interest boils over and he's usually in that state.

Now, a pc therefore has to be pretty smoothed down before you start Goals Assessment and start the rest of this sort of thing. And if you have to use an extraordinary method of getting in or keeping in the rudiments, I would say he wasn't ready for Routine 3 because he's going to get far too anxious. He's going to explode far too heavily. He's going to be all a quiver here because one, he's doing something which is very nervy anyhow and the other side of the thing, he doesn't have any confidence in his auditor.

While he's being anxious – it's something like – something like the fellow's ride – finds himself riding on a train and suddenly sees the engineer and fireman walking back down the aisle, while they're going through the mountains and the train is accelerating, you know? What are they doing here? You know. He gets nervy. He wants to know that auditor is sitting there in the driver's seat, man. He wants to know that this is going and he wants to know it's going as fast as possible and he knows damn well it's liable to go wrong and it's too good to be true anyhow.

See, he doesn't express it to you and he really doesn't understand it analytically himself. But he's been sitting in this cage. This cage has been pushed around from head to head, more or less randomly for some time. And it has various inhibitions and so forth. And he has long since realized that nobody could get out of this cage, you see? He's long since realized this. And he's habituated himself to it. And he's reconciled himself to it. And he believes in God and all that.

And then he's got himself perfectly schooled and then by God the padlock begins to rattle. Oh my God! That padlock hasn't rattled – that padlock, that damn padlock hasn't rattled

for the last eighty trillion years! He thought it rattled once about eighty trillion years ago, but that's the last time. Is somebody really going to open that thing up? You know. And what you're looking at there is a sort of an incipient prison break the guy can't quite believe in. [laughter, laughs] And even though he doesn't understand this analytically, it's there or its impulse.

So, frankly, in a Routine 3 session especially, you can drive your rudiments out, out, out, out, out, by not doing the job. If you can imagine the fellow on the outside of this cage. The fellow doesn't hear the lock rattling now. No padlock rattling. And he listens, you know. He finally peeks through the keyhole and sees the bird is now polishing up the bars on the other side of the building which has nothing to do with letting him out. And frankly he is liable to become hysterical. He frankly does. He's liable to become hysterical. Sees the auditor there, polishing up stonework and so forth, doesn't have anything to do with him. See? Auditor's saying, well, so on.

You could imagine what would happen. You get the guy up threequarters of the way to getting the goal and then start to take your E-Meter apart. [laughter] That's cruelty. See? Sheer cruelty, sadism. And actually you can run middle ruds and Q-and-A and do a lot of indefinite things and so forth. All of a sudden the guy is just saying, "I knew it couldn't be true, I knew it couldn't be true. But still it's really got to be true," and he responds accordingly. Then all of a sudden rudiments, hell. The mechanics of the mind simmer down to a jail break that is going to go wrong. And he starts to control the session and try to do all sorts of wild things, don't you see?

So the auditor on a Routine 3 session has got to sit there and drive pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. The more time he wastes, why, the worse off it is, see? Now, he has to balance this sensibly within himself. This he has to balance within himself as an auditor. At what point does he start to drive rudiments out by trying to get them in? At what point does he do this? And therefore it is not even vaguely recommended that this repetitive syste Too time consuming. Takes twenty to twenty-five minutes to get through the beginning rudiments. *Ooooo!* That's a long time. And the pc will begin to respond to this as being a long time. And he won't like it.

Now, theoretically the pc has been audited up to a point where he can stay in-session anyhow before he's doing R3 and therefore if you went into too much weighting of the rudiments, gave him far too much importance you see, why he starts to drive them out himself. You'll see this. The first time you put in the middle rudiments they go in easy. The next time you put in the middle rudiments they go in harder. The next time you put in the middle rudiments, God, he's got a dozen answers, see? You'll see this. You're just putting in the middle ruds too often.

It's the amount of progress made which is the total measure of Routine 3. Actually it's in Prepchecking Routine 2-type – well, not Routine 2 but Class II-type processes – it's the amount of stuff dug up that he didn't remember, that is the index. And all that's kind of cute and interesting and he actually, a lot of time, doesn't even connect it to feeling better or something like that. But not this other, see? He's willing to play the game on Class II but when you get into these Routine 3 processes you're in a different operating mental climate. So therefore,

you could find a present time problem. Oh, just imagine you get this guy – you get this guy and he's been listing and he's been listing on his goal and he's listed up to the line and three days ago he had a free needle and he hasn't had one since. And there's a whole bunch of stuff that is coming up and things are going *boom*, life is getting rather interesting. But he all of a sudden realizes now that this stuff is actually going to come off of him.

And you take him right at that time and then start him into the next session and find a present time problem and in that present time problem start to run, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" Your pc's going to blow up. That problem is going to get worse and worse, it's going to go deeper and deeper in and the rudiments going to go further and further out and there hardly will be anything you can do about it. In other words what you're running into is the pc's goal is being alter-ised. And the whole session becomes a GPM all on its lonesome, see. You understand? GPM, he depend upon goal. When goal, she alter-ised, you get a mass. Well, the session isn't a mess, it's a mass. There's where it goes.

Now, these are the things, just speaking sensibly about this whole thing, it's a lovely thing to be able to lay down rote, you see – and to a large degree we can. I can – and get this thing squared away and so on. That's lovely. But there is a point, there is a point when you can get in the road of your own feet on this sort of thing. And you never want to falsify the fact that it is clean when it is not, and so forth. But you can handle it in such a way that whereas it might be out, the pc isn't told that it is in, see?

Let's suppose that the pc always has latent answers to it after you said it's clean. Now, I'll give you another phrase that you can use with great usefulness. You see, it was clean, you see, you noticed it was clean. "We have the significant withholds off of that" see. Or "That is clean of important answers." You get the type of phraseology, you see. Now, it could go this far. "At least we have the reactive answers off of it" see? Now, understand me there is no pattern for saying it is clean and it reads and so forth. Now, somebody can come along and tell you that this is the way you should call it. But let me tell you that the statement, "It is clean" is an awfully broad statement and it might not apply to your pc and it might be driving him out of session. Savvy?

So, you should say there, at that point, that you indicate to the preclear that you have not had a needle response. Now, that is technically exact. That is what you do. "Are you willing – are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" So forth. "Now, are you willing to talk to me about your difficulty?" Now, we say – if we say, "That's clean" he can still think of three or four things you see, that he's really not willing to talk to you about.

Now, if I were heading along on Routine 3 or something I'd be far more prone to say, "Well, we got the worst of that off, let's go on to the next one."

The thing was clean as a wolf's tooth and I wouldn't say anything about it at all if I didn't have any read on it. But I absolutely would *not* count on the fact that if it [didn't] read, the pc hadn't thought of anything. Pc thought of something – it wasn't significant – but he thought of it and then the fact you tell him he hasn't thought of anything – you see? That's the phraseology which becomes dangerous.

So, the exact proper phrasing of that must answer this exact definition, that the thing has not read although he may still be thinking of something, you haven't got anything reactive enough to stop the session at this point to take it up. See, you'd – you'd only say that when it was clean as a wolf's tooth. See, you'd clean it up – you'd get all the reads you could off of this thing you see? Then you say to him, "Well, that's good enough for the minute."

"Oh, do I have another one on there?"

"Oh, you've probably thought of some more things but there isn't anything registering on here that will hold up the session."

"Well, I thought you were a dog last night, wouldn't that hold up the session?"

"Apparently not, here's the next rudiment." [laughs]

And the guy will say, "Oh! I can still think of things and if they don't register on the meter then I necess- haven't necessarily thought about the things reactively so therefore they wouldn't impede the session because I'm not obsessed with them." And you'll have somebody coming in with a big theory. You'll have this all worked out.

"There's certain types of responses," somebody will say to you, "which are important and certain types which are not. Now, I sit here thinking all the time, you're a dog, you're a dog, you're a dog, you're a dog and you've never considered that an important response." If it – if it has rudiments in mind I don't mind saying to the – something, "You're quite right, has no bearing on the session."

Evaluation. Meter has never picked it up. Well, I don't want the meter to pick it up, for God's sakes. Every session we're going to clear off three thousand "you're a dog"s. This doesn't give you carte blanche to evaluate for the pc, but if you're going to make an evaluative statement the rule is – make an accurate one. [laughter] When you say, "That's clean" and it compares to "You haven't thought about anything either" that won't go down, see? But you can make it go down. You say, "That's clean enough to go on now." You see?

There's a lot of things which you can do with this and you'll find out this is normally true. You can make a session hang up, you can make a session hang up by letting the pc think of a lot of answers to a rudiments question which have not registered on the meter. One of the reasons they haven't registered on the meter is that they're not reactive. See, he's just thinking, "Mmmmmmm-mmmmmmm-mmmmmmm, the auditor mmmmmmm-mmmmmmm, I don't know maybe I shouldn't tell him about Gertrude, shouldn't tell him about Gertrude, I don't know whether I'm willing to talk about Gertrude or not."

The auditor says – has just said, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" you see?

And he says, "Oh, I don't know, I should – oh, I don't know...."

The auditor says, "That's clean."

He says, "That's clean? Hell I was just thinking about Gertrude and she's filthy." [laughter] "Doesn't sound clean to me." He'll get real upset about the meter.

But if you say to him, he's saying, "Well, Gertrude, Gertrude, I don't want to tell him about Gertrude, he's asking me what do I want to tell him about Gertrude, I don't want to tell him about Gertrude."

And you say, "Well, we've got the reactive responses off of it anyway."

"Oh, what I'm thinking here doesn't have any reactive responses, so what."

Let it go. You've created a different atmosphere. If you're going to say something evaluative, why be sure it's correct. And as far as telling people if the rudiment is clean or the rudiment is not clean and the rudiment is still reading or something like that, if you're going to, don't tell them in such a way as to hang them with a missed withhold. And that's the basic rule on that. And if you're trying to get the rudiments in on somebody and get up his confidence for the first time do it the long way around and if your pc's at the other end of the line and trying to come down the line with his goal and Clear and so forth, you make it brief. And those are the basic laws that have – influence rudiments.

And the other thing is simply that if you get one out and then you don't do – you see, you get one rudiment out, the next successive rudiments are going to have a less responsive meter. And then you run from there into trouble. So, be thorough and be fast and be accurate and – but basically what are you trying to do? With the rudiments and Havingness sessions you're trying to clean up the needle, you're trying to continue the cleaning up of the needle, bring about more confidence in auditing with the Prepcheck activities and you're trying to bring a nice clean needle that doesn't have ticks and tocks on it up to Routine 3, get the fellow's goal in the least possible length of time and then list it out on four lists to a free needle and find the next goal and here we go. That is exactly what we're trying to do.

And you, of course, could be so formalized in trying to approach this situation that you keep driving madly to Canada to arrive in Mexico. And you keep saying, "Well, we just never get to the point of clearing this fellow, you see, because we actually haven't finished the Prepcheck formula rote x-y-z-k," you see. And you look at the fellow's needle, it's clean. Well, if this fellow becomes aware of this you know his needle starts to dirty up on irrelevant auditing thereafter. He gets to certain zones where he deteriorates as a case, merely because he knows where you're going. That's only if he knows where you're going.

These things will all be – got to be kept in mind by an auditor. An auditor is trying to clear somebody, his aim and goal. My aim and goal is trying to train people so they can clear people and get the people cleared at the same time. In this particular unit that takes a little bit of doing but we are doing it and we are succeeding and you may not have looked around lately but clearing is probably swinging in under the 250-hour mark now for the whole ruddy lot. And that's getting down there within finite ranges.

And we have put the dynamite to several cases that were historic with Routine 3GA and those cases to begin with had such dirty needles that the Phoenix laundry would have rejected them. So, we're not anyways unconfident of what we're doing. It is just the ease with which we get it done.

I give you as much rote and formula as I can't pound sense into your 'eads. That's the truth of the matter. You have rote and formula which get you beyond and past points that re-

quire very good judgment. Now, up to a certain degree I use rote and formula. I use things like Model Session and rudiments and meters and standardized types of sessions and this sort of thing and don't vary from these. But actually that isn't just a rote for the sake of rote, that's something that's been built over the years.

But you can get some parts of your parts mixed up in slowing the pc down and after that, why, you're in trouble. Then you wish this car only had two wheels because it could only blow out twice. You see? Whereas it's got four wheels and you get four blowouts before you get to the end. You get the idea?

This is no invitation to depart from standardized sessions, but it is an invitation to understand what you're doing and to be sensible about the use of your tools and to recognize what this thing called an E-Meter is and how your rudiments behave under it. There is no constancy of read to an E-Meter. Your E-Meter reads to the degree that your TR 1 is good and your pc is not ARC broke with you.

Fortunately we have a meter that has quite a bit of tolerance on that. But it can't go all the way, it won't give commands and it won't restrain an ARC break by simply leaping off and giving a confidential, pastor-like talk to the pc. It won't do any of these things so you just have to realize what your tools are. Okay? All right.

Thank you.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: CCHs, NULLING GOALS

A lecture given on 28 June 1962

Okay. This is the second lecture, 28 June AD 12. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Questions. *Qué* questions do you 'ave? Yes, Ian.

Male voice: Ron, if the – if a person is ready for 3GA when you've got a nice, clean, free needle – smooth needle, you can read instantly and directly, and if rudiments and havingness of the CCHs will do that, if you're auditing outside, not from the point of view of us training here, but if you're auditing someone outside, would you need to bother about the Prepchecking stage?

There is this possibility, Ian. Would you – would you need to do this outside if a person had a nice, free, clean needle? There's this possibility: that a person is at your mockery level, see? Reading at 2 for a girl, 3 for a man. Needle appears to be not really free but, you know, it's not jerky or anything. You've got the unfortunate fact in such a case of just nowhere. See, you – you've got just a big beautiful nowhere as far as this case is concerned. And this case is going to rise up into trouble. This case is described in *E-Meter Essentials*.

Now, if the case were not of that type, you would at least – you would at least have to run, some Model Sessions and Havingness sessions to give him some kind of an idea of what auditing was, you see? They would – they would need to have a little bit of certainty grooved here, because this factor of anxiety is going to rise in this case. And remember if auditing was a total unknown to this person, this person wouldn't have a clue.

It would be best policy on any case to run a rudiments-Havingness session on the case. Find his Havingness Process. Run a Prepcheck-type session even if it were only grooved in the direction of goals, don't you see? Give him some idea of that. And then get firing on his goals list, yes.

Does that answer your question?

Male voice: Yes.

Good. A certain sensibility is offered in this. But remember there can be this other case, this one that's described in *E-Meter Essentials*. The dead thetan case. And, boy, that one would blow up in your face. That one would really explode. You would have more trouble than you could shake a stick at if you started to do a 3GA on this case because the case is, of course, not even vaguely anywhere. They're merely calm. Okay? All right.

Yes, Jean?

Female voice: CCHs. Can you tell us something more about the method we had on CCHs?

CCHs. Can I tell you more about the what?

Female voice: The method we had on CCHs.

The method?

Female voice: The new method of not taking up physical originations but just asking the pc, "How are you doing?"

That's not a new method. Somebody invented a method. The CCHs are a fruitful source of invention. [laughter] And they are what they are. And those of you that watched me do the demonstration that night when I was running the CCHs on Suzie, remember you didn't hear very much about calling off what she was supposed to notice, you just heard a lot of – of "How are you feeling? How's it going?" and so forth, "How are you doing?" You know, this kind of comment. And then somebody came along, apparently – I don't know who it was around here, and I didn't find out about it till a couple of days ago – and they started asking – a person's eye would twitch and they would say, "Did you notice that eye twitch?" and so forth. And they were using this as a method and it got to be quite a method.

But actually, let's look at it compared with the Auditor's Code. Of course, it's an evaluation. We have noticed the eye twitch and we're forcing the person to notice an eye twitch. And the whole trick is, is let's get the guy to look; and we'll find that if he looks he will exteriorize from that particular somatic. That's what we're trying to do.

And this is a very deft, very, very delicate action that the auditor undertakes. And you start using mechanical sledgehammer type actions on it and it'll fold up. All of a sudden the pc doesn't get better. The pc does a physical origination, he starts going this way, you know, and you just ask him, "What's happening?" But that's as far as you can go with evaluation. You just say, "What's happening?"

And he says, "What's happening? Oh! Yeah, yeah, thanks, ha!" And he maybe doesn't even say anything more. He sort of notices that something is going on. Because they will walk along somnolently without noticing anything is going on unless you stay in two-way communication with them. They put it all on automatic, see? And they start walking into a wound-up doll proposition, see? And they just go through motions and they never look at anything and they just go through this and they hope they will finish up at the end of two hours without dying or something. And they just fall rapidly out of session.

So the CCHs call for a physical origin – origination on the part of the pc because the CCHs are physical processes less than mental processes. See? And you count on the fact that he has originated something. Well, he does something, he makes a physical motion, he makes an error. He does this, he does that.

Now at this point, if you can bring him up to the point of observing as a live being not an automaton – see, you just get him to observe – why, he gradually will get better and better and better and better and better. It's quite – it's quite mysterious how rapidly he will improve.

But if you step over the borderline, see, an inch, and tell him he's got to observe – he won't. Then he feels bludgeoned. Then he feels banged around. And he just feels like he's picked on. Feels like he's being criticized for having an eye twitch and all that sort of thing. So it's a terribly delicate line and it's a very difficult one for an auditor to hew, actually. Sometimes the auditor finds that he has gone too far.

The old drill that best describes it is "Fishing a Cognition." And you just try to fish a cognition out of this fellow. And if you don't succeed, *violà*, you have not succeeded. And if you do succeed, *merveilleux*, we have succeeded. You just pays your money and takes your chance. And it's just on the basis of "Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you."

And the pc suddenly holds it back. And you just say, "What's the matter? What's going on?"

"Oh, I had a pain in the end of my hand."

And you say, "Good. Well, all right. All right now?"

"Oh, yeah, yeah. It's much better now." See.

And "Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you."

And he all of a sudden says, "B-z-z-z-z-z!"

And you say, "What's going on?"

"Ah," he says, "it stings."

And you say, "All right. Good. All right. Give me that hand. Thank you."

And then all of a sudden, why, he's giving you – he's giving you three, four of them and it's nice as purr and there's nothing going on of any kind whatsoever. Get the hell out of there, man. That's your – that's flat for all intents and purposes. That's actually everything that's going on.

Now an auditor, in his anxiety to make somebody well, often pushes somebody's teeth down his throat. And it all stems from just that fact; the auditor gets anxious to have a beneficial effect upon the pc and is liable to get impatient, see, and is liable to start pressing. And as soon as an auditor starts this he drives the pc out of session; he adds a note of anxiety to it all, a note of urgency, a note of impatience. And the pc is – attention has shifted over to the auditor.

Now, it's just those considerations which establish what you say. Actually it isn't any wording, see, it's just those considerations. You can say enough so as not to yank the pc's attention off onto the auditor, evaluate for the pc and tell the pc what is going on, you can do that. But basically, you want to keep the pc vaguely aware of an ARC condition with the auditor and also noticing what is happening. You can easily overstep that boundary. So there is no actual series of words which give this, because it'll vary from pc to pc.

I imagine some upstage character from Oxford would be terribly upset every time you said, "How you doing? How's it going?" and that sort of thing. You'd have to say, "I hope it's – I hope it's quite all right there, old chap."

That answer your question?

Female voice: Yes, it does. Thank you.

All right. What other question do we have? Yes?

Female voice: In the sessions as we have them here, Ron, if two things go on with goals listing, you see sometimes on the meter ...

Now, let me hear that again now. In the session?

Female voice: If two things go on in one room here, say in goals nulling...

Yes.

Female voice: ...so you see sometimes an odd read on the meter you're working on because it's sort of listening in. What can one do then instead of middle rudiments, to ask whether you are at the goals you are reading the pc and not the other one?[laughter]

She's talking about a pc hearing somebody else's goals and the meter responding to it.

Female voice: Maybe!

Well, I would say that your rudiments – your beginning rudiments, not your middle rudiments but your beginning rudiments – never went in.

Female voice: Uh-huh.

What are you doing having your pc respond to somebody else's voice?

Female voice: Yes.

Hey, you mustn't have your pc responding to somebody else's voice: That answers that.

Female voice: Uh-huh.

Now, of course, this demands of you much higher caliber in-sessionness than you would have out in the middle of the Sahara Desert in a soundproof room, see?

Female voice: Yeah?

Yeah. It demands much more in-sessionness.

Female voice: Uh-huh.

Now, if your pc's meter is going off reading on somebody else's goals, then your pc is not in-session to you.

Female voice: Reading odd, you see, it is sort of like picking up a word or something. It's sort of – of an oddity.

That's just what I mean. You're right with me. I'm answering the exact question you're asking. And that is to say, if your pc reads on a word mentioned by somebody else anywhere

in the vicinity and isn't reading exclusively on his auditor's voice, then that pc is not in-session to that auditor.

Female voice: Uh-huh.

That pc is in some sort of an auto-session. Or is in-session to this other person that has been auditing him three months ago, you see? Or something – something is wrong here.

Female voice: Yeah. What is it – what does one do then?

One gets the pc in-session. I'd wind that session up, *b-z-z-z-t*. And I'd give the pc a moment's break and I would start the next session and find out that four rudiments were well out.

Female voice: Ah.

Understand?

Female voice: Yes.

That is a very extreme condition that you're mentioning there. That is almost too extreme to be ...

Female voice: It's only sometimes happening Then it comes back again. But there's sometimes a moment when one is not quite sure.

Ah, pc isn't in-session. He's not interested in his own case. He's not willing to talk to his auditor. So, of course, he wants auditing so he picks it up from somebody else's goals list. [laughter]

I will comment on this, I will comment on this. Your in-sessionness at this particular moment here at this course is poor – is quite poor. I picked up pc after pc I've looked at in the last month or so and so forth, I have found them all floating on a sort of an auto-out-of-sessionness. And it used to show up in Sec Checking and Prepchecking. You ask them for a good, big overt, you know, well, they noticed a pin in their mother's boudoir or something.

And we actually did have this as an overt which an auditor managed a chain on. This – this one: they had thought of stealing a paper clip from a Central Organization, and this was the depth of sin and crime that the pc was willing to go into with that auditor. It wouldn't be safe to go any deeper than this. This one was particularly humorous because we have often used this as the ne plus ultra of a light auditing, acceptable overt, don't you see? That would be the screamer to end them all, you see. And actually somebody did come up with this; thought – their pc thought of stealing a paper clip from a Central Organization.

Now, that is all symptomatic of out-of-sessionness. That is all symptomatic of no-confidence. That is symptomatic of rough or wobbly Model Session. You see? Going past rudiments when they are still out, leaving them, you see. For instance, one of you the other day had the very, very bad luck of having the pc on the TV the other day when I stepped in here and there was just rudiment after rudiment after rudiment were giving quarter-of-a-dial drops and half-a-dial drops. In other words, the rudiments in that session were so wildly out that how could anybody have ever called it a session or never noticed it. So I thought it was

so bad that I got ahold of the student's E-Meter and checked his E-Meter. His E-Meter was all right.

But I had another pc in the last demonstration I gave you, Kay, and I noticed that she was pretty wildly out of session, and so forth, and finally had the auditor's meter checked and the meter was inoperative. I thought that was pretty interesting.

But this – you just have to learn to be so smooth and so predictable and have your pc under such control in a session that the pc just never would think of doing anything else than listening to and responding to what you were saying on your meter. Got it?

Female voice: Yes. Thank you very much.

You bet you. All right. Okay. Any other questions? Yes? All right.

Male voice: Ron, as a person hears Clear on 3GA, does the needle if it's – sorry, does the tone arm if it's down say at 2 and he's a male, will the needle free up and be a free needle and then go to 3 or will it gradually go towards the 3 and then go to free needle?

The latter.

Male voice: The latter.

Yes. Always the latter. Needles don't go free off Clear read.

Male voice: Thank you.

You bet. Next question. ...No questions? Goodness, gracious me. You know all about it, huh? Well, all right. Yes?

Male voice: On the CCHs, to get back to them, if you notice quite body – quite a lot of body action on a pc and you say, "What was that?" and they continually say, "Oh, nothing..."

You notice an awful lot of body action in the CCHs on a pc and they keep saying, "Oh, nothing..."

Male voice: Uh-huh.

Go on.

Male voice: Then you just acknowledge, "Okay, fine," and go right on with it.

That's right. That's right. And then the next time you've got him in a Prepcheck session you get off *suppression*. You can remedy that sort of thing. The person is, by the way, giving you a social response, giving you a social response. And the person, by the way, would be rather convinced that you perhaps were being critical of them so they're making nothing out of it, and so on. And I myself would have varied the auditing question I kept asking there, until the pc didn't give me the, "Oh, nothing." You see? I wouldn't challenge the "Oh, nothing," I would just ask a different question next time.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

I would say, "How are you doing?" Now, let him answer, "Oh, nothing," to that. You see, he can't. Got it?

Male voice: Thank you very much.

You bet. All right. Yes?

Female voice: I've got a question following that on asking the pc, "How are you doing?" In view of the fact that it activates circuits and what have you, what about if he just sort of starts, going into a compulsive outflow there? That's a bit of a dangerous thing to ask that type of case – "How are you doing?" I mean, it just doesn't stop from then.

Well, I suppose you could walk into this. Let's see, you asked a case, "How are you doing?" and the case goes into a compulsive outflow that you find is very difficult. In the first place, the compulsive outflow isn't dangerous, particularly, until it goes on long enough to run their havingness out the bottom.

There's ways and means of handling that sort of thing And they come under TR 4. Now, he goes into an action of this character, well you want to – you want to return the pc back into session. Because only a part of that response was an answer to your question. He went into a compulsive outflow. All right, you say, "How are you doing?" And he says, "Well, pretty terrible just now. I have been ..." Well, now, "pretty terrible just now," that answered your question, didn't it?

Female voice: Uh-huh.

Now, if you weren't in there with your acknowledgment, you, to some degree, drop the ball, see? Now, you've got TR 4 to contend with because he's now originating so, your trick is to understand what he's saying, acknowledge it and return him to session. And there are several methods by which this can be done. But one of the smoothest is he says, when he's busy – he's going on and on and originating, he's going yap-yap-yap-yap-yap, and "My father and mother always beat me and that's why I hate to have you touching my arm this way," and so on. An awfully good method of handling this is, "When did that occur to you in this session?"

And he says, "Well, it was a little bit earlier," and so forth.

And you say, "Well, all right. Now here's the next command." You've got to be slippy this way.

The essence of CCHs, of course, is communication, control and havingness. And you're perfectly right in saying, yes, there's some danger in an obsessive outflow on the part of the pc because it'll run down his havingness. And therefore that violates part of the CCHs. But also you're violating the control if you don't handle that obsessive outflow, see.

Now, a pc properly acknowledged has found out that he has reached you. See? If you acknowledged him properly then he's found out now that he has reached you and he'll stop talking. That's how the cycle ends.

So if you were to pick up his hand and put it on your shoulder as he was talking, he would shut up. Get the magic? He'd reached you.

I won't say the ways of handling this are unlimited, but there are several. And they depend, more or less, on the situation in which you are involved. There was one old lady, I remember, who was going on and on; and she was just talking to the blue, she'd just stopped talking to anybody, you know? And the auditor finally got around and got his face in front of her so that she actually couldn't look any

other way than look at him, and gave her a Tone 40, "Good!" and she was so surprised she almost dropped the mock-up. And well, what do you know, you know? It startled her considerably, not because of the suddenness of it but she thought that was a pretty nice fellow after that. See? You're actually not trying to reach the pc, you're trying to convince the pc the pc has reached you. And if you can do that, why, any pc will shut up. As a matter of fact, you could probably stop a war if you could convince the other side that they had reached you already. Because what are they trying to do, you see? It wouldn't be a retreat proposition because that would show they hadn't reached you and you were still worrying about their reaching you. But if you notice all war propaganda is on the basis: you haven't reached us and you're not going to; but we're going to reach you and smash you, see? And war is something that grows up this way.

So your ARC break can get going on the pc by showing the pc that the pc can't reach you. And the pc will start getting berserk after a while if you keep retreating on this, and so on. If you just remain silent and courteous the pc talks and talks and talks and you remain silent and smile faintly, you see and talk – and he can't see you – and the pc talks and talks and talks and talks and talks. You sort of withdraw a little bit, sufferingly, inside yourself and the pc will talk and talk and talk and talk and talk. You get what's happening?

All right. So your action is to consider an answer to your auditing question requires an acknowledgment and if the pc goes any further than that, that the pc is originating. Then if the pc is originating he has an anxiety about reaching you. So all you've got to do is cure that anxiety right there in a couple of well-chosen words or gestures and there you are.

Now, in view of the fact that you're reaching a pc with great surety every time, while running the CCHs, you're liable to get a reverse flow on the line. Auditing kids, of course, as you probably know, is very amusing. They turn around and run "Give me that hand," on you after a little while, you know? They kind of keep it balanced up. They're friendly that way. They – if you run 8-C on them they'll pretty soon run 8-C on you. And so forth.

Well, pcs will sometimes try to do that verbally. And try to do it some other way. That answer it?

Female voice: Yes, thank you.

You betcha. All right. Yes, Peter?

Male voice: On that, that reminded me of the question I wanted to ask before. And that is the use of CCH/Havingness that you used on the television. We haven't had any particular rundown on the use of that. Asking the preclear, "Touch me. Touch me..."

Uh-huh.

Male voice: ... with the CCHs.

It's very simple. The CCH/Havingness Process is simply repetitively, "Touch my – blank." And then don't introduce any parts that he'd be diffident about touching. And it's, "Touch my right shoulder. Touch my left shoulder. Touch the top of my head. Touch my stomach. Touch my right elbow. Touch my left elbow. Touch my right knee. Touch my left knee." See? "Touch my right shoulder. Touch my left shoulder. Touch the top of my head."

And you'll find out the pc would go on and on this way. It's quite interesting. What's particularly amusing about that is once in a while an auditor had love turn on on the part of the pc. You know? Love. Love raises its – its embarrassing skull, and so on. And that is a reach-can't reach; weird situation. Well, this process has the liability of turning on that phenomenon. And you have to run it out. So you have to run that Havingness Process long enough to run out the misemotional connotations which the pc generates. Quite amusing. That's the only thing wrong with it.

And as far as when you run it is concerned, it would be early on in auditing and once a session. It would have these limitations. It's something that goes a long way because you're going to have to run it quite a little bit to get it flat. Okay?

Male voice: Yes. I was wondering about its uses and to replace – instead of doing a model session rudiments, on the CCH session whether one could use that as sort of a havingness-auditor ...

Well, that's what it's for.

Male voice: Thank you.

That's what it's for. I don't know. Some auditors have pcs go out of session running the CCHs. And, let me tell you something, that is a mark of rough auditing. That – that's a mark of not much comprehend. You could do the CCHs in Model Session, but, that's all very well except for this one little thing: it violates the basis of the CCHs. They are a physical process and you're busily introducing a mental process on top of a physical process and it's sort of, "What's this all about?" see?

The facts of the case are that an auditor ought to be so smooth, so lacking in Prussianism, so uninhibited on his comm line that he runs a nice, easy, comfortable set of CCHs. And you're not going to find anybody going out of session. A nice, easy, comfortable CCH run wouldn't need any rudiments. Because the guy's with you all the way, you're not overrunning everything, you're running it up just to a point of three-no-change, it's no great strain on him, you're checking up on him, you're – you're – you're showing him concern, you're acknowledging them well when they speak to you and all that sort of thing. It sort of runs off and it's sort of like – sort of like waltzing with a pretty girl, you know, it's – it doesn't tire you.

But I imagine that trying to fox-trot with an elephant, I imagine could be fairly exhausting and would require innumerable rudiments. You get the idea.

The thing – that, however, is not a mental Havingness Process and belongs with the CCHs. A little of it'd go a long way. But it's blood brother with the CCHs and it would – your thought is very good there – it would supplant all this anxiety about MS [Model Session] while doing the CCHs.

Yes?

Female voice: Ron, what you were saying, you know, about the CCH process being, "Touch the auditor." Is it not all right to touch the surrounding environment? I mean, if you have a male auditor and a female, and you want to CCH process ...

Right.

Female voice: ... can you just not touch the things around you?

No.

Female voice: Touch his own body.

No, that is strictly an auditor rudiment.

Female voice: I see.

It is a havingness of the auditor. It puts in the auditor and so forth. If you'll notice, the CCHs touch an awful lot of surrounding environment. See? CCH 2, you've got a lot of "Touch the walls," and that sort of thing, don't you see? No, this is – this is just a peculiar oddball method of getting the pc to find the auditor. And to run any other Havingness in the thing is probably risky because it very well may not be the pc's Havingness Process. The pc is not going to get a tightened up needle while doing 8-C because there's a lot more to 8-C than touching the walls. But if you were just to get a random touching of walls and pat-pat-pat, imagine your embarrassment when you were getting the pc's Havingness Process to find out that that tightened the needle, which it easily could do. Don't you see? You follow that?

Female voice: Uh-huh.

So this is mainly an ARC Havingness. And you find this pc is finding his auditor a little bit roughish and – and he's getting standoffish and he's doing thises and thats and so forth, and he starts snarling a little bit. You run some of this CCH/Havingness and this really just smooths right out. Of course the pc's liable to smack you hard occasionally, but, I'm sure your shoulders could stand that. Okay? All right.

Female voice: Thank you.

You bet.

Yes, Jim?

Male voice: Nulling goals.

Right. This – you're interested in this tonight?

Male voice: Rather. Sensitivity setting.

Yes?

Male voice: I'm wondering if we're absolutely bound to null at the sensitivity for a full dial drop or can we null at a sensitivity setting which is more convenient, which might be a higher setting than that?

No. You're – you're wasting time. Nulling goals. Here's exactly how you null goals. It's its own formula. One dial drop, sensitivity set for one dial drop. Null the whole list; null it down to a point where you've got 30 or 40 left in. Take those 30 or 40 that are still alive, copy them on a separate sheet of paper, crank your sensitivity up to 16 and fire down that list at sensitivity 16; you're going to find your goal every time – providing the rudiments are in and the meter is reading for the pc and the auditor, see? Providing these things.

Any other sensitivity setting or settings would be a waste of time because it'd be a compromise between these two things. And you don't want a compromise. In the first place,

when you go down this goals list the first time, you're only going to find the goals that are going to stay in are going to be knocking hard when you first go by them.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

And after you've nulled the thing a couple of times, that knock is going to recede. And that's about the time you've got 30 or 40 left. And now, the eventual goal is only going to read at sensitivity 16, so you've actually shorted or scanted or shorthanded the nulling process. So you didn't have to knock the pc's brains out by erasing every goal, don't you see, as you went on down the line. In other words, you could do a light job of it this way. As long as your rudiments are in that is quite good. As long as you're getting ticks quite routinely on goals and so forth and your rudiments are in, that's fine.

Now. What gets in the road of this, Jim, and I think this is what you're talking about, is when this is not done from scratch in this particular way. You see, that has to be a package all by itself. You have to take the pc from scratch. So he wrote up a lot of goals himself and you finished off the list and you got the tone arm action out of the list. Then you went tearing down the list at one dial drop. And then you waited until you had 30 or 40 left and you copied those over and went to sensitivity 16 and then nulled those out at sensitivity 16. Then checked out – and then checked out against every one left on that list. All right, that's all stylized.

Well, we're continually running into people who have had old goals lists, who have had extended lists, who have had a goals list nulled out totally because it was not complete and had to be done again. All right, now we're running into random situations, see? That first one is the textbook solution and then when taken from scratch you'll find out it's terrifically workable.

But as soon as we move on and we've the person's goal list nulled out, now what do we do? See? When it all went null? Now, how do we patch up this situation? How do we – how do we add some to it?

We've got people who have had a goals list, already before they came here, has been already nulled out. And then we've added to that goals list, you see, and then have nulled everything out on that goals list so that now we had to extend a goals list and we are now doing a new extensional line and that all nulled out. You get the idea? This thing is winding up in a ball here somehow or another.

And even there, even there, that is not going to help you. By the time you have had to add to a goals list – let's say you had something like seven or eight hundred and you had to add to that list – well, the reads are going. You've got it faded down now. It is no longer fitting within the framework of the textbook solution. All right, you have only one sensitivity setting that you can use in that case: 16. Somebody has missed the boat so, therefore, now we are dedicated to sensitivity 16, God help us all. Now, it all has to be done at sensitivity 16. There isn't any other choice. There's no intermediate goals setting for nulling that has any value at all. And that's for that reason.

Your first list, "a virgin" is sufficiently charged that it reads beautifully at a one dial drop. And you're going to get every goal that is significant is going to be reading there bright

and shining, ready to be taken down to the last nub, you see? Once that situation has been overrun, spoiled, flubbed, now you're up against it.

It interests me why you were asking the question.

Male voice: Thank you. Because, Neal (if he doesn't mind my mentioning this) his needle is tight. Okay. And a higher sensitivity setting has been necessary for me not to need a magnifying glass to read accurately.

Well, he's not a stylized case here.

Male voice: No, he's not.

No. His goals list was nulled down in Joburg and it's been renulled and nulled and renulled and so forth. No, that's cranked all the way up to sensitivity 16, man. Rough as it is.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

That's the place to ride that one down. You'll have to ride the whole thing down at that to really get an accurate picture.

Male voice: Well, I've been doing that, hoping that was all right.

Yeah, well, you couldn't do anything else. Once the thing – once you have spoiled that basic picture, once the glory of that is departed into the sunset, you have the upper sensitivity and that's all you've got left. Okay?

Male voice: Thank you.

Right.

Male voice: How necessary is it to acknowledge after every goal? Instead of just the once after three.

Why?

Male voice: Well, it slows things down a bit.

Oh, it's rather microscopic in its slowdown. The original method of doing them was to acknowledge after three. And this acknowledging after each one is apparently – people have been doing it here recently. I don't know that it's mandatory.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

I'm afraid that I would much rather tear down a list. "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. Thank you." I'm afraid I would. But then, I develop a considerable – I get up – I get up to planing speed on nulling goals and other people don't like this speed. They don't think a needle will travel that fast. They don't think the reactive mind (which has no time in it at all) can travel that fast. The reactive mind, of course, is at instant infinity, exclamation point! The reactive mind will respond to a needle as fast as you can read and the faster you can read, it will respond to the needle that much faster. But, frankly, getting a thank you in between doesn't add all that providing your thank you is right on the ball. Because, of course, your *thank* you starts the second you have stopped talking.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

See? "To catch catfish. Thank you. To catch catfish. Thank you." And you just use it for a filler. See, you put no pause in between, you just put a thank you. And if you could imagine the sentence, "To catch catfish, thank you – to catch catfish, thank you – to catch catfish, thank you," all with no spaces between the letters, see, there's no spaces left in the line and it's just all letters, you know, like Russian is written or Chinese or something like that, why, you'll get the same effect.

Male voice: Ron, if one did it that way, you wouldn't be able to glance at the pc on the intermediate thank you – on the say, the first or second thank you.

Why?

Male voice: Well, it's – because you're saying thank you the microsecond after the instant read should have occurred. You'd get the "you" in by the time you ...

Female voice: You've got two eyes.

Male voice: I can't believe this.

Oh, I don't know. You guys can go on looking at pcs and having a ball, but I null goals myself. The speed with which you can null goals is – has a lot to do with this. And if you didn't find it very nice to get in the thank you or something like that, I should say offhand it was not necessary.

I've always nulled goals, "To catch catfish. Thank you." No. "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. Thank you." And looked at the pc and gave him a thank you to see if he was still in the chair. And let it roar.

I don't know how many goals I can null a minute. But it is a lot. And I look at these pathetic attempts to null a hundred and fifty goals in a two-hour session and so on, and I say, "Oh, let's all go to sleep. Let's let our arms and legs fall off." Because, frankly – because frankly, it's just wasting time. You're paying time to the reactive bank. What's the reactive bank, man? What is the reactive bank? Well, it is a timeless activity. It responds to minor and major thoughts. And why make it respond to any minor thoughts when you're trying to get it to respond to major thoughts? You know? And I don't think courtesy was ever heard of in the reactive mind. I know I've been in one for quite some time and I never found anything very polite about it. When it bit, it bit.

I'm not trying to break down any particular drill that you are being taught in this particular way. But you also are entitled to know that I don't have any particular patience with – with anything that gets in the road of auditing. And when I do auditing I do the essentials and I don't do more than the essentials. And I get the job done. And you could really make it fly.

Speed, man, it's speed. It isn't courtesy. It isn't whether or not the auditor bites his fingernails. It's how many goals you get read per unit of time.

It's how many goals you get written per unit of time. How many goals you get read per unit of time and how many items you list per unit of time that totally regulates the length of time it takes to clear a human being. Nothing else regulates it.

Now, we start getting in the vagaries as, "Is the pc in-session?" trying to keep the pc from going out of session. All right, to a certain degree we can tolerate that. We had better

pay attention to that to a certain degree. Because the meter will go null on a pc who is out of session. And if you don't get in your beginning rudiments you're liable to be going straight into it with roaring present time problems and everything else and your meter not operative and you've got a hundred and fifty, two hundred, three hundred goals you've nulled in that session and – oh hell, you didn't null them in the session, the pc nulled them before he came in, and that means the goal was in that bunch. Well, lord help us, man, you have now gotten yourself into *beaucoup* trouble.

So you want to make sure the pc is in a state of mind whereby he will read on the meter. Now, don't stretch that state of mind and push him so he won't read out of the meter while trying to make him read on the meter. You understand?

All right. Well, similarly, a pc who is being hit with machine gun fire is much less likely to have rudiments go out. My pcs don't have time to have rudiments, you know? They don't have time to have rudiments go out. They just don't have time, that's all. Keep them busy.

Male voice: ... while you're nulling I've been asking Jack for some good recommended reading material ...

You're out of session. That's why your list is slop. How do you like that!

Jack, wake up. Find that man's goal. Stop this nonsense. He has no interest in his session. Hah! Isn't that right?

Male voice: Every time I do something the middle rudiments go out.

Uh-huh. I just looked at it. The middle rudiments were put in, I think, fifteen to twenty times in one session. And I didn't think they had to be put in once.

Now here's what I talked to you about in the first lecture. I'm sorry to be rough on rats here. You understand? But, here's the way it is. Using middle rudiments to drive the pc out of session. Now, the pc says he is not interested in what's going on. Every time he says something the middle rudiments go out. See? You got that?

Male voice: Uh-huh.

Well, don't do that. Your middle rudiments are out when the meter's no longer reading. And that goal, then, is probably on the list. But I noticed that the list is 2.75 to 2.3 of tone arm action in 20 minutes, which also might speak of an incomplete list. Or it might speak of the fact that the middle rudiments – the middle rudiments, being rudiments, are knocking the pc in and out of session and you're getting rudiments action. I don't know which you're getting. You're getting tone arm action on rudiments?

Male voice: Occasionally. Not always. Usually it just goes straight through. Just say the questions, say the whole thing and that's it.

Well, 2.75 to 2.3 tone arm action says that the list is incomplete. That's too much. Furthermore, there are a few too many strikes on the list. A few too many. You know, it's nulling a little bit hard, and it could be listed a bit further, and you just lay off the middle ruds.

Male voice: Okay.

And pc starts to snore, kick him; and keep on going. He looks out the window, if you complain about his disinterest in session, say, "Get interested in this session," you know? Say, "Whose goals are these?" Got it, Jack?

Male voice: Yes, Ron. Thank you.

All right. Well, that is the – that is an example. Because I just looked at the folder in there. There was too much TA action and I said, "Well, there's a possibility the list is not complete." And then the other one thing I saw, too many middle ruds.

When your meter is no longer registering tick, tick, tick, you know, "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish," your meter hasn't read; not at all. I don't care whether it was at a one dial drop or sixteen, see, it hasn't read, not at all. Your ears should go up, flop! And then, "To eat gumdrops. To eat gumdrops. To eat gumdrops," not one single tick on that goal. *Ooooh!* This is probable that something weird has occurred. Don't make up your mind yet, however. "To run downhill. To run downhill. To run downhill." Not a single tick – except some random ones that you don't know quite where they are. You haul back at that point and get your middle rudiments in. And you'll find out if you do that that they only go out once in a blue moon – once every couple of sessions – something like this.

If you're suspicious of middle rudiments, put in your beginning rudiments and run right over into your middle rudiments. Put in your beginning rudiments, *ta-ta-ta-ta-ta-tat*, and put in your middle rudiments, *ta-ta-ta-t-atat*, and then just leave them alone.

You actually can use middle rudiments to keep the pc from talking and make the pc disinterested in his session. That – he's just given us the perfect example.

Male voice: Did the same with me today, myself, I noticed it.

All right. Of course you would. It's happened to you as a pc. That make sense to you?

Male voice: Yes.

Yeah, have you ever felt all of a sudden like you were being punished for talking?

Male voice: What do you mean all of a sudden? [laughter] Don't blame Jack for this.

No.

Male voice: I was punishing myself.

Yeah.

Male voice: But certainly, that's true.

But there was a feeling of punishment. Pc will normally get that frame of mind, and after that you can't keep anything in.

No sir, just because a pc talks is not any reason to get middle rudiments in. And that is definite. See? And if a pc never says anything about any of his goals I start to worry about him. You know, pc's sitting there looking out the window; well, that's all right as long as the meter's reading. The meter stops reading, I get worried. One of the symptoms is the pc doesn't ever say anything, never does anything, so forth. You can't find a goal on a pc in that – in the

frame of mind that the pc feels he is punished because his rudiments are out, he's ARC broken, the meter isn't reading well. Make sense?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. Okay. Right. I wasn't being hard on you, Jack. He thinks I was. All right. I was being hard on you, Jack. [laughter] All right. Yes, Dale?

Male voice: On listing goals, what are the current tests of the completeness of the list?

No TA action on listing.

Male voice: Well, how little is none?

There's a certain amount of drift. If you want to know how little there is – if you want to know how little there is ...

Male voice: Uh-huh.

... supposing you were to sit there and say, "Do fish swim? Do fish swim? Do fish swim? Do fish swim?" to the pc. Or supposing the pc were simply – this – you understand this pc isn't Clear – was to sit there with his hands on the cans and have nothing happen.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

How much would the meter drift?

Male voice: Uh-huh.

That is how little.

Male voice: Okay.

All right?

Male voice: That answers my ...

It's damn little. It's in the course of an hour it drifts from 2.75 up to 3.1. But that's just normal drift.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

See? Tone arm motion, lots of motion, is defined as .75 divisions of the TA every 20 minutes, within 20 minutes. A little motion is .25. No motion at all is what you're asking to be defined.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

Well, no motion at all is defined as the normal drift, if nothing were happening.

Male voice: All right. Thank you.

All right. Yes?

Male voice: Question on Prepchecking, Ron.

Right.

Male voice: In the new rundown, when you run the When, All, Appear, Who system, you run it several times.

Now, what's this now?

Male voice: When you're running the ...

When you're running the ...

Male voice: When you run the withhold system on the ...

When you run the withhold system on the ...

Male voice: ... on the earliest incident ...

... of the ...

Male voice: ... of the pc ...

... earliest incident the ...

Male voice: ... and the pc ...

... the pc has now found ...

Male voice: That's right.

Yes?

Male voice: When you run the When, All, Who ...

Yeah.

Male voice: ... When, All, Appear, Who, will he manifest something to indicate to you that everything in that incident has been cleared? Or do you run it several times?

You want to know how long to run this.

Male voice: That's right.

You want to know how long to run the withhold system on the earliest incident the pc has found. There are two questions to this. You want to – if it doesn't release and look like a toy balloon being punctured – you can tell when the basic goes because the rest of chain will go and the pc will usually manifest it emotionally. They say *he-he*, or they cognite or say, "Oh, well, yeah, hey, I never knew that!" See, there's a cognition goes along with it, there's a release of affect of some kind that goes along with it. They, "You know, I always thought that that tricycle was mine! Ha-ha-ha! 'Tisn't! I stole it!" You get that kind of thing. And it goes up the line and you find out that that's the end. There isn't any point in proceeding beyond that. As long as the What question nulls with it.

Now, you're talking about obnosis by the auditor. How long do you run this thing? Well, if it doesn't produce such an action, there is an earlier incident. So you don't run it very much. You run it just enough to open up the track to an earlier incident. See? You run it on the earliest until you can find an earlier. How many times is that? Well, on some pcs that will be three or four times. But on most pcs it'll only be once or twice. And then you're asking for the earliest, again. He's asking, you know, earlier incident. Oh, he says, he's really got the earliest now; it's at the age of forty.

You'll find some pcs go down this line sort of like a tent peg, you know, being driven into hard ground with a sledgehammer. You know, thud! thud! thud! you see? And other pcs,

you didn't notice there was a crack in the ground and they went to the center of the earth. *Swish!* Where'd he go?

It depends to a large degree on how closely associated it is with the GPM. And if you're trying to pull something, right off the side of the GPM, you can expect it to go down awful hard. And the cognitions to be awfully tiny. And the number of times you use the withhold system to be numerous. But if it's a nice piece of free track, it goes boom! There's the earliest withhold system, once, twice. His tricycle all the time! *Z-u-u-u-p*. That's the end of stealing cars, see? And four minutes by the clock, see. The other's an hour and a half by the clock. You get the difference?

Male voice: Yes. Sure do.

So it's actually – varies. But it always winds up in a cognition. If it doesn't wind up in some kind of a cognition, the line never blows. Okay?

Male voice: One other – two other questions. If you say, "Is that all of that?" and he says, "Yeah, that's the lot," do you press for more?

No. That would be a double questioning and that would be a Q and A.

Male voice: I see.

He – you have asked him a question, he has answered it, you've got to give him a cheery aye-aye.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

Very often he'll give you these things out of sequence, see. He'll give them to you all out of sequence. He's already asked the question, at which time you're quite at liberty to omit the one he has just answered. You say, "Well, when was that?" And he said, "Well, when George and I went down to the – (so on) and I didn't tell you about this, but there were three Fords there and they all had false bottoms," and so forth. Well, then you ask him, "What didn't appear?" because he just answered All.

This is a fluid system. It's very fluid in its application. You always ask them, When? And sometimes you don't get a chance to ask them, All? And sometimes they gratuitously tell you Who didn't find out about it. And you don't ask them right after they told you because that's an invalidation. And they – you say, "Well, what didn't appear?" "Well, Uncle George didn't appear and if he'd found out about it he would have killed me; fortunately he didn't." Your next question is When? See?

Male voice: Uh-huh.

It's a fluid system. And it depends to a large degree on the cognition in it.

Now, I will tell you this about Prepchecking. Once in a while an auditor gets unlucky. He just shouldn't have gotten up that morning at all. [laughter] And he asks this perfectly innocent question off of a form and finds out that he's going down through the middle of a coal mine that the pc observes nothing in. He has just unfortunately hit *bing-gong-bang-thud*, into the middle of the GPM. He's not about to clear any What question that he has anything to do with. See? It'll just slug, slug. How far south is this thing going to go?

Well, actually, he can carry it back. He can carry it back. He can get the thing to release. He just shouldn't have ever asked that question. He just knows that. It's too rough.

And once in a while when you're in private practice, you'll skip one. You'll wish you hadn't, but you'll skip one and say, "Well, there wasn't any reason to have really flattened it because it was impossible to have flattened it." You'll say to yourself, "Well, I'll come back to it later after we've cleared him," or something of this sort. And your pc then, after that, will get sort of nattery. And you can expect the pc now to develop into sort of a nattery pc and the needle will get a little dirtier.

Well, when you do this trick – because everybody will do it sooner or later – I've done it – just remember that's what you did, and go back and grind it out. Grind it out.

But occasionally it's just lowering one down through the dark maw of the coal mine. The pc sees nothing, he cognites on nothing, he can remember nothing about it, the needle is still firing, there must be something there, he is terribly occluded, you have to run the withhold system five times on making a telephone call to find out if he could commit an overt. You know, I mean, it's just gruesome, see. Grind, grind, grind, grind. Because, of course, these – some of these chains have – are free and they're on parts of free track, you see? And some of these chains are right down the GPM line, *du-du-du-du*.

If there was any way of forecasting a chain being in the middle of the GPM line, you'd never ask the question in the first place. But, of course, you have to ask the question to find out that it is. And then you've had it! That's the liability of Prepchecking You should recognize that.

In answer to your question, it's a variable number of times. It depends on how arduous it is for the pc to get back earlier and blow the chain and that's it. Okay?

Male voice: Yes.

All right.

Male voice: There was one other question.

All right.

Male voice: If the What question is still reacting, can that be one of two things, either you haven't got the basic or the incident you were working on is not yet cleaned up?

You could have a tiny, tiny, little forerunner to the incident which you are trying to clear up that the pc hasn't seen yet. It's always – the answer's always a former incident.

Male voice: It's always ...

It's always an earlier incident. But that earlier incident can be five minutes ahead of the earliest one you've found, see? So we don't say how much earlier this thing is. See, it could be a thousand years or five minutes. But if it doesn't blow you haven't got the earliest.

Now, there's one little exception to this rule: Is sometimes the pc thinks there's an earlier incident because he's been told so, when there isn't.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

And you saw such a case on a demonstration. Pc was convinced there was an incident at four – at age four. There was no incident there. Simply checked it out on the meter and told the pc so. After that, why, the incident at the age of six blew and we didn't have any more trouble with that one. Okay? Answer the question?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. Well, that's it. We've crucified enough for tonight. Don't anybody commit suicide over this. Because, let me tell you, you can't put E-Meter cans in the hands of a corpse. Therefore, suicide isn't indicated. You understand. As long – as long as the person can still handle cans and still talk and we still have E-Meters, the situation can be saved. That's something for you to remember in years to come.

Thank you.

Repetitive Rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking, Part I

A lecture given on 10 July 1962

[part missing]

Thank you.

Okay. This is Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture of what?

Audience: Ten July.

Ten July, AD 12. Very good.

[part missing]

Well, I'm going to cover repetitive auditing tonight and give the first lecture on this subject as such, because there has been a considerable improvement which, if you dig the opacity from your optic nerves and can read a needle, why, all will be gorgeous.

Now, the contest is not so much to develop a technology that I can do or that a handful of auditors can do. It's to develop a technology which gives routinely good results in the hands of auditors and getting around those things which the auditor is having trouble with, with the simplest possible solution.

Now, we are right back to basics today in auditing. Right back to basics. You can find the ghosts and forefathers and ancestors of practically everything we're doing in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, oddly enough. As a matter of fact, we still use today some of the principles from *The Original Thesis*, and they are nowhere else stated than in *The Original Thesis*. The auditor plus the pc – greater than the reactive bank. The auditor versus the pc is less than the reactive bank. So you get no auditing done. Those formulas that are in the back of *The Original Thesis* still form the foundation of auditing. And right along with this, we're back suddenly to a type of activity which all auditors are familiar with. Auditors have always been able to do repetitive processes. They haven't really never had any trouble with them.

The main thing they had to find out and one thing they never could learn very well was when was a repetitive process flat? I remember giving a lecture, I think, in the 17th ACC and there were something on the order of about thirty-five students on that course, and I had just given a lecture concerning comm lags and the three ways you could tell if a process was flat, you see. And I had just given those and so on, the day before. And I came in the following day and this was the burning question, you see, in that whole unit is how did we tell if these processes were flat? And I asked them student after student, front row, second row,

third row, fourth row, and there wasn't anybody who could give me any of the answers. That was sad. A certain amount of knuckleheadedness has gone forward ever since that time on the subject of when is a process flat.

Well, now that has been solved in this method of using repetitive processes or questions. These are actually not repetitive processes. They're repetitive questions. And they are flat at a very precise point. And this is the one you will have the hardest trouble with is, of course, when are they flat. There's two troubles one has with that. One is not reading the meter and the other is not believing it. And either one of them bring about a very upset pc.

So anyway, this process design or type has been adjusted to Model Session, June 23, 1962, changed in the HCOB July 4, 1962.

Now, this Model Session is a brand-new designed Model Session. It looks like the same Model Session but it is not the same Model Session. It is the repetitive Model Session. And it is designed with the change of July 4th, which deletes the Havingness from the beginning rudiments but leaves it in at the end rudiments. It gives you your beginning rudiments and all but the Havingness in the end rudiment as an auditing question. And they are just handled as such, in repetitive treatment.

You have here a number of processes, in other words. You have as many processes, if you are going to do them all repetitively. You've got the beginning processes and the beginning rudiments are the beginning processes. And you've got the middle rudiments and they are the middle processes. And then you have the random rudiment which is a random process and then you have the end rudiments which are end processes. It's quite interesting.

You'd think slugging this many processes at a pc in one session would be catastrophic. And if it is not done properly, I assure you it *is* catastrophic. All you have to do is overrun the process one question. It's just as little as that. Overrun it one question, there is a loud splash, and pc is in the soup. Just one question too many and you've had it. Now one question too few and you've had it. It has a tolerance of zero. There is no allowance for error on when it is flat. And most of your difficulties between now and the year two thousand will stem from what I have just outlined as possible errors.

Now when you're teaching this to people, when you're teaching this to people and somebody comes in and they say they are running Routine 3GA or whatever the routine is called, and the pc somehow or another isn't nulling well on the list and the meter isn't reading right and they say to you, "Please think up some unusual solution – some fabulously unusual solution." Let's see. You could dream up the fact that we do a yogi exercise every fourth command or something like that. That'd probably help the pc. I'm afraid your answer is something of this nature. They are ending their Model Session processes and the rudiments one question or more too early or they are carrying them on one question or more too long. Either one brings about catastrophe.

Now, if you end them too early the pc still has answers. And every answer that he has or would give you, now becomes a missed withhold. Which – I think that's marvelous, you know. We've just set up – you see, there's two things you could do about missed withholds: Is you could forget all about O/W – bury the whole thing – never have anything more to do with ever asking anybody for an overt, you see; or do it exactly right. Those are the Aristotelian

elements involved. The black and white. We're into oddly enough some black and white things. There are no shades of gray in any of this, you see. And this Aristotelian – you either don't ever breathe at a pc that you ever want to know anything from the pc of any kind whatsoever or you do it perfectly. Any shade of gray is chaos. Disaster will strew the auditing room. This hyperbole is actually not hyperbolic but an understatement of fact.

Marriages, business careers, life itself could go by the boards if you don't believe that. I mean this is really wild. You either never ask the pc anything about what he ever did, to minimize the situation, or you do it perfectly.

Now, in view of the fact that you can't do the first one for this reason: any time you see the pc you're liable to miss a withhold. The mechanism is still there. Whether it's advertised, written up or not, it is still there, and explains all the vagaries and upsets that you've had in auditing. It's still present. Wouldn't care if we abolished it; we held a big conclave and decided to eradicate it and so forth. I don't think it would do a bit of good.

In addition to that, there happens to be the case who thinks you should know everything they're thinking. This is one case in twelve – as frequent as that. And you should know everything they're thinking. And if you don't know everything they're thinking, of course, you will ask them questions. So any time you ask this pc any kind of a question like, "How are you?", you've missed a withhold. You say, "How do you do?", you've missed a withhold. They're furious with you. I don't exaggerate. That is the truth of the matter. There are people around who think you should know what they're thinking. And they think something is wrong with you if you don't. And the way they got into that state of mind, of course, was pretended knowingness on other people's parts and too much indulgence and this and that. Actually, overts against questions get a person into this state. But just did a bulletin on it. It's coming out Thursday, HCOB July 12, I guess it is.

Now the – if this type of person exists, and that type of person does, and if lots of people get into this state, and they do, and if man keeps being active while being secretive, which he will, it is inevitable that you miss a withhold. The person is sitting in the room; you walk in the room; you walk out of the room; you've missed a withhold. No conversation. Furious with you. You'll see it happen every once in a while. It becomes utterly inexplicable. You didn't do anything to the person. You didn't say anything to the person. Nothing. And they're mad at you. Well, you can't do number one then. So the only answer is to do number two perfectly. You can't do it, "fairly well." It's unfortunate that we have entered into a level of auditing sometime since where you couldn't do it fairly well. It's impossible to do auditing fairly well. Auditing must be done perfectly.

Now, you're very rich at this time whether you know it or not in having Repetitive Rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking because it is rather easy to do these things perfectly. There's no variation. You don't have to vary questions. You don't have to dream up something in passage. There aren't exceptions to the rule. These things all go on down the line. Now the only difficulty you will enter into is in a very, very severe case you will find that the Model Session withhold question has to be changed for that very severe case. You have to specifically state, "to another," or something like this in the question. You'll find that the person always answers it with a motivator. And he'll spin himself in.

You'll say, "Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?" If you know your pc and this pc falls into the one in twelve you'd better change that question. Like, "Done anything to another?" Or even "done anything bad to another." Because the pc will answer it this way, "Have you done anything you are withholding?", you see. And the pc will say, "Yes. I sympathized with myself for having such a lousy auditor." [laughter]

And man, they will keep going this way, and you can just see the pc scrunching up in the chair. And you let this be answered that way on and on and on and on. And the next thing you know the pc just spun himself in. It won't ever clear. That is the test. If you just sit there and you keep asking this question, "Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?"

And the pc says, "Yes. I discussed with Gracie Ann what an ugly face you have." See. And so on and so on and so on. Your end rudiments are going out faster than you're putting in the beginning rudiments, don't you see?

And you could just go on like this endlessly. You can just go on and on and on and on like this, and this question doesn't clear. The needle gets sticky and then it gets dirty and you can't tell whether it's clear or not. So you have that vagary. And I would dare say sometime up in the near future I'll probably watch you operating along this line and will probably dream up an absolutely perfect question for that very one that's totally embracive. But just now I've been so busy I haven't done it. So you just have to put up with that.

Now, auditing is a pretty open and shut proposition now. And oddly enough, it is as successful as it is predictable by the pc. Now, auditors get spoiled by a success. A howling, singular success greeting an unusual solution can practically ruin an auditor. I know. I myself have sometimes smoked around for a month or so trying to recover from some fabulous victory. That's right. It was an unusual solution and I couldn't figure out why it worked or how it worked or exactly where it fitted into the jigsaw puzzle and so forth. Well, you saw more unusual solutions from two or three years ago and back than you have seen since. And you have seen many more unusual solutions from 1955 back to 1950 than there were from 1955 onward. You get the idea?

In other words the more we know about the mind, the less unusual solution we need. That is something to remember. See, the better your tools, the less the unusual solutions you need.

That is something to remember. It's also a way to measure up somebody, let us say, an HPA/HCA student. That person is smoking along one way or the other and one day they get up very bright and they hit it rich, you see. And they hit some button on the pc, dream up this unu... they're worrying about the pc, you see. Well, if they're worrying about the pc with the modern weapons which they're using, then you can really realize that they're not using the modern weapon. They're doing something odd or peculiar already. So they lie awake half the night trying to figure out what button it was, and they remember their Axioms or something of the sort, and they put it all together one way or the other, and they put their finger – because pcs – auditors are all so intuitive and they can put their finger exactly on the button that needs to be pushed, you see. The pc breaks down and cries and says, "Oh God, how did you

know this?", you know, and feels wonderful and the warts all disappear off his face. [laughter] Just like that, *zzzp*. The auditor goes *guuulp*.

You have to beat him after that. You have to beat him several times with losses before he starts to realize that he'd better audit along a standard line. The way he gets beaten is he does the same thing to the next case. Well, the more unusual was the solution, the less cases it's going to work on. So he might have to audit another hundred cases before he would get one to respond to this button.

So after that he gets nothing but losses, losses, losses, losses, losses. It works, unfortunately, sometimes. Sometimes they get so many losses they just stop auditing. And they never really trace it back to the singular victory which departed from a standard procedure or action.

Now, the closer we approach in toward clearing – producing Releases easily and clearing – the closer we approach in toward this, the less unusual solutions appear or are required in the handling of cases. Naturally, if you have the answers that release and clear people, well, you aren't going to get it hunt and punch selectively, you see. You're not going to audit one one way and another the other way, don't you see? In order to release everybody and clear everybody, you've got to have how everybody's mind works. That's it. All right. Let me point out to you we're clearing people. We're releasing people rather easily and we're clearing them. So you see, we're getting in an – into an invariable type of procedure.

Now, the procedure which we're using, which did these tricks, gets modified to the degree that it is successful in the hands of all auditors – not a few, see. So we have two things monitoring: the result and the ease of the result. Those are the two things that monitor our technology.

Now, I watch people auditing. And on the Saint Hill Course we're watching – as they come in brand new – the better auditors in the world. There's no doubt about that. I mean just as they walk in the front door they're the better auditors of the world. Instructors faint, you know. They just hold their heads, say, "Oh, my God! Don't tell me they really audited like this in Port Darwin. Oh, my God!" I have to cheer them up. I say, "Oh, my God! You should have seen what they were doing a few months ago in London. I mean, don't be so downhearted about this because it's been worse. It's been worse." "No, we doubt it."

All right. So our technology at the moment, because of observation and cooperation here, is monitored against what these auditors can do. Well, that makes a mighty rough hill to climb perhaps in this technology for somebody who is already having a very hard time of it. But I try to make a bit of an allowance for that. And when I find something that you can do standing on your head, I know it can be done elsewhere with sweat. If it doesn't get done elsewhere with sweat, if it gets done not at all, well, it will require further study.

Now I feel, however, that we're at a very happy state of the game. The problems were these. And you should know the problems about this before you start sailing off on unusual solutions or something or not grasping the solution which we're using. You should know what the problems were. I'll try to outline those to you rather rapidly. I won't tell you I'll tell you all of the problems, because some of the problems were you personally. But... I thought that'd wake you up.

Now, the problems are these. You got a GPM. A pc is built like a universe. First mention of this is *Advanced Procedures and Axioms*. Time postulate. What begun this 'ere thing called the MEST universe. It were a prime postulate. And it then accumulated thereunto, mass. That's the way the universe was built. Built on a prime postulate. And that's the way any mass connected with the pc was built: on the pc's own prime postulate.

A pc's reactive bank does not exist native to the corporeal self he is packing around as an identification card. They have other reasons for having bodies. I know. Sensations, storage, and that sort of thing. Food absorbers – for polite drinking. There are various – various reasons to have bodies, you know.

Oh, you'd be surprised – wearing a doll body, somebody offers you a drink, and you can't follow a very mannerly procedure. I know. I got to be a drunk one time on a planet a long time ago. It was very embarrassing. And supposing you're sitting there with some human beings and somebody hands you a drink, you know. There you are in a doll body. Well, if you poured it down your gullet, for God's sakes, your condensers would short the capacitors now – and I do mean short out! Your crew chief would be collecting you and wanting to know what happened. He might add "Sir," but it'd be in sort of a surly fashion.

So the hostess offers you this drink, you know. You know what you have to do as a doll? Pour some on the tablecloth. That's right. So it'll evaporate. It's the only way you can get drunk. Oh, hadn't you remembered that? Goodness, you're foggy these days. Not remembering something like that. It's impolite. Ruined linen. Man dramatizes it. He takes these sniffers – these balloons – brandy balloons. And he, you know... [makes sniffing noises, laughter] That's – that's how a doll gets drunk, you know.

Now, a human being is merely determined by having a human body. And the difference between a doll and a human body is just a difference of corporeal self. And you know a doll packs around the same kind of bank as a human being. Thetan's got a bank. It's always the same kind of bank. This bank is constant and is all built the same way. It was built on a prime postulate. And oddly enough, so was the universe built the same way. Only we call that prime postulate the basic purpose of the individual in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, or his goal.

There can be a lot of these. There can be a lot of sections of the master – you might say the whole track GPM. The individual is dragging this stuff around.

It is the *alteration* on the prime postulate occurring in the course of putting it into effect. In other words, the individual says he wants to catch catfish and that's his prime postulate. That's his basic purpose. Of course, you might say there's a prime prime postulate and a prime postulate. The guy in the beginning of any cycle on the track or any life usually makes a prime postulate. I remember my prime postulate when I picked up this body. No, not this body. The one just before that. And that was, "I'll show them they can't put me out of the game," you know. No effect to amount to anything on this lifetime, monitored by a cycle prime postulate, don't you see. But that's a new prime prime postulate erected on a cycle prime postulate. And then you've got the prime prime postulate for the whole track. You're not going to get to that in one fair gulp. That's a few goals back, you see.

And the story of it all is alter-is. The individual's going to catch catfish, and by God, he finds himself studying law. Accumulates mass. He'll study law and try to go fishing. It's the shift of attention; the shift of direction. And it inhibits his ability to as-is so he accumulates mass. Also, change of attention is change and energy is change, if you want to get more scientific about it. There's a lot to be understood about how mass evolves out of alteration.

Alter-is-ness. Alter-is a postulate and you get mass. Well, you got the idea. Lightning bolt goes from A to B. *Boom!* Nothing left of the lightning bolt. It all went over to B. All right. Let's have a lightning bolt determined to go from A to B and then let's put some huge capacitors and some impedances and put three vias on the line and let it flow. Something is going to happen to mass. Something is going to occur here. Let it flow through just – just this much. Just let it flow through air and you'll get ozone being created. In other words, there's a – change is going to take place.

Change occurs the moment that you make something do otherwise than go from A to B. Something goes from A to B smoothly with no impedance of any kind if you can imagine that, and you get, of course, no change as far as that's concerned. Oh, you doubt that. Well, there's this little point. You see, if it goes from point A to point B with no change, then of course it can't – not travel across any distance, can it? You follow that? So point A has to be point B. And under those circumstances you get a no-change situation.

Now, by introducing the arbitrary of space, you have introduced a via. It can't get from A to B without traveling through some space. You get one of the first things that happens to build a universe. That, by the way, looks so ordinary to you, but in actual fact is so peculiar that a universe will result from it – that A and B are different points. That's really a brain-cracker – distance. Now as we inspect all these various things, we see that alteration or shift of attention is what causes hang-up – motionlessness in time – you already have time. Now we get a shift of attention, we'll get a motionlessness in time. We get all kinds of variations. We get accumulation of mass. We get dissipation of masses. We get all kinds of weird things going on here. Interchanges of masses. Dislocation of points in space. We get all kinds of things. And because we're getting all these changes, we get an individual, who after a while, obsessively changes.

There are two things wrong with the human personality – if you can call them wrong – two basic errors. These are not the most basic errors. One is too great a constancy, and the other is too much inconstancy. Those are two crimes, you see. Two is-nesses.

An exaggerated constancy is described in that *thrilling* poem, "The boy stood on the burning deck, The flames were about to kill him, And there came a thrilling rescue in the last three feet of film." That, of course, is an alteration of the poem. It almost murders you just to read the poem, you see. The temptation to alter-is it is so great, because its constancy is so fantastically stupid. He stands on the burning deck and burns up, see. This is supposed to be a great thing. We're supposed to teach the kids, you know. If you're standing in the road and you are supposed to be waiting for your father, and the car is coming, it is very evil if you move. Don't move.

Doesn't sound educational, does it? Well, that is what you might call too great a constancy.

And the other is too great a variation. You never can find the kid. Unlocatable. As soon as you call up Jimmy's house to find him, why, he's gone over to Mary's house, and you call Mary's house, and he's back at Jimmy's house, and you keep this up for hours.

Auditors do these two things. Auditors do these two things: They resist change even when it is sensible; and they will obsessively introduce change when it is not required. Constancy without understanding, without reason, is simply a characteristic of MEST. One should understand why one is being constant before one starts being constant. I recommend it thoroughly.

And one should also understand what he is undertaking before he introduces alteration. This is also appalling. Now auditing, oddly enough, following the science of mind and life, does not necessarily bring about – and is not bound and determined to bring about its own track and its own mass because it's short track and it is singularly deprived of duress. Auditing today is not something to worry about unless it is done in such a knuckleheaded fashion that nobody would believe it. Then you could worry about auditing because it'll put the individual beyond the reach of help, which is the only actual overt.

Well, you could audit an individual so badly and so constantly and so consistently that nobody could ever tie him down again to get audited. That would be a crime, see, caused by bad auditing. Because it would make auditing bring about an inaccessibility of the case, you see.

And you could audit somebody on the wrong goal knuckleheadedly enough, long enough and hard enough and knuckleheadedly enough, and viciously enough, and ARC breaky enough probably to kill him, see. Probably knock the body off before you got through. It would take some doing. An auditor would have to be singularly stupid to do this, but you must not, just because we are all tender little flowers that are likely to be shocked, we must not exclude that fact because it might alarm somebody.

I am a great believer in people doing what they're doing, knowing what they're doing I'll think that's a good thing, you know. I don't like to see troops told that they are going to go to heaven if they get killed on the battlefield fighting the Unguts or something, you see. I used to look at the whirling dervishes telling the Mohammedan troops and that sort of thing that this thing was going to happen, you know. Hang more dervishes. It made me feel spinny for a while, but I ran it out.

Anyhow ... Cheer up, it's not that bad. [laughter] Now I don't like to see you walking in against the pcs these days without realizing that you could use Routine 3GA in a completely knuckleheaded fashion; insist on – insist on the pc handling the wrong goal; insist on very ARC breaky and duressful sessions and so forth, and obtain a – well, probably, possibly even a knock-off on the part of the pc, see. I don't like to see you blind to that fact because it could happen. It would have to be pretty – pretty wild, but it could happen. Ordinarily the pc becomes very sick and very dizzy and you realize something is going wrong, and if you know your business, then you'll find the pc's right goal. It now becomes a little bit harder to find, but it can still be done, you see.

Now, in Prepchecking – in Prepchecking we had a problem. First, there's this problem of alteration. There's a problem of too great a constancy. You know there are people still run-

ning engrams because the stuff I figured out later, that was no good; that, the early stuff, that was good, you know. I know this. There are people in the United States – there's some guys in the United States sitting in the back areas. They're still running engrams like mad. They probably never will get beyond this point in psychology classes in universities where they're using Dianetics. Because that was good, but any improvement on it, well, that was too much. And Hubbard shouldn't have started thinking about thetans or anything like that. That was a nasty thing for him to do in this materialistic society. That's what you might call too great a constancy.

The guy sacrifices his future in the – in the idea that constancy is that great a virtue. Well, it isn't that great a virtue. Constancy must always be accompanied by understanding. Similarly, change should be accompanied by understanding. If you fully understand the tools which exist at this moment, you will see minimal reasons to change them, and you'll get your maximal change from the auditors who know the least about these things or do them least well.

But that doesn't say when you're auditing a little kid who can hardly speak English, that – you see, this is too great a constancy – he's seven years old and you're – he can't speak English very good, you know. He's only been speaking it since – for the last five years, and you say, "In this session is there anything you have suppressed?"

And he says, "Suppressed?" He says, "What's that? What's that suppressed? What? What's suppressed? Suppressed? What's that?"

And you say, "*Suppressed*. I'll repeat the auditing question. In this session is there anything you have suppressed?" And you know, you're not going to get anyplace. You have to give it to him. He'll finally understand what you're talking about. "Hid" or "squashed" or "put out of sight." You know, you'll say, "fail to reveal," he didn't get that. He didn't dig that. And you'll finally say, "hid from me." *Hu-hu*. Yeah, he digs that, see. You get the idea.

But this is – this is too great an alteration. Talking to somebody who understands all this and so forth. Pc says to us, "Well, every time we have a session you keep talking to me about difficulties, and I really don't like to have difficulties discussed because – and so forth, because it upsets me every time you mention difficulties, and difficulties are pretty bad, and nobody can ever get over their difficulties, see?" So you omit it from the Model Session. Never ask that. That's too great a change, man.

Or every time you say the criticism end rudiment, why, the pc says, "Every time I – every time I hear that I – I get the idea that you're – you're just sitting there looking at me and thinking that I just sit here and criticize and criticize and criticize you all the time, and do nothing else but criticize you. I never criticize you. I never think any critical thoughts to myself at all. I never think any critical thoughts in the whole session. Yet you just keep asking this question and asking this question and so forth, and I ..."

So you say, "Well, have you done anything in the session?" I'm afraid that's too great a change. Or let us say you can't clear the mid rudiment, "In this session, is there anything you have failed to reveal?" and you can't clear this mid rudiment. It just doesn't ever clear. So you say, "Are you concentrated on anything during this session that you aren't letting me in on in some fashion." And then develop seven or eight more middle rudiments. And then develop a

hot button: "In this session are you refusing to win?" I can hear it now. [laughter] This becomes the place where they raise kangaroos. It's up there in Southwest, New South, North Wales – place they raise kangaroos. I can hear it now. Right above one of those little lakes. Canberra. That's it. Canberra. Yeah, yeah. I can hear it now: "In this session are you refusing to win?" You know? Something like that. Gets to be very fashionable. Finally, we send out an expedition, make the archaeological discovery that that's why the civilization of Canberra disappeared, you see – because they squirreled all the time.

You get the idea? There's moderation in all things, even in constancy. And there's certainly moderation in alter-ness.

If you think you need four or five different new middle ruds to get your pc kicked along the line, you're going to be in more trouble than you're going to be in because this is one of the problems.

One of the problems is that an inconstancy of approach by the auditor causes more trouble than an unusual solution heals. Yes, these little buttons are wonderful; injected in the right place and all that sort of thing. But they inject an inconstancy and a failure to predict in the session, which overreaches the good they do. In other words, they actually might improve the pc's case and lower the pc's confidence; because he couldn't predict what the auditor's going to say next, see. And he gets down along the line and this auditor's always coming up with something different, you know, and the pc's always coming out of session with his attention on the auditor. You see, that can be an evil. And it finally results in violating the definition of in-sessionness.

You get a constancy that works so that your middle rudiments consist of suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal and been careful of. That takes an awful lot of edge off the case. Yes, we know there's more we could get off the case. Mary Sue and I were fooling around one night and I think we racked up I don't know, eight or twelve or fifteen, something like that, different new things that could be put into the end rudiments.

End rudiments would be about twenty questions long. You know, you start the session ten minutes before session time in order to get the end rudiments done by session end, you know. There's all kinds of them: "Is there anything in this session you've been responsible for?" The hottest of them, "Is there anything in this session that has shifted your attention?" or "Has there been a shift of attention in this session?" that sort of thing. Oh, that's a very hot button, but listen, there's about twenty of them.

And we were cleaning up a session which hadn't been noteworthy for its meanness or something of the sort, and she kept asking these questions. We were just – the session had just passed by, and she got a fall on every one of these. Little tiny things. Didn't amount to a hill of beans, you see. But nevertheless each one of them was slightly charged.

What you're trying to do with Model Session – and this is another problem – is you're trying to make the pc auditable and continue to be auditable. That's all you're doing with Model Session and its processes. Just trying to make the pc auditable and continue to be auditable. And oddly enough, if you run it, it's got therapeutic value. The repetitions are perfectly done with Havingness or something like that in the body of the session.

This is tremendously valuable, therapeutically. But honest, you could run it for a thousand sessions just as itself, and it wouldn't clear anybody. The virtue of Model Session then, is not its processing value, it's its predictable value. Pc knows what's going to happen, and additionally it takes the edge off the things most likely to distract the pc. Your Model Session doesn't try to heal all the pc's mari... Imagine your embarrassment. You're going to use the Model Session – the PTP question, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc says, "Oh, I'm having terrible difficulty with my husband."

So you say, "All right now. Isn't that marvelous? We've finally gotten her to realize that she is – and so on."

And we take off at this point – see, we're not even in the session – and we take off at this point, and we use this. Just as a repetitive question. No – we could, too. We do nothing but run this with one aim in view: to cure all of her marital difficulties. We're going to have all of their marital difficulties cured on the whole track.

Five or six sessions later, the pc's starting to look rather odd by this time. And we somehow or other never seem to get past this rudiment. We never bother just to clean the rudiment, you see. We're trying to audit the case with that rudiment. And imagine our embarrassment – either we or somebody – we finally get tired of it – we finally find the pc's goal: "To kill my husband." [laughter] You're never going to run a R3GA with a rudiments process, I assure you.

Hidden in this case – here's another difficulty – hidden in any case is this basic purpose, a prime postulate. And earlier than that other prime postulates. These vary. And it would be very nice to say the basic prime postulate for all human beings every place is "to be." And all you have to do is list, "to be," and that will be marvelous and we'll just get the four way flow on "to be," and we just do that on any pc and we never have to do a Goals Assessment. And I wish that were true because you're knuckleheaded when it comes to Goals Assessments. But it doesn't happen to be true.

No, they have goals of various kinds. "To kill my husband." "To catch catfish." "To fall in love with golden haired goddesses." "To be a crapehanger." "To sit." [laughter] Now, remember that any alteration of that goal is going to add mass, and it's actually a fantastic thing that we have processes such as these Model Session and Prepchecking today, which actually can do something with the case over the head of this without getting us into too much trouble. Remember that's the way it is. It doesn't get us into too much trouble. That's the way to look at Model Session and rudiments and processes and Prepchecking and so forth. It's just fine. It doesn't get us into too much trouble.

As far as improving the case is concerned, all we're trying to do with the case is smooth out the needle. That's basically all we're trying to do with the case so the case will sit there quietly and can have an assessment run. Now, that's the brutal truth of the matter.

Now, that people feel better is incredibly a fact, but it should be regarded as somewhat incredible by an auditor. How can the guy feel better when he has a goal, "to sit," and his job tells him he has to run all day. [laughter] See, that is your senior aberration, and is so over-

whelmingly senior to any other button or aberration on the case that to be able to do anything for the case at all is absolutely miraculous.

But you can walk up to somebody, and put your finger on his forehead, have him look at your finger with his eyes shut, you know, and so forth, and cure his headache by spotting your finger around here, there; or that you can run "From where could you communicate to a leg," and "To what leg could you communicate," or something. That you could do anything for this guy at all – that you could take somebody who's lying in a sickbed with upper leukosis or something and run out what the nurse said yesterday or something and have the hemorrhaging cease. This is absolutely fantastic when you sound the well of human aberration and know that the prime postulate is going to interfere with anything you try to do. That you can get away with this is fantastic. Now, this is unusual enough without flying into the face of the gods.

Now, if you're trying to solve a case without recourse to the case's goal, I sympathize with you. I've had lots of experience. I can tell you that it can't be done. That case will not solve all the way. That case's recoveries will be quite often very spectacular, neighbors thrilled to pieces, everybody very happy. Little Izzekranz can see again, you know. Marvelous. Roscoe's right arm is not now shorter than the left. Yeah. This is gorgeous. It's fine. You'll find these pcs in due course of time, not necessarily getting that trouble back, but you'll find out they haven't found out they changed really. Very unsatisfactory over the whole thing. You're not going to change a pc short of his goal.

The way to change a pc is to clear him. That's one of the basic problems you're up against. The basic problem of clearing a pc is cleaning up his needle. The basic problem of cleaning up the needle is to have a sufficiently powerful process which is sufficiently constant in its application, that the pc gets very confident in being audited. Do you see how those problems add up?

Now, strangely enough, a pc is not going to let anything help him against which he has fantastic overts. He gets in a games condition with it, and you as the auditor or the subject you're using – he gets overts against you or overts against the subject, your missed withholds and it makes him misemotional or something like this, and he can't be helped as easily. In fact it is not only much harder but sometimes impossible to accomplish help in the face of those things so it requires a certain amount of preparatory action so as to keep the pc in-session.

Now, you were asking me one night whether or not you would do these things – you would set up a case like this after you left Saint Hill. Well, you're going to run into the same problems. You see, some case with a nice free needle, and you say, "Oh, well, that's fairly – all right. I mean – well, I'll just sail into this case. Aw, I'll just get the case's goal and ..." And you'll be killed by your own good luck. So help me Pete, you found the pc's goal. So help me Pete, it was dead easy. Nulled it out, the needle went free, the pc felt marvelous. It's an absolute miracle. It didn't take anything like the number of hours that you thought. You think this is the most marvelous thing that ever happened to you, see. Oh, it's marvelous, see. Great. Great. Great.

And you get your next pc. And you say, "Well, I've got a fairly free needle ... There's no dirty needle there or anything. I'll just go to work here." And then we hit the anxiety peak

as we come up on the last quarter of the run in finding his goal, and suddenly discover belatedly that we have never had the pc under control ever. And the pc's anxiety throws him totally out of control. There isn't any way we can hold him in-session. He just blows, *bloom!* So we keep climbing uphill against this sort of thing, and we waste five times the number of hours on this pc that we would have had to spend in setting the pc up in the first place. And we become citizens, see. We can be spoiled by good luck. Don't think for a moment that you can't have good luck like this. Just please for my sake feel a little bit leery of it.

Little Johnny's schoolteacher understands you're a Scientologist, and she's heard something about this and she wants this and that. And we say, all right. Well, make yourself out a list of goals, and we'll find a goal. And she does and you run down the list once and you find a goal sitting there. And that's the only thing it takes and it checks out perfectly. And you list it, and you list twenty-five items for each line and the needle goes free.

She tells you the next goal and the four items to free that and she becomes OT, you see. Look, I just hope it never happens to you. Yes, then every pc after that is going to look horrible. It's just disastrous in all directions. Life becomes gruesome.

Now, the other thing, the other main problem that stares us in the face with all this, is the fact that the E-Meter itself can be run into a hole with the pc. You can neglect reads on an E-Meter and make the E-Meter unworkable. An E-Meter does not ARC break from full reading to no read, one-two. That is not black and white. It's all shades of gray. An E-Meter fades out and becomes less and less readable the more you neglect. A very inexpert auditor, not seeing the tiny reads that occur on the meter in answer to rudiments questions, can very easily and very shortly get into – get the pc into a *barely* readable meter, which only reads on the greatest of greats, that just misses withholds from there on out. That is the problem.

That's ending the rudiments process too soon. We ask the question one more time. The needle was rising as we asked the question, and there was a microscopic, infinitesimal slow in the rise. It'd take Hawkeye himself to have seen it. And the auditor lets it slide. Actually, he lets the next one slide. And he lets the next rudiment slide. By the time he gets into his third or fourth session doing this sort of thing, his meter isn't working. The guy could have been found standing over the policeman with a smoking gun in his hand, and the meter on the question, "Did you kill that cop?" would not even wiggle on that auditor.

In other words, you can sort of educate the meter out of reading. You see how you can do it? It's done on a gradient. Now, we know it can be done with a sharp and incredibly harsh ARC break from read well to no read at all. But this other one has not been suspected until recently. You can get a meter which gradually drifts out of read. The next thing you know you're ending all of your rudiments questions too early. All of them. The rudiments are never in. The whole list goes null on you every time you turn around in nulling the list. About every three questions, the list – every question goes null. Every read of every question on a goals assessment is null. There's – that needle is no longer ticking at all. That is the consequence of this earlier neglect. Now, you might have not – not have been the auditor who neglected it, but you must to some degree have aided and abetted it in the rudiments.

Now, the other problem is being too careful because you aggravate the pc every time you try to clean a clean rudiment. Just clean the clean rudiment. Now, I did some more tests

on "Do you agree that that is clean?" and taking the read off of that. I found out that doesn't work because you're cleaning a clean rudiment. And it will ARC break a pc more often than it will salvage the case. If it was clean once, it was clean, man. You can say, "Do you agree that that is clean?" so as not to evaluate for him, or "Do you agree that that is null?"

Now, you've got an end of process type of solution. "Is there anything you care to ask or say before I leave this rudiment?" If your pc always adds something afterwards you could frankly get into the habit of asking him if he wanted to say anything, see. But it doesn't come under the heading of part of Model Session. What you must remember is what you forgot in the CCHs. Two-way comm still exists in a session.

Model Session run strictly, right on the button, word for word, still is not a muzzled session. Oddly enough, it would run today as a muzzled session. But a good auditor should have enough sense to maintain two-way comm with his pc. Too many auditors withdraw out of the session and just let the Model Session carry it. That's too great a constancy, you see. Never asks the pc how he is; never sounds cheerful about the thing. You know? Never does anything to let – you know, keep the pc thinking we're all alive after all. So you drop that out and you're also in trouble.

Now, we're also wealthy to the degree that repetitive rudiments use exactly the same pattern as Repetitive Prepchecking, and we need only one skill to cover both. And that is one of the problems – is teaching a number of technologies, a number of processes, a number of procedures. No, I would rather teach one procedure superlatively well than ten indifferently. So your two things the auditor was having the most trouble with – rudiments and Prepchecking or Sec Checking as it was called earlier – have been solved today. And we've brought this up to a constancy. Well, nobody is trying to change things just for the sake of changing things, but one is certainly – I'm trying, and I think I have succeeded in bringing it up within shooting distance for any auditor so that he gets results.

It's a great joy to see the pc sitting there chatting with you, talking to you interestedly about their own case, brightly, very happy to be sitting in the auditing chair.

You use this type of procedure and you use it well, why, the pc just sits there and they talk happily to you and describe everything and they're real sent, and things are blowing Things will blow, blow, blow, blow, because they're cheerful.

And sometimes when you've been grinding away on a pc who never spoke to you cheerfully but just answered the auditing command, you all of a sudden shift to repetitive rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking and have the pc sitting there cheerful, happy, glad to be audited, glad to talk to you – you will see that there's a considerable advance just in the technology itself.

If your pc isn't doing that with you, and you use repetitive rudiments or Repetitive Prepchecking, well, you're probably doing something unusual.

Thank you very much.

REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING, PART II

A lecture given on 10 July 1962

Okay, and this is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. What did you say the date was?

Audience: The 10th.

The 10th?

Male voice: Yeah.

How did it get to be the 10th? Terrible.

All right, we're still covering the subject of repetitive rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking. And we're now going to go ahead and extend this into Repetitive Prepchecking.

Repetitive process is simply a process that is run over and over with the same question of the pc. The pc answers the thing and the auditor gives him an acknowledgment, gives him TR 4 on his origins and it is run until it is flat.

And when we say repetitive these days and apply it to rudiments and applying it to Prepchecking, we are talking about a very precise flatness. There are no more – there – in this use of it, you do not say – oh, this is really corny, I mean, to add this – "I will ask you this question two more times and then end this process." Now, you don't ever say that, see. The procedure is very precise.

There's two ways of handling these things: one is repetitive, the other is fast. See, you can include these as technical terms: repetitive rudiments, fast rudiments.

Now, there are no, and you would never run any, beginning rudiments as a fast check. Beginning rudiments would always be repetitive.

Early on when you are doing basic types of sessioning, particularly in training, you do your middle rudiments repetitive and your end rudiments repetitive. At that moment your end rudiments become single questions, each one, and it takes forever to get them in.

And that is not how they are written in Model Session. It is almost identical, except that you take the packaged question and subdivide it so that your un... your half-truth, you ask

a whole question repetitively about a half-truth, and then a whole question is only about an untruth and so forth. You break that down so it becomes a *fabulous* number of rudiments.

But that's all right. That's all good training and that's all fine and it's kind of a Prep-check in disguise. But that would simply be a training mechanism.

It would be more usual to run your middle rudiments repetitive than end rudiments. End rudiments thereafter, would normally be handled as fast rudiments. And normally mid rudiments, particularly as a case advanced, would be handled as fast rudiments.

The random rudiment – asking for a missed withhold randomly, any part of a session – would usually be handled as a fast rudiment. In the first place the pc hasn't – you haven't missed that many withholds on the pc during that session. The pc starts to look a little bit tense so you ask him the random thing and you ask him the random rudiment. You're just asking for a missed withhold, that's all. And check it on the meter, guide his attention into it and he tells you this and he's fairly cheerful.

Sometimes you have to wrestle around for this one. I mean, be accustomed to getting that question answered. Never ask for a withhold unless you get the question answered: That's a maxim. And never ask for a missed withhold unless you are fully prepared to sit there all night to get it answered. So a little bit of random rudiment goes a very long way.

Now, the repetitive aspect is very precise in its delivery. At one time we were sec checking this way. Everybody could do it very easily. And we found that it was very well handled normally. And it was known as the "Impasse system," – its earliest action, sometime around the first of the year. And it was quite successful. And I got Prepchecking – developed Prepchecking after that, asking for chains, and developed the withhold system and so on.

And if you are very expert and your pc is well, well in-session and you dig chains and basics and a lot of other "if's," prepchecking by the withhold system is undoubtedly very fast and it's very good and very able, and percentagewise it is unteachable. There are not too many auditors can use it successfully. They get all fouled up. Their feet get all tangled up in the E-Meter and it gets pretty grim.

Quite in addition to this, used as itself on an ARC breaky or poorly reading pc on the meter, is not as successful as the Repetitive Prepcheck.

In other words if you are very good and your TR 1 is excellent and your pc is well in-session, prepchecking with the withhold system can be pretty marvelous, pretty rapid, and you can do some things with it which look absolutely miraculous. But in the general course of human events, your pc is happier, you will get more done – the average auditor will get more done with Repetitive Prepchecking than he will get done with Prepchecking with the withhold system. So, Repetitive Prepchecking becomes very valuable. The pc goes better into session with Repetitive Prepchecking than they do on Prepchecking with the withhold system.

We are not doing, and I do not advocate your doing or learning, Prepchecking by the withhold system. I don't advocate that now. If you were fortunate enough to have learned it, and to have learned how to do it, you will occasionally find yourself facing some pc that you are trying to straighten out – straighten out a needle on, or something of this sort, and you take Repetitive Prepchecking combined with a fish and fumble, or either one of them, and you

can chase that needle down and clean it up, scat. And it's a good skill. If you haven't learned it, don't bother. Okay?

The Repetitive Prepcheck follows exactly the same pattern as a repetitive rudiment. And this is a wild virtue because the individual is then not having to learn two skills; he only has to learn one skill to perform two functions. They are both identical. There is nothing – no difference at all between the way these two things are used, except of course, the repetitive rudiment stems from the rudiment question of the session as given in Model Session and no other way, except of course, as you might have to modify it for a very motivatorish case or as you have to modify it, perhaps for a child – something of that sort.

You don't use more rudiments than you'll find in the modified Model Session. Don't use more rudiments than that. If you find yourself having to run more rudiments than that you still have the solution. The ARC breaky pc, of course, comes to pieces on O/W. And see, you've still got a process sitting there.

The process O/W – general O/W, is added, by the way, to Prepchecking, Model Session, and can go prior to any Prepcheck, Havingness or Routine 3 session. It isn't not – doesn't matter what type of session you are in – the rule is the same.

We've never before had a specific allowance for one fact: that occasionally a pc comes to a session – not comes into session – but comes *to* a session so misemotional, so ARC broke, so wrapped up in a PTP of great magnitude that they hardly even hear you say, "Start of session." They are just involved. And this new Model Session allows for you to put in general O/W ahead of any other rudiment, because the pc can't pay any attention at all to the rest of it and you are just going to get soup and mush. You – just going to find yourself terribly messed up, because the pc's attention is so fixated that any change of the pc's attention on exactly what the pc's attention is on is going to lend to ARC breaks, apathy and upset on the part of the pc and is actually a cruelty.

The other one is a seriously ill pc or a pc who feels too ill to be audited. Now, those two pcs we have never specifically taken care of. They are unusual circumstances, but the general O/W at the beginning of session – just after you say, "Start of session," is "What have you done? What have you withheld?" Or the motivatorish one which will be out with the 12th July bulletin, 62. The motivatorish question is "What have you done to another? What have you withheld from another?" You have to get around this tendency, "What have you done?" "Well, I've punished myself terribly by sitting down in this auditing session and having to look at you," you see? I mean, the pc will rapidly plow himself in on this.

That, right there at the start of a session, is *not* run against the meter. It's *not* run against the tone arm. You should understand that it isn't run against the *meter*; it's run against the *pc*.

Now, when it first came out, that was when I first released it, I showed you how you could run it against the meter. But I found out on a little more experimentation that it really wasn't necessary to run it against the meter. You are going to find out if you missed a withhold on the pc in the next two questions anyhow. See? So you needn't even bother to check it if you don't want to, you just, "What have you done?" you see, "What have you withheld? What have you done? What have you withheld?" Oh, his tone arm is moving madly, you

know. Well, maybe you've got some kind of a situation where you've never seen the pc's tone arm move before, *ho-ho*. You know? Great. It's true, too!

Some pcs with a superautomatic bank – you know these pcs are rare, but when you meet them, you've had it. The superautomatic bank: Did you ever hear about this? Well, it is just like somebody shuffling through a Niagara Falls of lantern slides – if you can just imagine it. They are all over the time track. Everything is grouped, everything is in motion, everything is automatic. You say, "Did you ever drink any coffee?" And they get rapidly five hundred pictures of drinking coffee. See? You say, "What did you say to the fellow?" And just on the mention of "fellow," you get *brrrrrrrrr* of "fellows." See?

It's almost impossible to hold this pc on the time track anyplace. The pc is not very frequent. But I have seen a pc with an automatic bank fail to respond to any processing known to man or beast because you couldn't control him enough in session – except O/W. Now, I've seen them – I've seen them run on anything else – no tone arm action, no answers, can't spot it on the time track, always in trouble. The mere fact that you have asked them a question practically slaughters them – upsets them.

The pc generally starts in and says, "Well, I've been audited an awful lot of times, been audited in an HGC, and several, several auditors and I've had no less than twenty-nine Saint Hill graduates" – this is very peculiar you see, because there aren't twenty-nine of them in Canada – "and all of this and so on, and never had any results, and all of this sort of thing, and it's all very terrible and I wish I had some reality on the situation, because I always have this kidney backache," or "I always have this – this knife through my chest," or "I always have this bad foot. See? And it doesn't do any good. There's just no reason to audit me and I don't ever get any results from auditing"

You hear something like that, ask the pc what happens when you ask a question or ask the pc what they are looking at, and you are liable to find you are auditing an automatic bank. Quite interesting because the case, of course, is in so many engrams so often they never have an opportunity to suffer from just one. Yet they will respond to O/W. You can ask them "What have you done? What have you withheld?" or the motivatorish version of it, see. "What have you done to another? What have you withheld from another?" And actually get a wild lot of tone arm action.

So the only thing you would do with tone arm action – the only thing you would do – if you did see tone arm action while you were running O/W because the pc was sick at his stomach that day, and you hadn't seen that much tone arm action on this pc, and you were prepchecking this pc, *ho-ho-hoo*. Well good, just move it into the body of the session.

In other words, you run the thing until the pc feels much better and you can get in your first rudiment. Then get in your second rudiment, get in your third rudiment, go into the body of the session and resume O/W. Get the idea?

So if you were getting tone arm action on a pc with O/W and you hadn't seen it before, no matter what you were prepchecking on, why, that would be about the only time you ever paid much attention to the tone arm action of O/W. Don't you see? That would be a time to pay attention to the tone arm action of O/W.

But you don't run the tone arm action out of it because you can't. And you don't run the ticks out of it because you can't. Would you please look at the breadth of the question? Have you even said, "In this lifetime is there anything you've ...?" No! Well, let's just jump at the whole track! "Now, have you done anything in two-hundred trillion years?" See? "Well, that's not flat yet." [laughs] So just forget about – forget about that, except where the pc's concerned.

Now, we used to have an ARC break-type process that we ran without the meter. Do you remember that? You know we ran it – we spotted the fact the pc didn't feel good with our eyes, you see – we didn't pay any attention to the meter. And we ran something on the pc till they felt better and they looked better to us, and then we went ahead with the session. Do you remember that? That was because the meter was unoperative on ARC breaks, so you could never quite take that chance.

Well, O/W comes under the same category. The pc says – sits down. He says, "Oh, I'm not going to be audited by you. I don't want to be audited by you because the last time you audited me you put both of your feet in my lap and kept kicking me throughout the whole session." And the thing to do at that particular time is not say, "You're lying." That is not the right thing for an auditor to say. It's just – not that there's anything wrong with it – it's just that it isn't done and Ron frowns on it. Now, the thing ... And the pc will do worse than frown.

The thing – the thing to do at that particular time is realize that if you asked the pc, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?", you are going to get a howling, screaming, "No, goddamn it and I never will." Don't you see? We are now going to just stack up a whole bunch of new overts.

See? If we run, "What have you done to *me*? What have you withheld from *me*?" – we are running a terminal and maybe we're allergic on the pc's terminal track. See, maybe it – maybe we are the wrong terminal to be used as a terminal on the track, you see. Sometimes you know, you can audit the wrong terminal and beef up the pc's bank in about five commands. But as the auditor, if your attention isn't being yanked off onto the – I mean pc's attention isn't yanked off onto you all the time you could audit him for hundreds of hours without messing him up, see. So you can say to this pc, "What have you done? What have you withheld?" That's all.

Now, if the pc seems to be withholding things and having a very hard time, you could ask the random rudiment in the middle of that particular process. It's an opportunity to use the random rudiment. It's called random ... You see, mid ruds are used only in the body of the session. This random rudiment which pulls the missed withhold can be used during any rudiment or at the end of any rudiment or any time.

So you could run O/W and you'd find this pc would eventually settle down. The pc would find you as an auditor and so forth. The pc's finally sitting there, looks pretty well all right, looks better, sounds calmer, doesn't look even apathetic. We say, "Well, the pc looks vaguely like they could be audited." So then we go into the first rudiment which is, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And the pc says, "I guess so." You see? That's a way of handling that situation.

Supposing the pc blew and you went and got the pc and tried to get the pc back into session. That's in the middle of the session isn't it? What are you going to do then? Oh, I don't know – I don't think if you let a pc blow you deserve a solution. Let's go on to something else. [laughs, laughter]

No, you could use that. By introducing the random rudiment or getting the random rudiment flat you would also accomplish the same ends. And probably you couldn't use O/W on such a case without using the random rudiment also. Now, how would you do that? Well, you'd use the random rudiment every once in a while. Just check a rudiment while running O/W, in other words.

Now, the random rudiment is always checked against the meter, but O/W is the exception to the line. You don't run the O/W questions to a flat meter. You don't because you can't. And it is not safe to leave that without adding the random – without being very, very – I won't say that you always have to use the random rudiment by reason of running O/W, but I would say you would be safer if you did, rather than to wait till just the question after the difficulty question. That might be one question too many, particularly if the pc was misemotional. At the beginning of session you are liable to spin the pc in again. Do you follow this?

So you can use the random rudiment anyplace. Let your conscience be your guide. Of course, the more rudiments you use, and the more you use middle rudiments unnecessarily, why, the more time you are going to waste in a session. That's your main penalty. And the less auditing the pc will feel he is getting.

Now, just how does this – how does a real rudiment sound? How does a real rudiment, repetitive, sound? What is it?

Well, the auditor ignores his meter and he says to the pc, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" – not watching the meter.

And the pc, let us say, says, "No."

And you say, "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" And get it answered. And then you say to the pc – no meter, see – "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

And the pc says, "No."

And you say, "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" And the pc answers it – you still don't have a meter, see.

"What – are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

And the pc says, "Yes."

You say, "Good. I will check that on the meter." And for the first time, bring the meter into it.

And then looking at the meter, you say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Now, if it was clear you say to the pc, "Do you agree that that is null?" or "Do you agree that that is clean?" And you – if you've got a null read – didn't react to your question – you leave it whether the pc says anything else or not or whether the "agree" has a fall on it or

not, because the rule is: is once you get a clean read, you never ask it another time. You shut up right now.

If you've gotten a clean read on, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties," the only way you can ask it again – and the only reason you would ask it again – is because you couldn't read the meter, and to keep in the reality factor you say so. Rather than use clear technical words, rather than to use words which might be slightly engramic or something, use something that is offbeat like, "That was an equivocal read." The pc learns pretty soon that when you say "equivocal," you probably mean that it wasn't quite understandable to you and that you are going to say it again. That's the least the pc will get out of it and you haven't introduced the idea "the meter isn't reading," or "that was wrong," or "I couldn't tell," you know.

You old Dianeticists would know the folly of saying to a pc when he's half-anaten, "I couldn't tell that time." That is lovely, you know, you just get that piece of the time track in the session – just get lost right there, you see. So use something like, "that was an equivocal read," see. Use something besides... That is not a – there is no standardization on that particular wording because you are going to run into trouble on any standardization. Because sometimes you weren't able to see it, or something of that sort. And your R-factor to be put in very solidly, simply should be that. You can even say, "It hit the pin. I'm sorry." And ask it again. Get the idea? It's what breaks through to the pc without interrupting the whole session and throwing it all in a cocked hat.

The truth of the matter is, the R-factor is, is *you missed it*. You couldn't tell. You missed what it said. And that's fairly easy to do.

Don't feel too upset because it has very, very little to do with the auditor. Given a trained auditor, all variations and numbers of equivocal reads depend on the pc he is auditing. Audit one pc and my gosh, every fifth – every fifth read on the meter is equivocal. See, you've got a dirty needle that's going tickety-tick, tickety-tick, tickety-tick, tickety-tick, tickety-tick tickety-tick – and it never ceases. Boy, how you can read – how you can get a read through that is pretty fantastic, and yet you have to do it.

So, rather than make a liar out of yourself and ... Never pretend on a meter read, because somewhere down deep the pc knows. See? Never pretend. Say what it is. Don't ever try to make yourself look good at the expense of the meter or something like that. Boy, that's dynamite!

So, about every so often on a pc, and sometimes on the same pc, you'll get patches of clean and patches of dirty and you'll just spend a couple of sessions when all the reads are – about every third or fourth read is equivocal. And then you're into the same trouble when the pc is coming up toward ... You got the needle all loosened up with prepchecking gorgeously. And at sensitivity 16, if a breath of air passes through the room, why, the needle kicks over against one pin and comes back hard enough to hit the other pin and bounce. You see? And it does it so rapidly – and by the way, I probably should mention this: You ride the thing with your thumb. You ride the tone arm with your thumb. See, you should always be able to ride a tone arm with your thumb. See? You don't keep reaching over here adjusting it. You see me do it on the TV because the meter is left-handed, see, for me. See, I have to work the meter

with my right hand which I ordinarily wouldn't do at all. But that's just so you can see it on TV – it has nothing with the proper way of setup. And took a little doing for me to get used to that too, when I first started to run that.

But, it's very funny, in order to do this, this is the way you'd – see – you'd have – it can't even be done. This is the equivalent position of the meter. See, really – you can't do it, so I have to adjust it with this finger. And it's very hard to do. So you don't – you never have seen how I do this, but when I'm auditing the pc, I put my thumb over here on the tone arm and throw – this is with too loose a needle, see – and I throw the thing as I start to say the sentence. If I've got too loose a needle, throw it so it will hit the pin and bounce back and idle as I say the last word. It takes nice timing, but you know you can actually train yourself to do this to such an extent that your needle is never under the impulse of being thrown at the time you are saying the last word.

If you are absolutely perfect, the needle will be sitting right straight up in the middle of the dial completely motionless and unaffected at just – at the instant you finish the last word, and you'll get [snaps fingers] any action that is on it. You never find yourself trying to read on a fast rise. I always distrust fast rises. Particularly, do you know a goal – an actually reading goal – doesn't have enough impulse to read down against a fast rise. Did you know that? It won't tick against the fast rise. It will show up as a tiny slow, if you can detect it at all.

You'll see some goals – they'll go tick, tick, and then by that time the pc is now suddenly getting a fast rise, you see, because they've got a very floaty needle or something like that, and you will have said the goal the third time as it gave that fast rise. And you won't get any read, and then it will drift over toward the middle again and you'll say the goal the next time and you will get the tick, the tick, and then the fast rise and it won't read. That's about the only time. An impulse against a speeding needle is always to be distrusted. Don't get too trusting about that.

That needle was flying around. Remember that needle has weight and the little tiny missed withhold that is going to shoot your session full of holes does not have enough energy to overcome all that inertia. So the needle that is really flying around on the dial – ah, you'd better call equivocal reads more often than you do, until you really get used to it, any time that needle was going too darn fast.

Oh, never go in for this: never wait for the needle to sit down before you start reading it. Don't make that mistake because you will find yourself spending one and two and three minutes dead silent as the auditor in the session, waiting for the needle to be still enough to ask the question. But of course, now that you have started to ask the question the pc is not yet in the condition where the pc is not disturbed by the sound of your voice, so of course the needle then starts moving and is off the dial by the time you have said the last word. Then you have to wait two or three minutes, don't you see, in order for the needle to quiet down. And that's not what we're – that isn't the way you ought to be doing it.

No, the way to – the way to handle one of these things is: If your sentence finishes against a fast flying needle that is flying very, very fast and so forth, and the pc's reads are usually against that direction, see. It's up, and the pc's needle – there's a slight fall you've been getting lately. And you didn't detect a slow. See, that will read as a slow. Don't take a chance.

Just say, "That was equivocal," and say it again. See? Don't be in all that hurry. But when you announce that it is or infer that it is by saying, "Do you agree that that is clean?" – you be awful sure that it is clean, you understand?

Say "equivocal" all you want to, you understand, but be sure. Because this other factor enters in. This other horrible factor enters in: Miss a little tick here and a little tick there and the pc will cease to read on the meter at all. They've gotten away with it this time, and they've gotten away with it that time and the next thing you know they know the meter isn't functioning on them; and the meter will read less and less and less and less and all of a sudden the meter doesn't read for you as the pc – as the pc's auditor.

Interesting, isn't it? And then you have to trace way back in your auditing and you have to take the Zero Questions that you hoped were clear; and then you have to study down the line; and you really scrunch up your eyes; and you really watch the meter; and finally you'll see that one of those questions goes *pft*, you know. And you say, "Did it or didn't it?" And you say – ask it again and you watch it very closely. "No, it was a null that time."

Oh, you've had it. See, you've compounded the felony. Of course, it will be unreadable the next time because the needle has already ceased to read, to all intents and purposes, because the pc – you just missed too much on the pc, don't you see? The needle isn't reading now to amount to anything, and you did get one little tiny twitch, and just that extra question to make sure will be enough to cause it to be another missed withhold. See?

So that one has – that track back has to be done with the greatest of care. And you get back to something and get it to twitch, and then call the twitch and get it answered. And you gradually will build the case back to a good, solid reading needle. That's how to build them back when they've faded out on you.

All right. So, with all that explanation – you check whatever question it was that you were asking the pc, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" You've gotten no reaction, so you say to the pc, "Do you agree that that is clean?"

And the pc says, "No. Yes. The sky is green. The moon is made of green cheese."

From there on it's a TR 4 situation. You got it? That's just a TR 4 situation. You don't do anything else, in spite of the liabilities of missing withholds. Once you have declared something clean don't reverse your tracks, because this upsets the pc more than the tiny missed withholds. See?

You'll get all upset about this thing. See, I mean the pc – "Oh, what the hell? God almighty, we got the thing clean. We had a present time problem and now here we've got another present time problem," and so on, so you never check it twice. Once you have issued the papal bull – once the proclamation is posted in the village square it is never pulled down, till next session, or the next time you run mid ruds or something. See? You've pronounced it.

Now, the pc says, "No, that was not clean. In actual fact there are several difficulties I'm perfectly unwilling to talk to you about and they have to do with cats, fishhooks and catfish and various things of that character." You just TR 4 him, TR 4 him, TR 4 him. "Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thanks. Good. Well, all right." And we get on with the next rudiment. You got it?

All right. So what's your exact action here? The exact action is without the meter, you say, "Question." The pc answers it yes or no. You ask him for the more information if he hasn't given you the information. Ordinarily a pc will generally get so that he is making a session out of it. That's neither really bad or good in the rudiments. He won't give you the yes or no anymore because he finds out it won't do him any good, you'll just ask the additional question, so he answers the additional question at the time you ask him the rudiment. Quite common, let it go by. It's not perfect, but then neither are rudiments.

So the setup in this particular case is: You ask the pc the question and you – the pc answers it – has an answer for it, has an answer for it. You always ask the same question. You never vary the question. You never ask another question. You can engage in two-way comm at any time with the pc of course. But you don't go and pester him; you don't Q-and-A on this; you don't question his answer – nothing like this. You take whatever he tells you. You even take what he tells you if he gave you a motivator when you asked him for an overt, you know, unless it flagrantly is not an answer to the auditing question. Flagrantly – it has to be pretty flagrantly not an answer to the auditing question. "Since the last time I audited you have you done anything that you are withholding?" "I am mad at you." Well, when you finally get it amplified, the pc has answered the question, only he's shorthanded it. So you didn't buy that? Cut your throat man, you are going to have an ARC break. Now he is going to be mad at you. You get the idea?

You say, "Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding?" And the pc says, "Well, I've become unwilling to talk to you about my difficulties." Of course an auditor at that time practically goes up the pole. He doesn't know whether to go back and ask the first rudiment question which is apparently clean. He doesn't know. But the truth of the matter is, an auditor is only puzzled when he feels he has to do something every time the pc says something. That is the only auditor that ever really makes a mistake.

The guy who can sit there and fiddle while Rome burns, and fiddle cheerfully with all his TRs 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 right on the front burner – that's the auditor. But the guy who has to go and call the fire department every few minutes – he's a lousy auditor. See?

So you say, "Since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding?" "Yes, I've become unwilling to talk to you about my difficulties." And my God, you just went over the rudiment and that was clean. Well, don't be so concerned; don't be so involved. The pc, in actual fact, is simply telling you that there was a point during the wee small hours of the morning, when he became unwilling to talk to you about his difficulties. And he decided this, see. And he doesn't also tell you that at breakfast he decided he could, see. And you ask him the first rudiments question, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And he says, "yes." And of course this is clean and perfectly factual. And then you ask him if he was withholding something. He tells you – if he amplified it, he'd say, "Well, in the wee small hours of the morning, yak-yak-yak-yak, why then – so on, I became unwilling to talk to you."

Buy it, see. Don't be too critical of the pc's answer. The only time you want the pc to say more is when you honestly didn't understand what he said. When you can't make sense out of something, you are a fool to go on. Why leave yourself in a mystery-sandwich session?

The beginning and end of the session are totally clustered around the mystery in the middle of the pc's comment.

Why did the pc say, "Roses are piccadillied never." What reminded him of what that caused him to say which? You put yourself on a missed withhold with regard to the pc. He doesn't know that you didn't know. See, always fill that missed withhold in, for this reason: The most serious button that you can disturb on a case, of course, is the knowingness button. You throw the pc into a situation that has to do with know or not-know, and of course you are going to get into an involved situation. So, that's the only time when you ask a pc to say something else or amplify it.

The funny part of it is, let's say that you've had a horrible time in the last few days and you've become totally knuckleheaded and half-deaf, so that *every* time the pc says something you have to tell the pc to speak up and you didn't understand it. You didn't hear it, you didn't understand it, you didn't dig it. Do you know that the only way to really mess up the session is to fail to do that – when you didn't understand it, not to say so. Then you can mess up a session. Next thing you know you find yourself furiously angry with the pc.

Why are you angry at the pc? Well, he's missed a hell of a lot of withholds on you, hasn't he? You didn't understand a thing he was saying. On his Havingness Process, you didn't know whether he was pointing at the ceiling or the rose garden. See?

Now, therefore with those amplifications and that sort of thing, you simply ask the rudiments question and you get the pc's answer *until* the pc has no further answer. It's the pc who decides he has no further answer – nobody else. He's got to say, "No, I ain't got no more answer."

Now, as long as the pc was willing to sit there and answer the auditing question, you have no recourse to the meter. He just goes on and on and on. I don't care if it's the whole session. But remember, there must be answers to the auditing question.

You can't say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

And he says, "I want a drink of water." That's not an answer to the auditing question.

You, in that particular case say, "I will re – well, thank you. You want a drink of water, all right, well, we'll take care of that in due course. Thank you very much. Now, I'll repeat the question – 'Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?'"

He said, "But I really do want a drink of water."

You say, "Good. Thank you." Just treat it as a brand-new origin. You aren't going to get in an argument. I don't care if the pc originates the word "peanuts" thirty times every half hour, see – once a minute. Always give him an ack on it. It'll wear out before I do. I don't get upset because he is repeating himself.

Now, you'll sometimes get a repetitive rudiment sung back at you. Now, we can talk about your, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" An auditor become quite upset by this. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

"No, I am not willing to talk to you about dogs – the trouble I have with dogs."

"All right. Thank you very much. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

"No, I'm not willing to talk to you about my trouble with dogs."

"Thank you very much. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

"No, I am not willing to talk to you about my trouble with dogs."

Well, you can go on like that forever, can't you? The very funny part of it is, you can always go on like that much longer than the pc can.

I usually start increasing my acknowledgments – the only thing I ever do to meet a situation like that. Of course, there is a limit on increasing your acknowledgments because if you gave the pc a tone one-thousand, "Okay," you know, he'd disappear. [laughs]

Sometimes I assume – I assume that I haven't understood it when I haven't. I'll make the pc tell me. See? I figure out, well, yeah, he – I haven't got it, you know. I just – and I won't have. It suddenly dawns on me that I'm not digging what the pc is saying. See. He's talking about firedogs. I get this little additional datum, you know. "I'm not sure that I dug you. I'm not sure that I understood what you were saying."

And he says, "Dogs, dogs. I'm not willing to talk to you about dogs. I have trouble with dogs. Every time I light a fire in the fireplace the dogs fall over." "Oh," you say, "Oh, oh yes." Funny thing, his repetition will cease at that moment.

The onus of understanding is on the auditor, and also the onus of making it understandable is on the auditor. That's where your TR 4 goes to pieces. You get into more trouble with TR 4 because you confuse Qing and Aing in making something understandable. You could actually make a pc sit for a half an hour and explain this thing to you that you couldn't dig and you would have a better session than by, in any way, pretending that you understood it when you didn't.

This happened last year sometime. Somebody was running old 3D and the pc – the pc all of a sudden ran into a spacecraft and was talking about oogly-boogly rotor bug drives, you see, and how mescus these things were. And his auditor was a girl, and fashionably all these rocket jockeys that now have girl bodies, you know, aren't supposed to understand anything about this in this lifetime. They keep pretending this all the time till you finally get them back on the track. Anyway, the auditor sat there just so long in a big stupidity about the thing and finally said to the pc, "I don't know what you are talking about with this oogly-boogly-bug-rug oogger-drive, or whatever it is."

And the pc who had been only moderately in-session, sat up, got very alert and explained a spaceship – this particular Mark 61 space vessel or something of this sort – in complete detail to his auditor with sufficient explanation so that the auditor actually did understand it! And the auditor came out of session saying, "And I would have bought one if I had had the money." [laughter] One of the most pleased pcs you'd ever want to meet.

Anyway, that isn't a Q and A. That is not a Q and A. But to keep it from being a Q and A you've got to preface such a thing with the actual fact that you didn't dig it.

You never say to the pc that he didn't express himself well or that he is daring to talk about something you care not what of. So don't put the onus on the pc. Say to – say yourself the actual truth of the matter – you didn't dig it, see. "I didn't understand what you said. I don't grasp what you are talking about. Dogs, dogs. What – what kind of dog? I don't understand what you are talking about." And the pc elucidates and goes off the machine at that point. Why? Because a complete comprehension takes place and with a comprehension you get an as-issness.

Your pc gets hung up all the time because you never give him the comprehension necessary to an as-issness. You can practically blow the bank up like it's full of atom bombs if you give him enough comprehension.

You can overdo this, but oddly enough I never have. I never really have been able to overdo this. I only been sorry in sessions when I haven't – when I haven't really understood what that was all about.

Now, we get down to that drill. We have a variation when we check it and it does read. We say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And finally the pc says, "Yes, I'm willing to talk to you about my difficulties." And you say, "Oh, good. I will check that on the meter." This is the first time you've paid any attention to the meter and by golly, you get a read. Well, you stay with the pc on that read because factually the pc won't know what it is. He'll go darn near bats if you just leave him completely unguided. So every time it goes with the same tick as you got the first time, you have to recognize that the tick you got is the tick that will clear it and not a different one.

So you say to him, "That. That. That one. What were you looking at right that minute?"

"Oh-oh-oh-oh-oh, well – that's oh-who-oh – that was last night, midnight – I'd forgotten all about that, but I suddenly woke up and said, 'I'll never say another word to that auditor about my sex life,' you know, and went back to sleep again."

And you say, "Thank you."

Well now, that didn't clear, did it? So the whole cockeyed action has to be done again without a meter. Don't now stick on a meter. That is a serious mistake. Don't keep checking it and getting a read and clearing it and checking it and getting a read and clearing it. Why? Because that hidden one you just pulled – the pc actually is leveling with you – 99 44/100 percent of the time he's pure. He's leveling with you. He's telling you all the answers he knows. And when you release one that he didn't know you are going to get a whole bunch of locks. So why stick with it? See, it's just good technical sense. Why stick with it, because now he's going to give you all the locks.

So you just put the meter aside and you say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And he answers it.

And, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" and he answers it.

And, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

And he says, "Yes."

And you say, "Good. I will check that on the meter." And you do so. And that time it reads.

So you say, "That. What were you looking at right – right then? Yeah, that. That. That." You get that located, he gives it to you. You don't even bother to find out if that was it or not. You go off the meter. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

Finally, "Yes."

"Good. Thank you. I will check that on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Do you agree that that is clean?"

Now, whatever else happens after that point, you never do anything more about it. Do you understand? It's all TR 4 from there on. But you don't ask him two consecutive times against a read, see – ever.

Now, that's the exact procedure. Now, you go at it just like a one, two, three. Always do it just exactly that way. That is a repetitive rudiment. And you'll find out that has been worked out within an inch of its life and it just worked like a dream.

The few little difficulties you get into will only be gotten into early on in auditing the pc. The pc will very soon come uptone as far as you're concerned, to a point where they audit very well by this. They never tell you any lies. You very seldom – less and less do you find your end rudiments out and more and more do actual overts by the pc read.

Now, you do that every time just exactly that way. And you clean up your rudiments that way. That's a repetitive check.

Now, oddly enough, that is the *whole* drill also of Prepchecking. You do *exactly* the same thing. There is not one *tiniest* variation in Prepchecking. You just treat every Prepcheck Zero as a rudiments question and depend on the automaticity of cycling to pick up your basic on the chain. It's going to take longer, but it's going to be more thorough, and your pc's going to stay cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, cheerily in-session. The pc will be very happy with you – very cheerful.

You do this right – and with any given pc you never make a mistake on a meter read – and very soon you are going to have a pc going into session and being so cheerful and chatty and happy to be audited that you won't believe it.

And you start making little tiny mistakes or you pick up a pc on which little mistakes have been made and not play that pc back into a readable condition again, and your pc is going to be nattery and upset and miserable because you're all missed withholds, missed withholds, missed withholds – are all over the place.

There's a difference between night and day in the results you can get with exactly the same procedure. Do the procedure carelessly – horrible. Do the procedure very nicely, very neatly, very expertly, and the results are fabulous.

Prepcheck Zeros: Don't ever do anything extreme, extraordinary, unusual – nothing. You've just got a Prepcheck Zero is: "Have you ever stolen anything?" And that's all there is to it. And you ask the pc if he's ever stolen anything and, "Have you ever stolen anything? You ever stolen anything? You ever stolen anything? You ever stolen anything?" – as long as he'll answer the question.

And you finally hear, "No, nothing else," or "That's all."

Then you say, "Thank you very much. I will check that on the meter." Look very fixedly at the meter at sensitivity 16. Say, "Have you ever stolen anything?" And it goes *clank* and you say, "That reads." Well, don't think the pc is holding out on you. You've actually found one that he's buried himself down into and he hasn't got that one. See?

So, you've got now, "That. That. That. That. That. That."

He says, "Oh, ho-ho-ho-ho-ha-ha-ha-ha. I forgot about that thing – Bank of England." See?

And you say, "Thank you very much." – Off the meter now – "Have you ever stolen anything? Have you ever stolen anything?"

And he finally says, "No, that's all."

And you say, "Good. Thank you. I will check that on the meter. Have you ever stolen anything?" Clank! And just expect that cycle to go on and on and on, you see. But only clear it once and then go back off the meter again.

Finally, it's clean. Get out of there. Drive away from that while you are still alive. You ask, "Have you ever stolen anything?", after you've got a clean read on the meter and hell hath no ARC breaks like the ones you've just started to set up.

Because, you know why that ARC break is so rough? A thetan is closest to nothing. You've set up a nothingness withhold. That's very upsetting to a thetan. You've given him a withholding of nothingness, and of course he can't spot the nothing. See? And of course he's closest to a nothing and he thinks he himself has been missed. And he goes buggy when you try to clean a read that is not there. He's – you already – he's already told you all, you see. And you say, "Have you ever stolen anything?" One more question, see. He doesn't know what's happened to him. He thinks you are asking for him. And of course, he can't spot the nothingness that he is now withholding. He is withholding just one word, "nothing," see. You didn't buy "nothing," so now "nothing" is unacknowledged. So therefore he is unacknowledged, so it upsets him far more than missing an actual read. See the mechanism?

Now, that is all you do. Believe me that is all you do. And anything more you do than that – beyond getting your question answered, beyond understanding what the pc said, engaging in what little two-way comm passes by – anything you do beyond that, you get into trouble. And that applies to both rudiments and Prepchecking. The only difference now between a rudiment and a Prepcheck repetitive question is just that they are – one is in Model Session and the other is in forms or you've written up a flock of Zeros you want to knock out on the pc.

Now, Prepchecking comes into its own and the less – the least you goof around – the less you goof around in handling rudiments questions and trying to audit the whole case with rudiments, the happier you're going to be. And the smarter you are about Prepchecking and the more inventive you are about Prepchecking, the better off you are going to be.

An auditor should be able to take a plain form or an auditor should be able to write up a form based on the mechanics of auditing, based on the mechanics of the mind, based on his own intuition. So they are flat. All right, so they are flat. So what. So they didn't have any response to them at all. All right, good – he at least knows they didn't have any response to them. Or they might be hotter than a pistol.

No, you save your inventiveness and your intuition for the perspicuity of your Prepcheck Zeros. And you can be as inventive as you please. But once you've written down a Zero to ask the pc, then ask that Zero. Don't go varying it around. You don't vary it any. You just ask that Zero and get it cleaned with the repetitive rudiment form, you see. Same – same thing.

You suddenly woke up in the middle of the night and realized that this pc is craving – this constant constant craving – for ham sandwiches smothered in chocolate milk sodas and so forth, has a great deal to do with somebody who has been with that food fixation. Because you can't get anything on food and must be a person in some way or another. And lightning strikes and you realize that the pc must have had some member of their family who liked that sort of thing. You see?

So you just ask the pc this question, "Who do you know that likes strange foods?" You see? "Have you ever known anybody that likes strange foods?" You know? Well now, don't go getting goofy. If that's the question you dreamed up to ask the pc, that is the question you ask. You got it? And that is the question you flatten. No matter what you now go and find out, you've now made up material for a new Zero. See? Don't go wishy-washing around with the question you're asking until it is flat. When you've got that flat, now if you want to invent another question, why, great – invent another question, you see. But don't halfway flatten something and then vary the question – not with this system, because this system is too powerful.

Now, what you should know about this system is it has a liability. Now, the liability is that it pulls the pc deeply into session. It builds up a fantastically high ARC between the auditor and the pc. And your sudden goofs or perhaps a tendency to speak your mind on automatic three-quarters of the way through the session, or something like this. Whereas they never might have hurt pcs before – of course, you never had a pc in-session so they didn't bite. This time they'll bite. And you see the pc's ears fly off, man.

You say, "What the hell, what's so important about ARC breaks these days? By golly, I've done these things before and the pc's never ARC broken. Well, what's happening now? Good heavens." Well, it's just the pc's in-session. The pc was never in-session before. So the auditor's command value over the pc is fantastic – very high. So the disparity of the ARC break – just fantastic!

Now, let's say the auditor is sitting there not giving a damn what happens to the pc and somehow or another the session is carrying – the Model Session and the system – is carrying

the pc deeper into session and all of a sudden the auditor expresses his actual opinion of the pc. *Oh-ho-ho!* It's a betrayal that was never suffered between the Union and the South. The Civil War is going to result. Your meter just stops reading. Everything goes to hell.

Well now, this whole activity was invented for just one reason: is auditors were having trouble getting pcs to read on meters. You cannot improve this type of meter any further than this sensitivity or it will become unreadable. It just gets unreadable. It is adequate to find a goal. It is adequate to find this and that, but the pc has to be in-session. No electronic device is going to operate in the absence of a command value in TR 1 to activate the pc's bank.

Now, if the pc's bank is activated, any electronic instrument of high sensitivity is going to react. But in the absence of a high-level TR 1, in an absence of an in-sessionness on the part of the person being asked, you get no internal reactive bank reaction.

Well, that would be usual. People walk up and down the streets and they hear all sorts of things and people say all kinds of things to them socially and that sort of thing. And they are not affected by these things particularly. They wouldn't read on a meter either.

And you meet an old friend and he says, "Well how're ya, you old horse?", you know. Your meter wouldn't operate, see. You don't have now an engram about horses. So the common social aspect is that commonly and socially a meter is inoperative.

A person has to have some tiny degree of in-sessionness before a meter operates at all. That would be the most sensitive meter in the world. It isn't more sensitive meters, it's the degree the bank reacts, see. So there's got to be some tiny amount of in-sessionness. That the meter reacts to the degree that it does is fabulous. Even a – even a Keeler meter – these eighteenthousand-dollar monstrosities that they make up around Chicago – those confounded things, they'll even react on people in the hands of a police detective.

You think about ARC and you really don't – aren't immediately led inextricably into a course of thought which arrives at a police detective. I think you'll agree these are not associative thoughts. And even then you get some kind of operation on the meter, mostly because – at – but it's usually at that level of response that you find a detective, which is terror or something of this sort, you see. The guy is terrified. If he's really afraid of the detective you really get a reaction. You get how the thing operates? So it operates at that tone level. You would really get a pounding reaction if a fellow had just committed the crime and blood was all over the floor, you see, and the guy is trying to hide it, see. You get this terrific... And, of course, it even reads so that a detective can read it. And that's fantastic, you see.

I mean this guy is sitting there in the police station and shuffling guys through, and if he gets a single person to answer it somebody goes to jail. Look at the level of overt. What do you think that's going to do with this cop's ARC with the people he's asking, you see. Every win is an overt. Oh, my God. See, so we're not going to get very much action here.

So let's go a little bit further with this thing. Let's say the fellow was just afraid of police and has engrams on the subject. You'd get the same reaction on the meter.

A lie detector does not detect lies. Therefore – and actually they are quite dangerous in the hands of justice. Very dangerous in the hands of justice because in the first place you are not going to... There are many fine men in police work and that sort of thing, but very often

their work is undone by the terrific injustices of the fellows on the other side of them, don't you see? And cops are always swearing they could clean up all the crime in the city, you see, if the judge would only let them.

New York City – the way the bulls in New York City used to put it, they'll bring anybody in you want. Well, whether the magistrates will keep the fellows there or let them go because of influence is another thing.

But anyway, you get meters even operating at that level. But they would not operate at tiny levels of sensitivity in the presence of ARC. Your pc knows he's not – you're not – he doesn't – doesn't matter what overt he gets off, you are not going to turn him in, see. There is no liability connected with this thing so you're reading, actually, at a very high level of ARC. You are not reading in the same zone or area of the lie detector. And these impulses are very slight, man.

So you have to make up for ARC, what the situation lacks in terror and brutality. See, you are either going to – the pc is either scared to death of you and the meter reads because of high-degree terror, you see. Or you are either in good ARC with him, he wants to talk to you and therefore you have an influence on him and the meter reads. You get the idea? It's one thing or the other. So the meter – the better ARC you have with the pc, why, the better your meter reads.

Now, you start missing reads and you run into missed withhold phenomena. So, if you run into the missed withhold phenomena consistently and continually then it fades out and you cease to get the pc operating on the meter. Do you follow that?

All right. This repetitive system is so that you will get the pc *in-session* before you meter him. And just by the trick of, "He talks to you about his own case," gets him in-session so the meter reads. So you prepare a meter read before you read the meter. Then you prepare a meter read before you read the meter. So you prepare a meter read before the meter. You got the idea? And that's why repetitive rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking will work where nothing else does. Do you follow that? That's – and you will find that will hold up.

If you want to re... fix up a pc who has gotten so he won't read on the meter, you better backtrack against questions that have been left unflat on the pc at sometime or another. Develop those questions, get everything out – you know, get repetitive answers from the pc in this same system, get all that stuff off. Then ask him on the meter. Pull the hidden one. Get some more stuff off he wants to give. Pull the hidden one. All of a sudden your meter is reading again beautifully.

So, if a pc's meter stopped reading while you were doing Goals Assessment you would assume that he'd been badly prepchecked, not that your mid rudiments were out. Oh, your mid rudiments, you see, can be put back in and they're a patch-up and you'd better use them. Yes. But, to totally not read any place – goal after goal after goal after goal – not for one tick to occur. It's never happened to me. And it means there is bad Prepchecking somewhere. Go back. You have to develop the guy back onto it. You also must have missed a few little rudiments reads, or something. You've got to get the pc operating again. And don't just keep bulling on with the Goals Assessment; take him back, check over Prepchecking, figure it all out, get him straightened out, get him functioning again on the meter. Get him in-session with you

as the auditor and now you will be able to continue on and get his goal. You see how it's done?

But that's how this whole thing is designed. That's how it will operate. And it will operate to the degree that you don't do something unusual at the middle of thing that breaks the ARC up before you find – before you've found the thing.

You build a confidence, you'll get the reads, everything will straighten out. Do you see how that system is designed?

Okay. Well, thank you very much. I kept you overtime. Thank you for being patient.

METER READING

A lecture given on 12 July 1962

Thank you.

Okay. This is what?

Audience: The twelfth.

Twelve-twelve, huh?

Audience: It's not twelve-twelve – twelve-seven – yeah – twelve-twelve.

Twelve July, AD 12. All right.

First lecture Saint Hill Special Briefing Course having to do with meters. Meters, their importance.

With all due respect to meters, I feel I should apologize for coming a little bit late to this lecture – three, four, five minutes. But you should realize that this particular planet has a great many lures. There are all kinds of things. There's drink, you know, there's beautiful women. There are all of these various things and they lure you away and distract your attention from what you should be doing. And recently – I'd had a Lincoln for ages and – since about 54, and I traded – I sold it and got a fantastic price for it. And then I traded the – an old Humber we had out here for it, you see, and I got me a Jaguar and – a 60, 61 Jag – and came out all straight on this. And I regret to have to report to you that the Jaguar is leading me astray. [laughter, laughs] I went out to take a fifteen-minute run to get some fresh air and came back three hours later. So you see, sometimes it's drink, sometimes it's women – in this particular case it's a Jaguar. You'll pardon my weaknesses. Blame it on the planet.

Well, I was actually celebrating. I felt I should go out and get some fresh air and look at the countryside and celebrate, because you don't know it yet – but we've cracked it! We've cracked it.

In scientific research one follows certain laws. Take far too long to enumerate them. You'll find some of them I've used in Dianetics and Scientology are actually developed for the first time and has made it possible to crack some problems that have been cracking people. And, nevertheless, somebody comes along and tells you we don't follow the laws of research as used, well, I'm afraid that they are adventurous in the extreme because any law of research this planet has we follow and better – to an enormous extent. See, they just don't even vaguely have the rigor of research that has been followed in Scientology. Because we're not interested in anything but effectiveness and we've been cracking away – not at the idea that everybody was crazy – we've been going in a somewhat different plane and on a different road up. When

you can get a research problem down to where you have one variable and there's only one thing you have to remedy to straighten things out, why, *voilà!* You're there, you see.

All right. Clearing people, fixing up needles and states of mind in order to sit quiet enough and find somebody's goal – we've got that sort of thing. We've even got CCHs. They go tremendously far south. We've got all kinds of stuff here, you see. And I take a look at you and realize you've been audited in the last twenty-four hours and I can't figure how that possibly could have happened. Don't you see?

So there might be fifteen, twenty, thirty things wrong, you know. Might be a lot of things wrong, so during the last couple of months, having observed that auditors were not actually able to get a uniform result one way or the other, I started taking every variable out of technology that I could take out of it. And I just started stripping it down and testing what we were doing and stripping it down and testing that, and we finally got the Model Session the way you're running it right this minute. Without a single additional process, if something is wrong with the Model Session questions, you just use the question. That's quite a trick. Took all of the difficulties out of Sec Checking. You see, Sec Checking was followed by Prepchecking, was followed by Repetitive Prepchecking. Now the difficulties of Prepchecking by the Withhold System and all of the old Sec Checking difficulties are resolved – to all intents and purposes – right now with what you're using and calling Repetitive Prepchecking, you see.

Of course, tremendous background work has gone into all this which includes first a meter and then refining a meter and then refining a meter and then re – then abandoning them because no, it didn't work, and then refining a meter and refining a meter and refining a meter and we finally got the Mark IV. All of these things...

But still as – a pc could walk out of a session and look wobbly. See? Got everything streamlined down. Auditors are men and women of good heart. Nobody is questioning that. There must be something wrong here someplace or another.

And now I know that the variables are out of it as far as the human mind is concerned. There are no variables. You do your Model Session without any additives, your beginning rudiments and your middle rudiments and end rudiments, and you do the Prepchecking with Zero Questions which are applicable to the case and will straighten the case out. And you move through into listing goals and finding goals, and then listing the goal that is found – you're going to have a Clear on your hands. I mean, you can't help it. But, the pc could still walk out of session looking wobbly.

So I set you up last night. I said I'm going to watch three auditors, not necessarily all Class III-type auditors, very far from the worst auditors present and I'm going to look at these auditors, and I'm going to let you look at these auditors, and we're going to see what they're doing here. And I found out what they were doing. I never would have dreamed it – never would have dreamed it. We found the one variable – *the meter read*. The meter read. Now all three of these people have been reading meters for an awful long time. These three people should know a great deal about meters.

And it works out this way: All you've got to do to muck a session up is clean one read that is clean. That's all you've got to do to muck a session – to just throw it into a cocked hat.

Louse it up, but good. Just clean one thing that's clean. You can check something that's clean, but don't go clean something that's clean. Pc will go into a cocked hat every time.

And the other one is: Don't *miss* cleaning something that reacts.

Those are the two crimes of meter reading. Cleaning something that is clean – and failing to note something that reacts.

There's little to choose between which is the most serious. Frankly, there's little to choose. They're equally serious.

Why is this serious? Well, basically a pc has a certain knowingness. He may be occluded – he may be all buttoned in the cotton batting and black wool – he may be packed as tight as sardines ready for shipment. He may be all of these things, and yet permeating this hard core is an instinct, an intuitiveness. See, he basically knows. You can't kid a pc and that's a very important datum. You actually cannot fool a pc.

And any auditor that's going forward on the course that the pc can be fooled is being very foolish himself. He's being quite misguided. A pc knows when a question is hot, even if he doesn't know the answer. And he knows when one is cool. See, he knows there's nothing there or he knows there's something there. He has a something-nothingness sensitivity. He can sense if there's something there. He can sense if there's nothing there. It requires help before he can tell *what* is there – or before he has a high certainty that there is nothing there. Don't you see? I mean, you're now transmitting from an intuitive feelingness to an analytical knowingness. And this intuitive feelingness is not articulate. He can't tell you. You look at the fellow and you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" and so forth; and now you're asking him to express it analytically and give you what the problem is and all of that sort of thing. Well, he's not going to be able to do that very well.

But let's take the reverse. He doesn't have a present time problem – we tell him he's got one. Now, it's not aberration that objects. It's just this intuitive feelingness. He knows he hasn't got a present time problem right here and now. He knows he isn't worrying about anything.

Now let's take the reverse. Let's take the reverse. The pc has a present time problem and you tell him he doesn't have one. Either statement, if contrary to the fact – fact merely being established by this intuitive feelingness of the pc – will cause a disagreement between you and him.

Now, what you're basically doing is invalidating the knowingness of a thetan. Oh, a thetan will put up with a lot of invalidation of this knowingness. He has put up with a lot of it and so on. He can be overwhelmed by that invalidation. All these things are true, but he doesn't have to like it. That is the final test. He just doesn't have to like it. He can walk down the cloister every day and pray before Moloch or whatever they have in the monastery these days. Very hard for me, you know, to keep up with these various transient religions. And this situation – he can say, "Well, God is great," or "Moloch is great," or something of the sort. All right.

He's used this as a pitch on others. He's used this as a control mechanism on others. Used it to overwhelm others. So inevitably, because of the overt he gets overwhelmed. Did

you ever notice how unhappy they are when they are doing this? Well, what's this unhappiness? Why aren't they really relaxed about the thing?

This feeling of internal peace that you hear about every once in a while, I've investigated occasionally and found it was mostly a light in an implant which was moving across the thetan at regular intervals or something like that. He was nervous as a cat about it. Terribly nervous for fear his internal peace was going to be distorted or destroyed. But we're not off on any anti-something-or-other pitch except just truth is truth.

This fellow hasn't got a present time problem; you tell him he has one. Well now, you're auditing actually at a higher level of knowingness and awareness than human beings ever achieve. You've got his awareness and his knowingness all keyed-up here, and this intuitive feelingness of what is right and wrong is particularly present in an auditing session – far more so than out on the street or in the cloister. You've heightened this. Now you say to this heightened perception, which hasn't got a present time problem, "You've got a present time problem." Well, he's got a long way to fall.

Perhaps snails don't mind being stepped on because they haven't very far to squash. Do you see? But I think even a snail would mind falling off the top of the Empire State Building. See, the auditing session gives him a long way to fall. See, and you talk about ARC break – I call your attention back to anatomy about downcurves. It's the steepness of the curve per unit of time. The artificial tone of the pc or the tone which he is able to attain in a session is quite ordinarily much greater than he attains in life, you see? Now you give him one of these speeded downgrades – one of these downcurves – and you let him fall twenty tones in a 20th of a millisecond, see? Well, it comes to him as a severe shock and you get an ARC break.

All right. He's got a present time problem. He's sitting there worrying about Aunt Phylbia. He's just worried stiff about Aunt Phylbia and all of a sudden the auditor says to him, "You haven't got any problem with Aunt Phylbia. There is no problem there." Well, he's had this treatment often and he's found out that that didn't work either. You can't go around and not-is all the problems and wind up with everybody happy. So he knows that doesn't work and he knows that's wrong. But basically what he knows is he's out of agreement with the auditor. That's the first thing he knows. He's out of agreement with the auditor.

So let us say *hopefully* before the session got wheeling, he had a session. He had it mocked up he was going to have a session at least. He probably had a session at start of session, he'd maybe have a session through the first rudiment, don't you see. And, maybe the first rudiment even builds it up into more of a session, you see. Well, this guy could be likened on to somebody who is doing a high, steep fighter-plane climb, don't you see. He's going up. His awareness of his own mind, of his reactive bank, feelings – all these things are heightened.

And you get him nice and heightened and then you say, "Well, you don't have a present time problem with Aunt Phylbia." And he's hauled down because he thinks he is in good agreement or rapport with the auditor. And when he finds out he is not and the degree of the finding out "not" is a horrible shock to him. And he doesn't fall the ordinary one-millionth of a tone that George falls as he is standing behind the bank window and he said, "I've got a cold" and the bank customer says, "You haven't got much of a cold. You should have seen

Aunt Isabel's," see. He maybe does a little fall – about onemillionth of a tone, see. This pc does about twenty tones. Steep, steep. You've got an ARC break downcurve.

Well, all of this – all of this is the discovery of disagreement. This comes under the heading of that. He discovers that the auditor's in disagreement with him. He's in disagreement with the auditor and he thought he was in agreement with the auditor. And the degree that he thought he was in agreement to the auditor, crystallizes the degree that he suddenly realizes he is out of agreement with the auditor. All things are relative. And if you've got an agreement that's built as high as the Empire State Building, the first scrap of disagreement will appear as high as the Empire State Building.

Now, that should explain to you why a pc carries on so, when ARC broken out of a session. They aren't like that in life. They aren't like that at all.

You ought to see this fellow. In life, why, somebody walks into the store and says, "Hi, you old horse thief," you know. "You look like hell today." Doesn't change his mood any. He says, "Hello, Bob." You know, nothing to it.

In a session the auditor suddenly says, "You're a horse thief." Doesn't go, man. If the session ARC, you see, was as high as the Empire State Building, why, this disagreement erects a duplicate structure of ARC break, see.

It's pretty wild, and it's just all out of importance. The importance of it to the pc is fantastically great! It's as though he has suddenly been hanged for murder. And listening to a pc who had just been thoroughly ARC broken, you would be sure he was being unjustly accused of having too many bodies on his hands and being dragged off to the local galley – gallows, you see. You'd be absolutely sure that this was what was happening. If you listened to his tone, if you listened to the emotion involved with the thing, if you could measure out how bad he feels about it and so on. These things in the work-a-day world of hanging horse thieves would be tantamount to being betrayed by his whole family, turned in by his most trusted servant, you see and hanged for a crime, barbarously, that he did not commit. You'd think this was the circumstances.

Let's say that we were auditing in Japanese and you didn't speak Japanese, but the auditor who was auditing was auditing in Japanese – and you were to hear this ARC break come out – and you'd think, why – my God, that auditor must have broken out a knife or a samurai sword or something and taken several passes at the pc's head. But even that wouldn't have caused that much upset if you just listen to the emotional content of all this – he must have at least cut off one of his hands. There's something going on here, you know. You'd think.

You hear it in English – you understand it better, you see. You understand that it's all evolved out of the fact that the pc was told he had a present time problem reading on the meter and there hasn't been a present time... He – as a matter of fact he is sort of happy all afternoon. It's been the first afternoon, let us say, that he hasn't had pressing present time problems for a long time, you see. Let's just steepen the thing up, you see. And this auditor has simply said to him – nothing more than this: "Do you have a present time problem? That reads. What is it?" That's all the auditor has said. The auditor's not done another blooming thing. You've

had it from that point on – if that meter really didn't read. There was no read on the meter at that point whatsoever.

The pc, at a heightened level of his awareness of his own condition, instinctively realizes that he doesn't have one. So you're foisting off an untruth. Well, here he is swimming in the direction of truth for the first time in the last couple of hundred trillennia, and he knows the cage has suddenly been unlocked and here he goes, and all of a sudden here's this fantastic falsity which has entered into his environment and he reacts accordingly.

Cleaning a read that is clean or failing to clean a read that is reacting – produce almost equal magnitude.

The first is the most mysterious because the pc can't find out what's wrong because the withhold is nothing. See, he can't find out what's wrong. Actually, it's just withholding nothingness. What is wrong is nothing. That's what is wrong. A nothingness is wrong. It isn't nothing is wrong. The language hardly even handles the sense of it.

All right. So what do we get here as the greatest order of error? I want to give this to you the way that you will find it very easy to hand it on to anybody you're instructing or anything like that. It's very simple. A very simple statement can be made, which is as follows: You can have one lousy TR 4 in a session, can't you? – without busting it all up. Pc said, "I'm sleepy," and the auditor said, "Mm-mm." The pc said, "No. I said I was sleepy!" "Oh, oh," the auditor says, "Oh, oh." Wakes up himself, you know. "Oh, oh, okay. Yeah, fine."

That doesn't downcurve the pc particularly. You can get away with it. Oh, it's not good – but you can get away with it. You don't bust your session up one side and down the other side.

You can drop a TR 1 – even occasionally a 0 or a 2 and a 3, and still get away with it. You can forget to check a question and it won't cause the whole session to cave in. In other words, you can do at least one of any of these things.

See, you can forget a rudiment without absolutely smashing up the chinawork for blocks around. Pc's liable to say, "Hey, you forgot a rudiment." No, a pc doesn't act as though he had just been disemboweled.

No, the one that you can't do – see, you can do one of anything else – but you can't do *one* clean a clean read. And you can't do *one* neglect of a read.

Now, I'm sure that as you start going along the line flawlessly in auditing with meter reads, you will soon recognize the validity of what I'm telling you.

The one thing you can't do and still have a session come out right is a flubbed meter read. Whether it was clean and you cleaned it – or it was reacting and you didn't clean it. You have one flubbed meter read and you're going to watch everything go to hell in a balloon in that session.

Now, when you're used to missing them you get an entirely erroneous idea of what a session looks like and how a pc behaves. You get an entirely erroneous idea.

Auditing isn't the same thing at all. It's a sort of a half-out-of-session: "I don't mind ARC breaks; it doesn't matter to me what he does; I can somehow or another carry it along

anyhow on my own hook; and after the session even if he does flub, I can probably audit it out myself."

One has answers for these things, see. But there's not much ARC involved with it and there certainly isn't very much heightened awareness of the bank and ease of blowing and that sort of thing. The things that are supposed to be in the session aren't there.

Yeah, you go along and you get so you actually can become hardened into something called auditing that misses reads and cleans things that are clean and there are protests go along on this line and "Auditing is basically a sort of a protest," isn't it? I mean it's a "Good pc'ing is not letting the auditor get too close to you so that he can louse you up." I mean, isn't that by definition? [laughter, laughs] So naturally you really don't see fast auditing.

Now, auditing is as fast – in almost direct proportion – as a pc is in-session. Because the more he is in-session, the more easily he can blow things. And the less he's in-session, the less easily he blows things. So the length of time it takes to audit anything is bounded on all sides by the degree that the pc is in-session.

Let's clean up five Prepcheck questions. Pc's beautifully in-session; meter's reading gorgeously; the auditor has flubbed nothing; the auditor flubs nothing; everything goes along swimmingly and gorgeously, five Prepcheck Zeros. You begin to wonder what you're going to do with the rest of your time in session. See, they're all beautifully cleaned up and your session's only thirty-five minutes deep. And yet a lot of material came up on this. See? Guy feels a lot better. What are you going to do with the rest of the session?

All right. Pc not much in-session. Five Zero Prepcheck questions – five Zeros. Week – week. At the end of the week you kind of have to scant them because you can't do all that, you see. That would be the difference. Don't you see? There's how the old factor of "five to one" came about. It may be altitude to some degree. It may be the presence to some degree. It may be this and it may be that, but it's certainly – it's my meter reading that gave you the five to one. I don't miss on these things. I don't know why, but it just never occurred to me to. So, of course then it never occurred to me that you ever might.

No. Last night, Wednesday – Black Wednesday – it became very obvious. It became exceedingly obvious that there were, in the best session we saw – the best session we saw, there were read misses. See? Uncertainty – which was so great that it was actually transmitting: uncertainty. Worst one we saw there was actually miscalls, many of them. And you saw a pc moving on out of session.

Now, what is most interesting is that a pc is there to get audited and may – you may not have realized what a persistent cuss a thetan is. You may think of a thetan as somebody who can be overwhelmed and who can be crushed and who can be this and who can be that. To a limited degree that is true – to a limited degree it is true. He can get in such a position that he cannot outflow or communicate to the degree that he might. But do you know, he never stops trying. That is the fantastic thing about a thetan. He never really stops trying! He's got some idea that he is going to wipe out the civilization of the continent of South America and by this time he's deleted down to being one of these crazy-looking dogs they have in Mexico. But do you know that little dog sits around and every once in a while he'll – wipe out

the civilization of South America, you know? South American comes by and the little dog does what he can. [laughter] He really never stops trying.

What is fantastic in child – this is particularly notable in child handling – you think this little kid is "little," so forth. Well, it's utterly fantastic. As long as that kid feels that he is going to get anything borne in upon him from some quarter or another, he'll keep revenging himself on that quarter. This is what you call a bad child.

I've worked this out so often and observed it so often that I'm absolutely flabbergasted at the complete accuracy of it. Nursemaid shows up. She's going to push one of the children's head in, you see. Honest, from that time on she really never has a – he really never has a calm moment. It goes from actual insolence on the part of the child and outright disobedience – to spreading rumors and scandal and covert disobedience – to apparent obedience that always seems to spill the shoe polish all over the nursemaid's bedspread. And it just goes on downhill, to being terribly ill and impossible to care for and keeping everybody up day and night, see.

But this little kid is still trying. See? You can follow this impulse, "Get even with the nurse," you see? – right on down through a full cycle.

And although the manifestations of trying are enormously different and are hardly distinguishable as a gradient scale sometimes, you can carefully trace them all down and get all to the base of it and you'll find out, good God, this kid is still trying.

This person is coughing at the dinner table. If you trace this thing down meticulously as though you would trace down a tiny cough – because, you see, this cough the person is coughing, at best you could only trace down one tiny little portion of this cough. Don't you see. But if you want to know when it turned on and they started using it in this lifetime, it will be the end product of getting even with Father. See? Father: the harsh disciplinarian, the this, the that, the other thing. And the little kid sat at the table, and got down to a point where the only action that could be taken was spasms and fits of coughing at the dinner table, because coughing was very annoying to Father. This is your pc's cough, see.

Because of the GPM and the stronger forces that are at work, these facts tend to be obscured because it's quite difficult to run them down and doesn't pay too much cash award to run them down. Because after you've got rid of this source of the cough then you pick it up in some other lifetime. They were annoying somebody else then, the cough turns back on. And then, like a fellow I backed out of his head one time, I – he finally found out *he* was coughing and the body wasn't coughing at all. That's right. He was coughing – standing there ten, fifteen feet back of his head coughing like mad. Always, ever since he started coughing, he'd always blamed his body for coughing. But the point is, he was trying to make some point good. He was trying to reach in some direction and a thetan just never stops trying, that's all. You set him up a target to reach at and he'll try. It's fabulous.

Now, when you conduct a perfect session and then suddenly set up a wild, random wrongness somewhere in the session, you catch the pc off-balance and the pc goes to – into action reactively. He actually is powerless to stop himself from going into action. He'll say things, he will be cross about things because you had the reactive bank all stretched out, and let's say it was made out of rubber bands, you know. And it was all stretched out and it was all

fine and he was busy spotting, you know, various points of it, and this is the anatomy of it, and he's got a chance to straighten out this thing, and he's doing fine. And then all of a sudden somebody lets go of all the other end of the rubber bands. He finds himself in this mess. And he gets overwhelmed at that point and he starts dramatizing whatever's handy. And actually he's just got thousands – hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of these instances of unfinished cycles of "still trying," and they will go into action. They'll go against the auditor.

The final denouement – he'll say he didn't get any result. That would be one method of getting back at the auditor for doing this. He didn't get any result. It's actually worse than this: he gets negative results. He can actually dream up a negative result. He can get very subtle and very involved about this. What you do is convince the auditor – he can get down to this point – you can convince the auditor the auditor has gotten results and then you fix it up so somebody else knows now you haven't. But this somehow or another gets back to the auditor and we get a terrific confusion going here of one kind or another.

These are all dramatized things. These are all efforts to get back at, to fill in the breach – the dramatization of all of these things.

A pc is in control of the bank. Suddenly, the auditor's force and power with which this bank is being held up for inspection – see, it's auditor plus pc is greater than the bank – auditor makes one mistake on the meter, we have deleted the auditor from the session. The bank caves in on the pc and the pc dramatizes. It's very elementary.

It's always good news when you have only one error to locate. You can't always locate what's wrong. You can go on fumbling around. Supposing twelve things were wrong. See? Oh man, you could hunt and punch for those for a long time. No, the only thing that's wrong in Scientology today is meter reading – that's all. There isn't anything else wrong.

Look, if you guys in just a few days can learn to do repetitive rudiments and Repetitive Prechecking and more or less master a new Model Session and do all that sort of thing, and – we well know that your TRs – and we've isolated what Q and A is – we know all that can be straightened out. Well, these things, then, pose no difficulty. They're actually a no-difficulty status. No difficulty involved in any of that.

Well, where is the difficulty? Where is it? Where is it that drives the auditor to use an unusual solution to patch up something that's happened wrong? See. He's got to have eighteen new middle rudiments to put the pc right. Well, how come he needs eighteen new middle rudiments to put the pc right, see? Well, the pc must have been driven wrong somewhere.

Well, I know by careful inspection you don't need any more beginning rudiments than you got. You can delete the Havingness. As a matter of fact, too often it throws the pc's attention out of session. Pc is feeling bad, you can build his havingness up with O/W. That's havingness. Sure keeps the pc's attention on his bank. You don't want a pc extroverted at the beginning of session. How would you like to sit there and for half an hour persuade the pc – you'd never do this – but, persuade the pc to examine some locks or pictures. You know, persuade him that he should be interested in what's going on in his head. Think of that. Think of that. Can you imagine yourself as the auditor sitting there saying to this person, "Well, actually you're – you should look at those pictures. You say you have a pain in your chin. Well,

you should look in front of your face, there." And the pc said, "Oh, no. I'd much rather look at these walls."

Well, you could go on like that for quite a while. Once in a while you will find this kind of a condition. But running Havingness at the beginning of session tends in the direction of setting up that condition. Pc's all prepared to be interested in his bank and himself and his reactive mind and you say, "Be interested in the wall," don't you see? So to that degree, to that degree – it is not a serious error, not for a long ways. But there is something in favor of dropping it even though the pc's havingness might be down. See, on the average, on the average – down havingness will wreak less havoc than taking the pc's attention off of what his attention is on.

Now, if the pc feels bad, it's because of the overt-motivator sequence. That's right. That's the only reason the pc feels bad anyhow. It's the only reason he got a GPM – is basically, he's got this all in the woof and warp of the bank already. So, here he is. He feels bad and that sort of thing, and you run O/W, his attention will get on his bank and he'll get interested and he'll go into session.

Your problem with a pc, of course, falls under the headings of every problem an auditor has ever had with a pc. Communication, control – keeping the pc's attention on what you're doing, getting your auditing questions answered: all of these things. Oddly enough, to a marked degree, you have mastered these things. And sometimes have had them deteriorate and you have been overpersuaded into unusual solutions and actions and doing something else and Q-and-Aing and getting very anxious about the pc. You get thrown. Do you see? Why? Well, the pc apparently is out of session. This is one of the most baffling manifestations. You've carefully put the pc in-session by the best way you could and you'll find the pc is out of session somehow.

What drives the pc out of session although you're trying to put him in-session? Well, let's take Havingness out of the beginning rudiments, which we have done – just to prevent any possibility of this ever doing this. So we get good shooting all along that line. Let's patch this up any way we can by any mechanism we can. And it's all patched up – you don't have to do anything unusual about it. But we find this pc is out of session. He was terribly interested in his ulcers a minute ago and he's not interested in his ulcers at all now. Well, what happened? You missed a meter read. That's the answer to it.

It must sound peculiar to you. I tell you all you've got to do is run two or three Havingness Prepcheck or just – pardon me, Rudiments Havingness, you know, Model Session Havingness sessions – Havingness in the body of the session, which is gorgeous. Just run two or three of those and your pc's needle smoothes out. And yet there are auditors here who have run eight, ten or twenty of them and have had a rougher needle at the end of the time than they did at the beginning. See? I don't know if that was true or not, but the observation I have made could have been contingent upon several errors. And it could have been this error and that error and another error and some other error. And these various errors, all combined, could bring about the situation where the guy's needle gets dirty. See? We could be hunting for the needle in the haystack, in other words.

In every auditor we could be looking very carefully around to what *is* this auditor doing wrong? Is it TR 0, 1, 2, 3, 4? Is it his Model Session? Is it his – the way he snaps gum in the middle of the session? What is it? What is it? We could – it's this, it's that, it's the other thing. No, we don't have to look around like that.

The auditor is driven into looking bad by the fact he isn't getting results. And he starts looking bad. He starts getting anxious. He sees that his orderly and disciplined approach is apparently producing no good result, so he'll start doing other things to reach the pc, to produce an effect of some kind or another. His Axiom 10 is being thrown out the window and he starts breaking down his own discipline. He is – he hasn't anything to grab onto. His reality is poor.

All right, the Instructor comes along and tries to patch up this auditor. And he stands back and he gives him a terrific analysis of the thing. He watches him and he says, "Well, your TR 4 is quite weak. Your TR 0 could be improved, and you do always seem to make an awful clatter there writing up your auditor's report, so we can improve that. And you really haven't got this drill down exactly right as to when you ask on the meter and when you ask the pc – you haven't got that drill quite right. We'll straighten out that."

And we straighten out all these things meticulously and the Instructor works, you know, and his perspiration soaks into the grass – kills vast areas of grass off. And this auditor is finally all straightened out now and everything is fine and so forth. The auditor goes back into session and the pc ARC breaks and it all goes to hell. And the auditor, in his anxiety to help the pc and Axiom 10 and so forth, he starts doing unusual things and adds twelve more beginning rudiments and changes the wording of all the end rudiments and finally decides he'd better finish the session with, "Give me that hand," you see – a Prepcheck session. It seems to work for him, you see?

The Instructor gets a lose and it's reported to me, you see. And you say, "Well, it's just something or other isn't working and we're not quite sure what it is." And I decide once and for all what was doing it. That's what's doing it. Very hidden. Very mysterious.

The auditor in the first place wasn't actually getting the pc all this upset with his TR 4 or something like that. That wasn't really what was upsetting the pc. The auditor was missing meter reads. The auditor was insistently saying, "Well, it says right here," (as you saw last night on TV), "It says right here you have a present time problem so you – you've got a present time problem. That's all there is to it, see. You – what do you mean you haven't got a problem? Goddamnit, there it is!" [laughs]

This sort of an approach... And so the pc got all frayed around the edges and the session went to pieces and the auditor lost his drill. And so the Auditing Supervisor gave him a GAE and the Instructor looked it over and he says, "Well, this could look lots better," and straightened him all up and he goes back into session again and he does the same cotton-picking error. See? He just cleans up a clean read, you know.

Everything was going swimmingly in the session. They'd gotten down to, "Have you ever raped anybody?" You see? And there was a rape, you know. The guy had a rape on the thing. And the auditor says, "All right. I'll check that on the meter." It's clean as a whistle, see? "Have you ever raped anybody?" Nothing. And the auditor says, "All right, what's that?"

And the pc says, "What nothingness am I supposed to regurgitate here?" His reality breaks on the situation. First of all, he credits the thing, and so forth and so on and so on.

By this time he's got an ARC break and there is a read on the question "rape." It'd clean up instantly if the auditor simply had presence of mind enough to say, "Is there an ARC break here? Here, that. That."

"Oh well – huh, yeah."

And then asked the rape question again and he'd find it again would be clean. But if the auditor were particularly abstruse and obtuse, the second time he asked the rape question and got no read, he would see a read.

We don't know sometimes – they read a phantom needle. Maybe they're reading them – a needle they got mocked up because they themselves have got a rape on the case, see. We don't know what this is, but they will see a read here. And then they go and thrust it down the pc's throat and the whole situation goes to pieces. And the auditor walks out of that session and says, "Well, standard drills don't work." See?

The wrongness is the imaginary read – the erroneous reading of the needle. See? And out of this – this having the one thing you can't do wrong – we get a pursuance of a tremendous number of things going wrong. And then, of course, anybody can sit around and see these things going wrong. After all, the auditor picking up his E-Meter and hitting the pc over his head with it – that anybody could observe that that was going wrong in a session. So, you see? So they say, "Well, this auditor has an antagonistic attitude toward pcs, you see. And we'll give him some auditing and we'll do a 6A and we'll clean up all this antagonism he has toward pcs."

We send him back into session and this time he just stands there and kicks the pc's shins one after the other – in rotation – one, two. We don't see what has preceded this. What's preceded this is an erroneous meter read.

Now, that's the one thing that is difficult to supervise. You don't have a Supervisor stand in back of everybody all the time seeing how they did. And at this particular stage of the game you haven't got enough coaches or Supervisors who can read a needle accurately every time to tip you off. You understand? So your situation – your situation there, it just goes unobserved – whole thing goes unobserved.

Now, we can find lots of reasons the session went wrong: The auditor came a little bit late to session; the pc was annoyed with the way the meter was set up, *clang-crash-bing-pow*, you know and the cans dropping on the floor; there's noise in the same room – there's another session going on so we can attribute it to that. The pc feels a little bit fluttery and upset and the auditor forgets the first part of his Model Session and says, "All right. In this session have you been critical of me – I mean start of session!" You see, something like that – he makes some minor boob. Well, we say that would obviously wreck a session. And we have been built into a belief that a session could be wrecked by things which actually wouldn't wreck a session. They could be patched up. They could be straightened up. No, a session is wrecked by the invisible thing. This was a hidden thing.

The auditor was sitting right there and he said, "Do you have a present time problem?" And he said, "That reads. What is it?"

And the pc said – pc tries, see? "... I don't know ... I guess it's with my own pc. Yes, I'm having trouble with my own pc. Yes. That's it."

All right. And the auditor said, "All right. Thank you. Do you have a present time problem?"

"No. No. That's all. That's all."

"All right. Thank you. I'll check that out on the meter. Do you have a present time problem?" See?

There's no more read than a rabbit on this meter, see. Nothing. And he says, "That reads," he says, "What is it?"

And the pc says, "Do I have a present time problem. Well, now I have got one. It's the problem of having a present time problem."

See? Here he goes. It's the missed withhold of nothingness. And the pc goes right down the spout. So you say, "Well, do you have a present time problem?" It falls off the pin because it's falling on ARC break, see? You get an ARC break fall.

And the auditor says, "Well, that's clear. You agree that's clean?"

Pc now knows he has an ARC break and he feels very nervous, feels very upset one way or the other. Isn't responding well. So the pc says, "Oh, yeah, yeah. I agree it's clean. Yeah."

"All right. Now, let's get into this Prepcheck. All right. In this lifetime, have you ever been mad to a pc? That's clean."

"That's clean? *Me?* ...All right, if he says so."

"Have you ever taken any money and never given any auditing in return? That's clean."

"It is?" [laughter] "Golly, you know, maybe I cleaned that off in that other session ... I must have – somewhere ..."

Got no meter reads practically for the next – rest of the session until another ARC break occurs, somewhere here. Now the meter starts reading all cross-eyed and crazy, see? Finish up the session. Everything's a dog's breakfast. The pc feels bad and the auditor doesn't know what's wrong. And everybody is attributing it to something else.

But nobody was standing there pointing out the fact that the very first time he tried to clean something that was clean, and maybe he committed the felony of doing it again, he set up a situation of a missed withhold – the roughest missed withhold there is – the withhold of zero. The nothingness. There it went. There went his session. And he never does spot this as a missed withhold and the pc doesn't spot it as a missed withhold or call it such and of course it never cleans up. So you've got 3 May HCOB in full bloom. Right in the session and your meter stops reading, eventually. It goes on down on a gradient and stops reading.

Now, if this happens session after session after session, you get an automatic sessioning on the part of the pc. You get a pc trained to self-audit while faced with an auditor. The pc never waits for the meter read one way or the other. He unloads to you his withholds. See, he gives you this, he gives you that. He said, "Well, I've been very careful since the last session – so on and so on. Yes, I have a present time problem with so-and-so and so-and – I also had another problem with so-and-so and so-and-so and I had another problem with so-and-so and so-and-so and I got another problem with so-and-so and so-and-so. And that's about all the problems which I have, and so forth, and those are my problems. Okay. There aren't any more."

The auditor will say, "I'll check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem?" Gets no read and says, "That's clean." And goes on from there.

But the pc, if you'll notice, oddly enough, is beating the gun on practically every question – hardly waits for them to be asked. Here's your gopher sitting on top of the thing right up there in PT. He's keeping his own rudiments in – keeping his own rudiments in. You're nulling on a list – he keeps his own rudiments in.

Perfectly all right for a pc to say, "Hey, I just invalidated that item." The auditor should do nothing like auditors sometimes – when a pc volunteers something, why, they do the mid ruds on nulling. Man, that's a way to shut your pc up in a hurry. But you'll find out the pc who's really been mauled around with bad meter reading who keeps them in obsessively, he'll say, "Just a minute. I want to get this Invalidation off and that Careful off, and I got that and that's all straightened out now. Okay. Carry on." And the pc actually is running the session.

And that automatic attitude, self-auditing attitude, while in session, is borne directly and *only* from bad meter calls. Self-auditing of that particular type, right there in session, occurs only when the meter has been called upwards and backwards. Nobody is trying to say that self-auditing is no good and doesn't work and that sort of thing. There isn't anybody ... There isn't a soul here who hasn't done some self-auditing, even if on such a mild basis as: burns his finger and there's nobody around and he stands there and touches the side of the cook stove a few times until the finger burn goes out. Auditors are always doing that sort of thing. We're talking about the thing where the guy can't have an auditor. Well, he can't have an auditor because he can't trust meter reads anymore.

Now, you find a pc that has the word "difficulty" charged and the word "problem" charged – as minor thoughts these are terrifically charged – then use bad TR 1 on him so the whole thought doesn't register and you only get the minor-thought charge. Then try to clean the word "difficulty" while asking, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" which doesn't clean the word "difficulty." Do you find – do you see what I'm talking about? And you'll see a session fall right straight into the wastebasket, because there are no answers.

You see, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" is not going to clean up the read on the word "difficulty." You understand, I'm saying this guy has a charged thing called "difficulty." He's got a button called "difficulty." So where you – wherever you have a sentence, if you – in the absence of good TR 1 – wherever you have a sentence where the word "difficulty" occurs, even in life, why, there's an instant read at the end of "difficulty."

All right. Now, we try to clean up this rudiment with the poor TR 1, because the word "difficulty" is reacting. You're going to be in a mess in no time at all. Do you see what I mean? Because you're trying to clean something that isn't there. Well, it isn't that subtle. It's not that subtle. You don't have to worry too much about the TR 1 and the end words.

Those catastrophes will happen to you, too. You should know they exist so you can straighten them out. No, the catastrophes all occur unwittingly. The auditor doesn't think anything is happening because he's not aware of having made a mistake and the pc just goes into a total fog. The ARC breaks bloom in all directions. The pc ceases to read on the meter or starts reading backwards. Every time the auditor says anything to him, he has an ARC break, so he reads. Something wild is going on from one end to the other, and of course, we get no auditing done. Worse than that, we get negative auditing done. If you keep this up on meter reading, you'll drop graphs.

If you want to know – really drop a graph, get an intermittent fault in the E-Meter. You know, you part one of the wires so for every ten minutes, it's out for ten minutes. Do it for twenty-five hours and look at the graph, before and after, of the pc. It'll drop.

In other words, the technique and routines and drills of auditing are not great enough or powerful enough to overcome the liability of missed reads or cleaning clean reads.

And in a session, the number of reads that you can miss is exactly none. This is something that has to be done perfectly.

It's a tolerance of zero. There is no tolerance of any kind whatsoever. You just never miss a read.

That doesn't say you can't say occasionally that one is equivocal or something of this sort. You can, and read it again. No. It's – don't – don't misread. One misread will throw a session into a cocked hat. You can ruin a whole session with one misread. What do you think happens in a session where you miss five? Interesting question, isn't it? It's a question of, sort of "My God. How are you still alive?" Even as auditors, "How are you still alive? How hasn't some pc shot you?" It's pretty wild, you see?

Now, definition of a dangerous auditor is: an auditor who might miss one read in a session.

You see what you're shooting for? Now that you know what you're shooting for, make your form look good. Do your drills right and so forth. Don't let down on that.

But what you're shooting for in absolute perfection, is meter reading. Unless you can get that down to a point where you miss *none, ever*, you will be a dangerous auditor.

Thank you.

METER TRAINING

A lecture given on 12 July 1962

Thank you.

This is the second lecture, 12 July, 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course – and it has to do with E-Meter training: E-Meter training.

If people can't read an E-Meter, what's the matter with them? Obviously, it's bank. Obviously, it's lots of things.

Well, I'll tell you what the answer isn't. It's to audit everybody until they're Clear and then let them audit. This is very often proposed to me as a solution. Somebody calculated it, that it'd take twenty-nine thousand years for the auditors now trained on the east coast of the United States to finish up New York City – something like twenty-nine thousand years. And they're not that durable! That was my own comment on the thing, you know? You see, that's not and never has been a solution.

Another solution that's been proposed to me is that I audit everybody. [laughter] That's not a solution either.

No, the solution we're working on is a perfectly valid solution. Now we've got it narrowed down to – its most random factor at the present moment is the variability of meter reading – one auditor to the next. Auditors make mistakes reading meters.

Now, it isn't their banks, except indirectly, because the thing can be countered educationally. It can be countered very easily educationally. And you could say, "Well, the fellow's bank ..." so on, and so on, and so on, and so on, et cetera and et cetera. Oh, that's perfectly true – perfectly true – but it can be countered educationally more easily than by processing. That's quite interesting. And it's a fact *tremendously* in our favor.

First thing that's wrong with auditor meter reading is the auditor can't see. Now, that's a – that's not all of it, that's not all of it – but the auditor has a difficulty in seeing. And Scientologists, quite understandably (and I could compliment them for it) don't like to wear glasses. Fine, fine. But I'm afraid that the order of magnitude of the crime of wearing glasses doesn't even vaguely compare with the crime of not reading a meter. So that's first and foremost.

So this is – actually, this is a lecture of what we're going to do about this, you see? This is a lecture of what we're going to do about this.

When a person is going to be an auditor – not the pc off the street, the raw-meat pc – and we're auditing them, when we first audit this person, we should make out a Case Assessment Form. This more or less falls under the heading of Academy auditing – course auditing. Make out a Case Assessment Form. It's the old one; same one you would do if you were go-

ing to do a Problems Intensive, but you don't do the final two sections that you would do for the Problems Intensive. And in the process of doing this you'll find most paper matchbooks have some fantastically small printing in them. You look around on almost any paper of matches and you'll find some very tiny printing of one kind or another. Says all the advertising or something like that on it, and then it also says that it was printed and made in Racine, Birmingham, or something. See? Or a railway timetable – that also has some fantastically small print. Not supposed to be read by anybody because they'd never take the trains if they could read it, you know?

Reg suggested the other day the stock market report in the newspaper is awfully good. That's an eye strainer to end them all. It's anything, you see, that's about four-point type. Tiny, tiny, tiny type. There isn't anything that small on the E-Meter. There's no type that small. So you can't turn around and have them read something on the E-Meter. Maybe we ought to put over in the corner of the E-Meter some type that small. You see? Then everybody would find out what it was, and the test would be invalid. Or we take an insurance contract and take the small print section of it. That would be a good source of it. But you understand I'm talking about tiny printing. And it's very legible but very tiny.

And you hold it the distance away from the pc's face – the distance that he would ordinarily be seeing a meter if he were sitting back in his chair – and ask him if he can read it and have him tell you what it is. And if it's obvious that this pc can read this, we mark the top of the Case Assessment Form that his eyesight is good. Now, we don't care how it is good – whether it's good with glasses or without glasses, you understand? But if with glasses is the only way he can read this, then we will put the additional remark "Eyesight is good with glasses." And we'd just do this as a subtle tip-off that we're liable to have meter-reading trouble with this character if it isn't good. And if he can't read that tiny print the distance that meter would ordinarily be away from his eye, we put "eyesight poor," anything else we care to put, such as "requires adjustment" or "should have glasses" – anything we want to say. But that, we for sure add. And this will call to people's attention, such as a D of T or a Course Supervisor or something like that, that he has someone in his midst who, the second they start auditing, is going to be a liability. See?

So, let's get rid of the bad eyesight at one fell swoop. We don't care whether we have to get a magnifying glass – and one day Reg got me a crane-neck magnifying glass that went over the face of one of these meters and I've still got it upstairs; I'll bring it down – sure magnifies a needle. I was using it for microscopic reads to check up on old goals and things like that.

Glasses, anything you would care to do. But a magnifying glass, I should point out, is no universal answer, because everything might be blurry at the range of two and a half feet, which is about this range.

We can do something about it, and in the process of making this fellow an auditor, this is already called to somebody's attention because it's sitting on his Case Assessment Form, right at the top under his name, preferably written diagonally. And if you've got a red ball-point, put it in there. If his eyesight is bad, well, for heaven's sakes, underscore it a couple of times. Because you're setting up sessions to be very rough, ARC breaky; auditor is going to

go into unusual solutions; auditor is going to depart from the standard drills. All of these kind of things are going to happen, because in anxiety to make the pc better, why, he's going to do anything. And he will really never suspect that it's his own meter reading. He might suspect it, but he'd probably never confess it to anybody. See? So let's get that one out in the clear when we're running courses and that sort of thing.

And let's take a practical section and we're first teaching people about E-Meters. Let's pull out a timetable or the small print of an insurance contract or a book of matches and let's just hand it to the guy – holding it about two and a half feet away from him – and say, "Read that." This is an additional provision, don't you see? "Read that."

And the fellow says, "Uh – mm-mm ..." It's an ad for Bispicks, see? And he says, "Yeah. I can read that: 'Bispicks.'"

And you say, "No. The small print right there at the bottom."

"Oh," he says, "you mean the staple?"

Then the first step that Practical Section Instructor should take is to make that student take steps to provide himself with some glasses that are trained at two and a half feet, so that he can read a meter. You see? That would be his first step. He can make him go through set-up drills, and so forth, whilst the "occultist" [laughs] is making them up. You don't need any fancy glasses. They should ride on the nose. Girls tend to go in for things with diamonds scattered out along the rims and that sort of thing, but they're not really necessary.

Now, we think that's good enough. You think we've taken care of it then. No! Ladies and gentlemen, in Scientology we have not at that stage taken care of very much except maybe the next few days, because eyesight changes in Scientology like nothing else does. And it's quite upsetting to some pcs because their glass prescription is always shifting around one way or the other. All right. If we know we've got to do it, we can cope with it, can't we? But nevertheless that makes it a little bit hard to do.

So, any time Practical Section gets somebody back for a GAE, they pull out the insurance contract, the matchbox, and with the person's glasses sitting on the end of his nose, say, "Read that," holding it away at two and a half feet. See? So that's a good safety margin, because people's eyesight changes.

Now, this will get worse if everybody is reading meters darn well. Then processes bite harder and you're going to get faster eyesight changes. [laughter] But we can still cope with it. All right. That's fine. We just want them being able to keep seeing it out there.

Now, the trick is that you actually cannot trust the person to read a meter at that distance who can't read that print at that distance, because the amount of shake of the needle that is a read at sensitivity 16, that he'd have to follow down in many cases, is as much as print is blurring at that distance. In other words, if everything blurs to him, then the needle could move just under the blur and because the needle is moving, it just looks like it's blurring. See, it isn't a blur; it's moving. But he is so used to seeing things in a blur at that distance that it looks to him like a blur and therefore is not moving. You get the error that sorts out of this? See? Well, it's quite important to keep an eye on this as we're training people along and processing them up the line.

This is just for the greater good of the greater number of students. Don't you see? This fellow can always read this, and so forth. Well, that's fine. We'll still always do the drill. The person came back for some more meter work or something like that – he came back for some more this or that into the Practical Section, having been found wrong in auditing – let's assume that the first thing that was wrong that he did was not what the Auditing Supervisor said. Let's assume automatically that he couldn't see a moving needle. See? Let's just assume that. We don't care what the Auditing Supervisor said; we'll assume that. We'll take up also what the Auditing Supervisor said in the Practical Section, but we will just always add to it to this degree. We'll assume there might be something wrong with meter reading that we haven't caught yet. Got that?

Now, this merely takes care of the idea of focus. So far I've merely spoken about focus and being able to see a certain distance, and I have not talked about many other factors involved.

We have now hit the most elementary and the most obvious level of straightening up meter reading when we're straightening up people's eyesight with glass prescriptions or magnifying glasses or something like that. See, that's the most elementary level, but quite necessary. And the next level doesn't necessarily invalidate this at all.

Let us go into a much wider theory now, which is the width of present time. How wide is present time? Is present time a thousandth of a second wide? Is it zero wide? Is it two seconds wide? Or is it ten minutes wide? Now, you would be reading the future like mad and could win your fortune at Monte Carlo any time if present time was ten minutes wide. You might even be able to win some horse races. You know, get the bet down and – just before the window slams shut. And you still might be able to get your bet in under in time to get the horse in, see? But that would be bordering on what most people would call the ability to foretell the future.

I mention the word ten minutes because it's not impossible, because I myself have a ten minute band on TV and movies and that sort of thing. I never bothered to investigate it, but I have a subawareness of what is going to happen any time within the next ten minutes on the film. Now, this is very annoying. Spoils all the plots and so forth. Now, I first thought it was simply writer training, and I've since begun to watch some soap opera that no writer was ever near, you see, what passes for TV plays these days. Well, it happens just the same, you know? Suddenly find myself thinking about somebody being hanged, you know, then suddenly realize that this character who just walked in is about to be hanged and realize – then I realize how he is going to be hanged. You see, it's spreading down now from the ten-minute mark as the zero, and we're marking off one minute at a time. We come down somewhere within four or five seconds – that is the period in which I am actually watching the film. I'm aware of this.

So you see, by drawing that out I can conceive of a present time ten minutes wide. See, there's nothing more – nothing esoteric about this. I'm not trying to tell you that it's some wonderful ability. As a matter of fact, I very often would like to lose it.

A person who is cleared gets into the fantastic state of being able to tell at every intersection some fifty to a hundred feet before they get to the intersection, if anything is coming

down the intersection and from which side and about how fast. See, it's almost as if they have a radar vision that looks around the corner, and it looks to them as though they have developed a perception which is lineal, present-time perception. And they think they're looking around corners. No, they are not looking around corners. They have a wider present time and haven't accustomed themselves to it yet, and they are looking at a fringe of knowingness which is many seconds up the line. They're looking at something like a fifteen- to twenty-second fringe of knowingness. See, they know what's going to happen in fifteen or twenty seconds, but it comes through to them as an impression. So they think they are looking around the corner at the truck which is coming down the street. But they try to do that, and that doesn't work. And this is quite baffling to them. It's reading the future is what it is. But it isn't *reading* the future. It's not even *being* in the future. It's just that PT is that wide. That's the thing.

Now, somebody who is really sharp as an athlete ... oh, I don't know, I suppose Sam Snead has a present time from the drive of the tee to the landing of the ball. I suppose that all takes place in now. And if you asked him very closely, he would get the sensation as he hit the ball of knowing exactly where it was going to land or just before he hit the ball he knows where it's going to land. And everybody says, "This is skill that is doing this," you see? Well, it is not skill that is doing this. Actually, he knows where the ball is going to land, that's all. It's – he doesn't even have to go through the idea of following at a line of flight to find out where it's going to land. See? The ball is lying there and he is hitting the ball in the same band of PT.

Of course, the poor sods go out there and try to whip this guy Snead, you see, and nothing happens, you know? He feels a little stretchier one day and goes out and breaks the course record, you see? And then he feels a little stretchier the next day so he breaks the record he made, you see? This guy is terrific. But it looks very easy to him. And so it would look easy to you if you had control of both ends of the flight of a golf ball.

You see, people believe they can do this. Have you ever seen anybody stand on a golf green, and as the ball is rolling across the green, they go [demonstrates something] – and try to push it into the hole. See? "Missed," you know? Do you see people do that? You ever seen people follow the course of a bowling ball, something like that, and twist it back straight, and so forth, get down finally? Do you ever see people try this? Well, why do they *try* to do that if they know they can do that? It isn't the projection of the control they just did with their hands. They're aware of the fact that the event is not predicted and they're trying to predict and control the event. And their stretches and strains around in the thing is in despair of not having done so. Because it's always despair. It isn't really just ...

Well, if you were going to knock a ball into the – into the cup on the green, you certainly wouldn't go on – *oooahhh* – grunting and straining and doing all sorts of things. You'd just go *ptt*, and it'd go right in the cup, bang! You sort of brush a beam at it, you know? Well, how about at the moment you hit it it's already in the cup? Well, that's controlling both ends of the span of PT and this is your great athlete.

Great athletes, by the way, are always – always exterior. And you show them the Axioms of Scientology – "Oh, that's what I've been doing! Oh, yes! Good! Yeah, fine! Oh. Oh,

that's what that's all about! Mm-hm. Well, of course, anybody'd know that. Yeah. That's right." And they go right on down the list of the Axioms – *brrrrrrrr!* Quite remarkable. But what I'm calling your attention to is, their PT is wide.

Now, frankly, they don't think of their PT as containing motion. They think of it as containing control. Motion doesn't happen randomly in their PT. When they're doing something, they're controlling all the motion in that PT because they are in that PT and they have the width of that PT in which to decide. It's almost as if at the end of two seconds they could undecide what they decided at the beginning of two seconds. So therefore, they have terrific judgment. They don't have to test-decide anything, because they know which decision is right because they saw it happen. You get how silly and involved this can finally become? All right.

Those people are capable of perceiving motion. They can also perceive stillness as a total is-ness.

And then we get down to the guy who has a present time one one-thousandth of a second wide. And he is in nothing but anxiety – continuous anxiety. He's always regretting what he just decided because it's already too late. He's always in trouble. But it's an anxiety he feels. That would be a crazy man's present time, see? It's all wrong all the time. There's no telling what will happen. He doesn't even know if the bed will continue to sit on the floor, don't you see, because he can't perceive the bed sitting on the floor. See, there's no test line.

Actually, as you look at those TV sets up there, you recognize that those TV sets are continuing to be there. Don't you get that idea?

Audience: Mm-hm.

They're continuing to be there. You look at me; you know I'm continuing to sit here in the chair. How do you get the idea of continuance? You don't get the idea of continuance by comparing the fact that I was here and therefore I will be here. That isn't what you figure out at all. No. All at one glance you see me across a span of time, so you know I'm continuing.

Now, how about the fellow who can only see me across a span of one one-thousandth of a second? He'd be mighty anxious. He'd be mighty anxious. "Is he going to exist or isn't he going to exist? Is he going to sit down there?" And he'd wind up telling you, "you can't tell what I'm going to do next." He'd tell you, "You make me nervous. I don't know what you're going to do next." Well, how come he's so uncertain about it? Well, that's because you're not there while you are being there in the same PT, you see? It's a little bit hard to talk about because language isn't nicely matched up to this phenomena. It's unexamined phenomena. All right.

The less PT a person has, the more difficulty they have with the perception of motion and stillnesses. The more present time they have, the easier it is to perceive motion and stillness. Elementary.

Therefore, just to give you an odd example of this, an individual could be run on "Look around here and tell me what you're absolutely sure will be here in one second." Of course, all of you look around and you say, "Well, everything in the room will be here in one second," see? But then we start grading that up: Five seconds. Twenty seconds. Half a minute.

A minute. Five minutes. Ten minutes. And all of a sudden, about this, we're hitting – we're hitting such an – a wider fringe, the span is too great, and we have to look for a specific object and figure out a continuance for that object. But nevertheless this drill, phrased in any way that it could be put together – such as "How long are you absolutely sure that door will be there?" and take your answer – you would drill the person's perception into a broadening of present time.

There happens to be a process. (I don't say that these processes are the answer because they are not. I'm just giving you data.) you say, "Look around this room and find something that's having an effect on an effect," or "Look around this room and find something that's having an effect on something else."

The latter one, particularly, when tested, will be found occasionally to turn on for a pc, for fifteen or twenty minutes or maybe the next hour or two, a fantastically widened PT. You can sometimes get the same phenomena that a Clear gets of knowing about the cars coming, knowing whether lights are going to turn, when they're going to turn. His prediction goes way up.

"Look around here and find an effect that's having an effect on something," or "Look around here and find something that's having an effect on something else" – your commonest wording.

So these processes do exist which widen PT. They're specifically addressed to it. Nothing much to do with somebody's goals. Nothing much to do with anything else. But if you look it over, you'll find out that they're not so much processes as they are drills. They're practices. They're just practices.

So, widening of PT any way that you possibly could do it would improve a person's recognition of motion and stillness of a needle, or of course, change of rate of motion. Now, some auditors can – have no real difficulty in telling whether a needle was in motion or a needle was still, but do definitely have difficulty in establishing a change of rate of motion. The sudden tiny acceleration – the very slight acceleration which occurs in the middle of a fast rise: At what moment did that rise faster than the rest of the rise? Or, an accelerated fall: At what moment did that fall fall faster than that fall?

Now, we're not talking about good or bad meter reading. We're talking about the absolute minimum meter reading and that is meter reading. See? It's not a freak to be able to tell an accelerated fall or an accelerated rise. You *have* to be able to because they are reads. So even that skill – being wider than merely still and in motion – has to be under the hand of the auditor. He has to be able to tell that it's rising faster than it was rising. See, the – for one division it rose a tiny bit faster than it did in the three divisions before and the three divisions afterwards. That's the accelerated rise. You've got to be able to detect that because it's a read. He also has to be able to tell that it *didn't* do that, because that is a clean. And now we're getting down to very, very narrow limits of needle perception.

Now, the first is purely the problem of eyesight: Can the fellow see lines and circles and so forth at a distance of two and a half feet on very tiny print? That's purely eyesight. Now we're getting into – with this next echelon – the relative ability amongst people to perceive motion when it exists, lack of motion when it exists and change of rate of motion when

it exists. A slowed rise, a speeded rise, a slowed fall, a speeded fall – he's got to be able to tell those. And all of this depends on the width of present time.

Now, what perception can a person have? What can he do with his perception? How can a person improve his perception? Well, as a matter of fact, there's a fellow named Bates in the United States that developed a whole system and wrote a book about it. So much so that I think he got to be known as "perfect-sight-without-glasses Bates." Now he wrote this book, *Perfect Sight Without Glasses*. Terrific number of drills contained in this thing. Well, they've departed beyond this particular book and they have all kinds of drills whereby a person follows with his right eye one line and the left eye another line and that sort of thing. And they have machines you look into and it exercises the eyes and the fellow perceives, and that sort of thing. Very often this will alter the characteristics of a person's sight. I'm not saying this is any panacea. I'm not recommending this in any way, shape or form. I myself have tried some of these things and they've gotten no place. But I have seen sight improved by this – in other words, perception improved by this.

But we're out and beyond perception. We're into consecutive awareness when we're reading meters. There are three moments that we have to perceive in order to find out if a needle is still. Of course, at first glance you say to yourself, "Well, yuueearree [there's] only one moment that you have to perceive to find out if a needle is still, and that is simply look at it, and in that moment it isn't moving, so therefore, the needle is still." That's not good enough because you have nothing to compare it with. You have to have the moment before, the moment it is still, and the moment afterwards to make sure that it is still still. How wide are these moments? These moments may only be a thousandth of a second wide. So a still needle is read by "it wasn't moving, it isn't moving, it won't move; therefore it isn't moving and therefore it is still."

Now, a moving needle requires at least two observations and it is therefore easier to read than a still needle. A moving needle is always easier to read than a still needle. If you don't believe this, go out in the forest sometimes and try to find a deer that is standing behind a thicket watching you. Just try and find him. And, by George, you may be out there looking at him and in his direction for a half an hour and you'll never discover that he's there, because he's still. And you don't discover he's there until he takes off. You pitch a bully-beef can in that direction of that thicket thoughtlessly and he takes off. And you all of a sudden are aware of the fact that a deer has been standing there watching you – probably all the time you've been there. Startles you half to death. Well, how is it that you didn't perceive him when he was still but do perceive him when he was moving? "Oh, well," you say, "the relative thing, and it attracts the eye, and motion attracts the thing; and then there's more things to perceive, such as noise and ..." you can figure it out and you can figure yourself half to death!

The thing is only, basically, that motion requires only two observations and stillness requires three. The motion takes part of the responsibility of directing attention, don't you see? Whereas stillness takes no responsibility for directing attention. You see, the motion almost pulls the eyeball along with it. Do you ever get that idea?

All right. Now, let's be a little less esoteric than that. But a motion is detected simply by observing that something was in place A and then observing that it was in place B. And

you observe these two consecutive actions, you know it moved. That is all you have to know about it: that it was in place A and now it's in place B and therefore has moved.

Now, how narrow together can place A and B be before you detect that motion is occurring? You can gulp over that one. That's one of these questions almost: "How long is a piece of string?" But on an E-Meter we can answer it. It's something on the order of a tenth of the width of the tip of the needle, to the right or to the left, is a motion. Now, that's pretty darn microscopic. In view of the fact that the needle is sloped out and gets wider rapidly as it comes down, that tenth could be interpreted in all different and wide and peculiar ways, but I'm talking about the tip – the top tip. A tenth.

Now, most Mark IVs jiggle before you put in the cans. They all jitter. They all do. That's nothing because the stabilizing factor is contained in getting the circuit completed. That stabilizes them at once. This is nothing to worry about. Only start worrying about your Mark IV when you've got the can jack plugged in and the pc on the cans and it's jiggling. Now you can get worried because there is something wrong with your meter. Usually it's a grain of dust or something has gotten into the tone arm swing, but we've put a new tone arm carbon-brush arrangement in there, and they don't do too much of this now.

But most people are not aware of this. This meter is jiggling right this minute. You see this meter jiggle?

Audience: Yes. Hm-hm.

Hm.

Male voice: Big jiggle.

Well, the read that you're supposed to read is about one tenth of that jiggle. You having a hard time reading the jiggle?

Male voice: Oh, I can see the jiggle, but one tenth of it – uh-uh.

Yeah, one tenth of it. Ha-ha. That gets rather small, doesn't it? Well, to be absolutely safe, that's what you should be able to do.

Female voice: Hm.

I've seen a goal that read no more than that jiggle, and was the right goal, read every time. Yet nobody could locate it. I thought they were all nuts. It was obvious the goal was reading. [laughs] Nobody else could see it move.

Width of present time could then be broadened to a point of where you could perceive motion or stillness by various drills of perception.

Now, your next level, let's take up, is brevity of perception. What section of the present time you are in do you require to perceive an inaction or an action? And as soon as we have said that, we actually open the door to the solution to this problem. Broadening your present time is most easily done by clearing you. And any other processing leveled in that direction of broadening your present time is frankly a waste of time, because it's all going to come out right when you're Clear.

But the proposition that you must be Clear before you can audit anybody is totally unworkable and never will work. There are several reasons for this, having to do with practicality. And one of the reasons you perhaps are not too aware of, and that is to say, cleared raw meat with no reality on what has happened is enormously inferior to somebody that has the data and goes Clear. They get a subjective reality on what it's like trying to wrestle with the problems of it. They understand this. Their comprehension and understanding of the problems and so forth, are infinitely greater. They're left with a capability of understanding people, even though Clear. Whereas you clear raw meat and you're liable to find somebody now very impatient with people – wonders why he's associating with them or something of the sort. Gets all involved. I've had some interesting letters on this subject, by the way.

It's easy to follow some person's worries when they're jammed in their heads and aren't thinking very straight. That's easy to follow, if you can follow it, when they start figure-figuring. It's dead easy, you know? A guy is dead in his head, and the pattern of his thought is now going to repeat itself. You're going to have a way to figure this out. You may not get it the first pattern, but you'll get it the second pattern. You'll figure out finally what he means.

Well, this isn't true – you get a Clear who is doing a figure-figure and you've really got something on your hands. Trying to understand a Clear when he's figure-figuring is one of the more difficult things that you will be called upon to do here and there. Because you will inevitably make, sooner or later, a raw-meat Clear, and then he's going to ask you the damndest questions. You've had answers to these things all along. And, of course, he's much smarter at asking questions now. It's rather interesting. They've asked me all kinds of – I've been asked very, very complicated questions on the subject of why people behave as they do. Or how you – how I could possibly stand to associate with people or... You know, all kinds of oddball questions.

It just shows you that the poor guy has suddenly been launched into the stratosphere and is being expected to fly without having found out that he's in an airplane. He has no comparative data, don't you see? He'll be fine. I mean, he'll do well in life and that sort of thing – not that I'm trying to run down the state. But as far as the idea of the mind and people and this universe, there is no substitute for a guy being as spun-in as you are [laughter] and then going Clear, because you go Clear on it with all the data.

And listen, if you can understand what's going on now, you'll understand it real well; you'll get it nicely sorted out. There's a lot of virtue to be said for this. So, completely aside from any other understanding here, you get much more comprehending people this way. That's why clearing everybody without training any auditors is not a solution.

Now, when we look at the problem of time, we see that you have to have a little more time to conceive a stillness than you do – have to have a motion, because we've got to see three things, three moments of time in a stillness, and only two moments of time in a motion. And people, by the way, are more intolerant therefore and thereby of stillnesses. Whatever other value this philosophic observation has, they're much more intolerant, because it takes more time to see one; takes more time to observe one. They always think of stillnesses as absorbing tremendous quantity of time. They get very, very tired.

They see an oak tree out there motionless in the pasture and for a little while they'll "ooh" and "ah" over this marvelous oak tree. But they may go out and sit in the pasture themselves and look at this oak tree and then just suddenly be overwhelmed by the terrible standing-thereness of it, foreverness of it, see? *Th-uth-zz-zz*, you know? Whereas they look at something traveling rather rapidly, like a colt, and the idea never comes to their mind. Has nothing to do with the gra- the development of the colt. Has the idea that the colt is in motion, so therefore he – his continuance does not have to be as great as something that is standing still. See? Three moments as opposed to two moments.

So the period of time required to observe can be shortened until a person can observe in the tiniest, narrowest present time – three moments of time or two moments of time. Let's say this poor sod's present time – let's really cut it down, see – is a millionth of a second, see? Well, we're out beyond the realm of being able to observe anything at all. See? So he's had it. We're not training him as an auditor. He's leaning on a tree in some cemetery feeling sad for himself, you know? He isn't even picking up a body, this one isn't.

No, let's take a tenth of a second as somebody's PT. Oh, well, let's be better. Let's take a twentieth of a second – twentieth of a second. Now, that takes us down to almost anybody. See? And now let's be able to carve a twentieth of a second up into three pieces. And of course, we get three periods, see, of each one – what is it? – a sixtieth of a second in duration. So we then have to be able to observe an instant in time which is no longer than a sixtieth of a second. And we can observe three instants in time in the guy's PT. Therefore, he sees that the needle is still. He observes it's there, it was there, it is there, it will be there, all at one fell swoop and recognize that he has no motion involved with it.

So, you might then say the moment of tolerance of observation is a sixtieth of a second. You must be able to perceive an is-ness only a sixtieth of a second long. You see, this is not trying to expand somebody's PT before he's Clear, you see; this is cutting it down to where a below-average PT can perceive it. And now let's educate him by practice and drill into actually perceiving what he can already perceive. He can perceive a sixtieth of a second.

I don't know if you ever looked at the shutter of a camera that is set for a sixtieth of a second, but it's very perceivable. You take a shutter of a camera and set it for a twentieth of a second or something like that, why, you can almost see images in the room through the thing. You look through the back of the thing, and it goes click and it's – oh, it's dead slow. The diaphragm opens and closes again and it's – it's terrific, see?

All right. You set that camera for a five-hundredth of a second and you have to ask yourself for a moment: Did it open and close? You're more told by the fact that it clicked aurally, see, than the fact that you perceived the light. Nevertheless, you hold a camera at a five-hundredth of a second up to a light and most people will be able to perceive, at least – even if it were wide open as a lens – they'd perceive something about the size of a sixpence or something like this. They perceive a smaller diameter than the diameter of the lens. Actually, it's in direct ratio: The amount of PT that they can observe easily, see, is reflected in the narrowing diameter that they could perceive of that diaphragm. We won't bother to get into this too technically like that, but some people will see it as a pinpoint. See? And other people will see it at a five-hundredth of a second; they will see the whole lens. It just varies from person to per-

son. I only make these remarks and add this into the setup because it gives you an index of actually indexing people's present time, which you might find of some use sometime or another – choosing pilots or something like that.

Now, if we take a sixtieth of a second as a tolerance point – let's be twice as good and let's make it about a hundred and twenty-fifth of a second. Let's be able to perceive an is-ness in a hundred and twenty-fifth of a second. And you'll find out without broadening PT that most people will be able to be drilled into this.

Now, it goes something like this: They can perceive an is-ness in a second. You show them the lantern slide of a chair for one second on a screen and nearly everybody present, except somebody who is stone blind, will say to you, "That was a chair," but won't be able to give you much of the detail of the chair in that one second. But we keep showing them the chair and we keep showing them the chair and showing them the chair, and finally – it isn't that they stack up a number of observations; we could show them different observations of the chair – and they eventually would see the chair better. And they would see it better to the extent of telling you how the seat was finished – whether it was in cloth or embroidery or leatherette or something of this sort. They'd tell you how many rungs it had, how many verticals in the back of the thing and if there was anything else in the picture. And they eventually perceive everything that is there. In other words, they wrap themselves around the is-ness of the thing.

All right. We take another picture – let us say a table – and we show this to them for a half of a second, and a half a second, and a half a second – we show them the same picture half a second, or different views in a half a second – and they finally are able to pick up all of that. In other words, they can see in that half a second. We take another slide, entirely unrelated to it, and you'll now find out these people who have learned to see in a half a second – if they have drilled adequately on it – will get all of the detail necessary, or that's in the thing, in that half-a-second look, see?

All right. So we slow it up now to a quarter of a second. And we show them a picture at a quarter of a second. If before they were drilled at one second you had shown them the picture at a quarter of a second, to a lot of people it would have looked like a blank. But now we're working on a gradient scale. We've shown a second, we've shown a half a second; now we've got it down to a quarter of a second, so we show them the views of something or other at a quarter of a second till they can see at a quarter of a second without questioning.

And having done that, we move down to an eighth of a second and we repeat the same drill in an eighth of a second. You've got a magic lantern, is what you've got, or a projection machine of some kind or another, which has a photo diaphragm which can be adjusted from one second – well, it's got to have a time device on it so it can be left open – but it's adjusted from one second to a hundred and twenty-fifth of a second. We get everybody that's involved in the drill accustomed to seeing things at an eighth of a second there and at the eighth-of-a-second flash – they can get everything out of an eighth-of-a-second flash that they would get out of it.

Now we move down, of course, to a fifteenth of a second – that being a handy halving used by a camera – and at a fifteenth of a second ... That, by the way, is the speed of a

Brownie box camera. Have you ever looked into a Brownie box camera and seen the lens travel across in a fifteenth of a second? You'll be able to perceive everything that is perceivable in the picture in that fifteenth of a second.

Now let's take it at a thirtieth of a second. And let's perceive everything at a thirtieth of a second. And now we're up to a sixtieth of a second, and that's the first admissible point for absolute reliable reading. A sixtieth of a second. We get everybody in so they can see it and then we move them on up to a seventy-fifth, or some such thing, and then speed it up until we eventually get them to a hundred and twenty-fifth of a second.

In other words, if there's anything on the picture at all, the person's eye and viewingness and alertness on the thing can be trained up to see at a hundred and twenty-fifth of a second if it is there or if it isn't there.

What I'm giving you actually, is naval recognition training, World War II. There were a lot of these ideas kicking around California and other places and the navy and the army got up into certain problems they couldn't immediately solve, so they picked up educators here and there and they finally developed things like this recognition training.

I went a little bit further with it. We had outfits of one kind or another. You can teach kids the alphabet. You can teach people when they – that can't read, and you can teach them to read very rapidly. You can teach little kids to – arithmetic with great speed, as well as to recognize what kind of an airplane it is, given the briefest glimpse of it – all of these things. That was the intention with which the stuff was used.

They've brought it up into reading now. Now it's in reading, and they have – they issue you books in the United States now that have timed slides on the side of them. You set this thing and you've got to be able to see a single word or see a group of words and they give you different shutter speeds with which you can perceive these, and it's speed reading. And as an attesting to it, actually a United States senator was able to read – he had trained himself up to read, I think it was *Oliver Twist*, in fifteen minutes or something like that – at least he was standing there – but because he's a United States senator I don't believe that. You wouldn't either. Anyway, the fellow had actually condensed his recognition line.

That's the use that's being put to today. So they're still using this principle. That came off of aircraft recognition.

I never used it myself. I trained men on it and that sort of thing. I had an entirely different attitude toward aircraft recognition. I was in South Pacific at the beginning of the war. The extant philosophy at the beginning of the war was "If it flies you shoot it down because there are none of ours up there anyplace," and you sort of got into that habit. I got into a nasty habit with regard to aircraft: is – it flies, shoot it, you know? And in fact it's a good sport. He's shooting at you, shoot at him. What's the difference?

And I was never under the delusion that the Army Air Forces were on our side. I never was. I never made that mistake. [laughs] We used to talk it over occasionally, and we always came to the same opinion – that we were not fighting the same war. Anyway, they had an IFF, Identification Friend and Foe radar, and your radar screen would hit the aircraft and if it was equipped with IFF or if the IFF was working, it flashed back a signal and it told you that it

was a friend. You just shot at everything else. So I never used this system. But I did train a lot of people up in it and used it in various ways, and have myself been trained on this system itself and I know it's quite remarkable.

The first time I ever saw – I think it was a Japanese bomber – slide of a Japanese bomber at a hundred and twenty-fifth of a second, let me tell you, I didn't even think there was a blackboard there that the thing was shining on. Hundred and twenty-fifth of a second, you know? And I sort of saw it wink. I wasn't even prepared, you know, to greet this thing at all. I didn't even know what was going to happen, you know? And blink! And I was in there with a bunch of advanced students. The Instructor says to the students, "What was it?" And they say, "A Mitsubishi *yump-shomph-womph-womph* something or other bomber" you know? I just looked out the window. I didn't see any. [laughter, laughs] And I finally dug what they were up to. And I saw a group of sailors pass from a second of scratching their heads to find out whether it was an airplane or a fly or what it was that had been flashed on the screen during that second, to being able to hit it on the button in a seventy-fifth of a second with the greatest of ease.

Just that training gives you a method by which you can bring a person to observe stillness or motion in the tolerable instant of time. Now, we're not now talking about rigging up anything very fancy. This isn't a very fancy rig. This is any old projection machine fitted with a camera shutter that will take speeds of time of one second and down to a hundred and twenty-fifth, so it's not even a good camera shutter. Most of them will take you down to a five-hundredth and a lot of them to a thousandth, you see? You don't need it that fancy. But it has to be a fairly big shutter, and it has to be installed in such a way that it doesn't interrupt putting in slides. If you were just to take some pictures – pictures of pretty girls, (anything), or pictures of handsome and strong men (anything) – and just flick these on with some distinguishing feature, or if you were just to take numbers written on a piece of paper, see, that went into the slide just so it projected clearly on the screen, and you did this same drill of just shortening the length of time necessary to perceive it ...

Of course, it's best to have a large assortment of drills that goes in one after the other, because people very quickly will learn rotation, and they fool you in various ways, so that you throw in these slides variably, you see? Anything that they could recognize. It wouldn't matter what it was. A series of numbers. Anything, see? Blondes and brunettes. It doesn't matter what it was, as long as it was there to be recognized and you could tell whether or not the fellow had seen it. You could gradually work up his ability to perceive in briefer and briefer intervals of time until, of course, he could perceive in the three intervals, one sixtieth of a second each, necessary to tell him if that meter was acceptably still. Now, you'd have it. That would give you perfect meter reading.

Now, this is an interesting approach – an approach through a lot of training methods, visual training aids and that sort of thing, which were developed a long time ago but which were very successful. It gives you more than this. You could get into a situation here where you fit this thing up with an E-Meter element, and you actually see a still needle, and you actually see a moving needle. And seeing a moving needle for one hundred and twenty-fifth of a second would be asking the person to perceive moments of time consisting of a three hundred and seventy-fifth of a second. To perceive that it was still, it'd have to be a three

hundred and seventy-fifth of a second that the person could perceive an instant; and to see that it was moving, he'd have to be able to perceive a two hundred and fiftieth of a second instant. That's far beyond the tolerance absolutely necessary for a person to read an E-Meter. But if you're going to train people, train them good, you know?

And anybody could make this kind of a rig and experiment around with it until he found out how to shorten people's necessary period of observation.

The psychologist, who has made many mistakes – and by the way, apologized to us the other day. The big chief in South Africa apologized abjectly to me for daring to use my name in vain, and our solicitor turned the letter back and said that it would have to be publicly published, and so on. He was saying some dirty words concerning me. He was inferring I was a psychologist, I think.

Anyway, a psychologist has observed this interesting error, that the eye has a shutter speed of about a twentieth or a twenty-fifth of a second. This is a stupid lie. The eye has no shutter speed. You gaze into some girl's eyes, and if you're not terrifically stricken along other emotional lines, you maybe perceive that there is no Compur shutter installed back of the iris. I know it seems sacrilegious to gaze into some girl's eyes just to understand whether or not there's a Compur shutter back there, but nevertheless, you have to do some things for science. [laughter]

But the point is, is there is no interval. But there's a thetan back of the eyeball, see, back of the channel line, who has a width of PT and who tends to fixate on what he considers an observable moment. And then he – if it takes place shorter than that, it isn't observable. Well, he very rapidly – because you're narrowing time – can follow it easily. See, he can train himself down into narrower glimpses and it appears very comfortable to him finally because he's actually looking at segments of his own PT. And he finds his own PT fairly comfortable – relatively speaking – and so therefore he can comfortably observe briefer moments than that.

I mention this thing about the eye being a twentieth or twenty-fifth of a second, or something like that, because somebody will bring it up and tell you how it is sooner or later and doesn't happen to be factual. There is no shutter.

What the eye perceives as motion and what it perceives as stillness is almost as variable as there are people. This is not any constant.

To teach people never to miss a read consists solely and entirely of being able, for those people, to establish what is still, without any question in their mind, and what is moving, without any question in their minds, and what is moving faster or moving slower than it was. That's all they have to establish and be satisfied with in their mind and read a meter.

Meanwhile, you have none of these training aids, none of them. They are things of the future. So you are the children, the forgotten children of yesteryear, who grew up in the dark ages when we didn't have these things and somehow learned anyway.

But I call your attention to the fact that this can be taught, can be acquired and you can acquire it directly on a meter. Just by watching a meter, observing what is moving and what is still, you will eventually come to read it anyhow.

And remember this: that one read, wrong, to clean a clean or to ignore a reacting, moving needle in a session, are intolerable at the level of one per session. You can't even have one per session. It's zero per session.

So that is the direction I want to see you go and that is the direction I know you can go.

And we got the hump – we got the hump crossed and that is very good news. Now all you've got to do is read that needle.

Thank you very much.

Good night.

E-METER READS AND ARC BREAKS

A lecture given on 17 July 1962

Thank you.

Well, I just gave all the instructors infraction sheets so you should be very cheerful. They get on this stuck flow, you know? And they keep giving them out and giving them out, you know? And they get to a point where they, if you don't give them a few, why, they'll snap terminals, you know? [laughter]

Well, good to see you. A few of you look like you'll survive. No great percentage.

And this is what? This is the 17th?

Audience: 17th.

17th July, AD 12, first lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Okay. Well, nothing much to talk to you about tonight. You're all straightened out on everything and got it all taped. And I'm glad to see that. I'm glad to see that. As soon as you get some glasses and some magnifying glasses [laughter, laughs] – there's some possibility – there's some possibility – that your focal distance can coincide with the point of the needle; so don't despair. Don't despair.

Mary Sue had a speed flash system going. They teach them how to read in the United States these days with a flash system. You throw a shutter and it gives you a hundredth of a second – two words at a hundredth of a second. And you're supposed to be able to read those in that hundredth of a second, and so forth. And everybody flunked it.

So, we're making some progress. We're making some progress. At least we know now people can't see. [laughs] That's development.

All right. Let's look at something very banal; something you know all about. You can relax your mind. Let's look at the subject of E-Meter reading and ARC breaks, relationship between.

Model Session, June 23rd, AD 12, as amended (amended by the Havingness being dropped out of the beginning rud), gives us a weapon which exposes all else. As soon as we use that Model Session and repetitive rudiments – repetitive beginning rudiments – and repetitive Prepchecking, we've actually stripped the technology down to a very easy and very positive performance. It's very easy to do these things. They're not involved, you're not worrying about having to form What questions, you're not worrying about this and that. Actually,

there are plenty of forms around to give you Zero questions for this pc and that. And you yourself, dreaming up what might be wrong with the pc, can also dream up lists of Zero questions for some particular pc, which you should be able to do.

And the culmination of all that is the eradication of technical variables. And there's nothing there in the Model Session or its procedure or anything connected with what you are doing verbally, and so forth, with the pc, that is open to very much question. Oh, you can argue around as to whether or not you get in the end – the middle ruds by repetitive check or by fast check before you check the Zero. And you can contend that if the middle ruds were clean, then you shouldn't have to recheck the Zero – which you should do. You should recheck the Zero always.

A lot of questions can come up, but frankly none of these things are capable or susceptible to ARC breaks – capable of ARC breaking a pc or susceptible to creating ARC breaks. It's smoothed out to such a point that a performance done – oh, relatively indifferently – would leave a pc improving, gaining, coming on up the line.

And it exposes – the simplicity of this existing technology – also the simplicity of Routine 3GA; there's nothing complicated about 3GA – exposes just one thing, and that's meter reading. You take all of these constants and you find out that you do them – do them fairly well.

You see, you don't have to do those perfectly to get a result. You should be able to do them perfectly. You should be able to put on a good show. But you shouldn't be able to do – have to do them perfectly, you see, in order to obtain a result. I mean, the technology is very powerful. That particular approach to auditing is very powerful!

And it leaves to view only one potential error: TR 4 in one form or another.

There's a TR 4 phenomenon connected with the meter. And the meter, if poorly read, or only once in a while read wrong, operates to throw TR 4 out in the session.

See, the pc has a present time problem, and the auditor looks straight at the needle and says – after he's said "Do you have a present time problem? Do you have a present time problem? Do you have a present time problem?" and it got to that point where the pc says, "No, that's it!" and then he looks at the meter and he says, "Do you have a present time problem?" and the thing falls off the pin, and the auditor says, "That's – do you agree that's clean?" See? Misses the read – out goes TR 4. See? That's out the window. Bang, gone. Why?

Well, the pc has an answer which the meter hasn't acknowledged. According – as far as he can see – and remember, he's looking at the back of the meter. And as far as he can see the meter has not acknowledged it. He then can start to get mad at the meter. But usually he isn't sufficiently clear thinking or directive enough to get mad at the meter. He doesn't quite know what he's getting mad at. And so he usually assigns the cause of his upset to something else. This assignment to something else all the time is, of course, why what a meter does in a session, if misread, has been obscured for so long.

Of course, the meter did a perfectly good TR 4, but the auditor interpretation or failure to read the meter does a bad TR 4 and you get the same thing as though the pc had originated and the auditor didn't get it. So, therefore, you've hung the pc with a missed withhold.

Similarly, the pc sits there. "Do you have a present time problem?" the auditor says. "Do you have a present time problem? Do you have a present time problem? Do you have a present time problem?"

Finally the pc says, "No, that's it. Uh, that's it."

And the auditor looks at the meter and he says, "I'll check that on the meter," and says, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And, honest, it's falling at an even rate, you know, that is – no disturbance of any kind whatsoever. And it just keeps on falling at this even rate. There is absolutely no change to the needle whatsoever. And the auditor says, "What's that? What's that? What was the problem? What is the problem?"

And the pc says, "Well, there isn't any problem."

And the auditor says, "I've got a read here." See?

Pc says, "What could it be?" And then he says, "Well, I haven't got a problem!"

And by this time the needle is reading an ARC break characteristic. So he just says, "Do you have a present time problem?" Bang! the meter goes. You see? Every time. Bang! You see? "Do you have a present time problem?" Bang! "Do you have a present time problem?" Bang! See, he cleaned a clean and the only way he's going to get this off now is to ask if he's missed a withhold – the random rudiment.

Sometimes the pc doesn't interpret it just like that. If you were to say, "Has my asking this question upset you?" and he answers it and says, "Yes. Yes, it sure has," the read would then come off, and it'd be clean again, you see?

Now, what's this all about? What's this all about? Basically only one thing is occurring. And it's an old law which has been pretty well obscured, however, through the years and has not come up much with importance. The importance has never really been assigned to this. It's been cruising around inside of Scientology technology for ages and ages and ages. And that is, you mustn't acknowledge a lie.

Actually, you get yourself in trouble every time you acknowledge a lie. You accept a lie as the truth; that makes you a fool.

Guy rushes up to you and he says, "The whole of central downtown has just burned down, and it's all up in smoke, and 1,655,000 people have been killed!"

And you say, "Oh, good heavens! Good heavens. Good heavens. How terrible! How awful!" or faint away or something like that, not stopping to realize that there aren't 1,655,000 people in the town – or in the whole state for that matter.

And he says, "Ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho! Good joke! Good joke! You're a fool. Ha-ha!"

Now, what's this all about? Very simple. Prime postulate. Let's start learning to interpret things from Routine 3GA – that makes your Clears. And there's not much question about that. In fact, there's no question about it.

The only time we've seen them held up is when the exact original specifications of Routine 3GA were not rigorously, slavishly and fantastically closely followed.

For some reason or other when I sat down to write the four lines out for Routine 3GA, I scribbled them out as the potential, and I thought this will probably have to be varied for pc after pc. And you know, the only pcs that have gone Clear are those who have exactly been run on those exact lines – the first four I wrote. You get any variation on it: your needle will stick, tone arm goes up, everything goes to hell. That's sort of an oddity. It's an oddity. In the first place, the goal was probably originally framed in Amharic or Lingua Spacia or something like that, you know? And to hit the semantics of it right dead on the button and have that the only one that leads to a free needle is quite remarkable.

I'll give you the datum, although this isn't – not a lecture about it.

It's "Want – who or what would want (exact statement of goal)?" "Who or what would – ." (These are not in sequence.) "Who or what would not want (exact statement of goal)?" "Who or what would oppose" – what is it, the participial form? – "(the i-n-g form of the goal)?" and "Who or what would not oppose (the i-n-g form of the goal)?"

And it just has to be that. It isn't anything else. You can't say "the goal" so-and-so: "Who or what would want to 'the goal' (something or other, something or other)?" That's the way it's working out. I mean, it's fantastic!

And this makes it look very silly. What – let's get the goal "not to eat pie." "Who or what would not want not to eat pie?" is the wording of the line. There is no other wording. "Who or what would not want not to eat pie?" makes sense to the pc beautifully. And "Who or what would oppose not eating pie?" See? Them's the words! Them's the magic words.

And let's take this silly shift of pronouns. "To kill myself," let's say, is the goal, see? "Who or what would want to kill myself?"

Auditor sits there and reads to the pc, "All right. Any more items here? Who or what would want to kill myself?" It's fantastic. I mean, you can't say "to kill yourself." You can't change the goal that much.

So you can apparently horse it around all you want to, to agree with the English professors, and miss clearing. That's apparently the magic code on this sort of thing

And it's doubly upsetting because you miss all the right items. And they become missed withholds then. So the tone arm goes up and sticks, and everything goes up and messes up and so forth. And the session is hell to run; and can't hold the pc in-session. You drive home in your Mercedes and feel like going off the curve.

But it's just nothing – nothing but the slavish following in of those lines. Well, I expect someday there'll be an – we'll find exception to it.

It isn't true just because I sat down and wrote those four lines as the first lines – has nothing to do with it. But nothing else has ever brought a free needle. We're up to about nine now. And they all go free on those wordings, and on any other wording they don't go free.

All right. I just interject that.

3GA is a demonstration of the similarity of construction between a reactive bank and a universe. And you've got the common denominator of the construction of something. The universe is formed by a prime postulate, which then alter-ised, makes matter, energy, space and time. Maybe someday you can amuse yourself by speculating what that prime postulate might be. If enough of you hit it, why, the earth will start getting spongy, but don't let that scare you. Go ahead and run it out. If you get that tough and that strong, you could always mock up another one, couldn't you?

Anyway, the pc has a basic purpose or a goal. And this is indistinguishable from prime postulate. See, he has them – he makes them at different stages of the track as he goes along, but he hasn't made too many. And therefore, you get your prime postulate as being the basic building block of a reactive bank. It's the goal, it's the basic purpose and so forth.

So that if you have a section of the reactive bank of the last trillion years, or something like this, or some strata of the reactive bank – actually, it doesn't go exactly plotted against time; it goes kind of differently. It goes fundamentally. How basic is the basic purpose, see? And that's sort of liable the first time to skim off what looks like the basic part of the – the whole time track. In actual fact, the basic purpose has occurred before earlier track, and that's all sort of condensed in and it's become part of this cycle. So your basic purpose isn't something you can plot back on the E-Meter and find and blow. You see? I won't go into any ramifications of that particularly.

But there's this postulate, see?

Now, the prime prime postulate would be the basic-basic of the goal or purpose on which everything else would be stacked. You're not going to get it the first crack out of the box. So don't worry about it. You just take what you can get on a goals list.

Now, the keynote of the formation of mass and spaces and everything else connected with the bank – that is, the reactive bank – the keynote of it is alter-is. And then the alter-is suppresses down into a not-is. Now, you see, the postulate is an is, and then you get an alter-is, and then you get a not-is, then you get the formation of matter, energy, space and time contained in the bank.

Now, that is the most succinct, brief, correct, workable, demonstrable statement of the structure of the reactive bank and man. And also, in the field of the physical sciences, it is the most direct and correct statement of the formation of the universe. It's demonstrable.

In other words, the human mind merges simultaneously with the universe. See, you've got the parallels of their construction and evolution. In other words, the field of the mind is now on a parallel – the field of the mind is now on a parallel – with your scientific sciences. Because, of course, there is the field of the mind and then there is the universe – not as everyone tends to believe: first there is the universe and then some fleas come along and light on it and develop their mental aberrations. It does not go this way. It goes quite the reverse.

You have thetans and they develop reactive banks, and then you get as a result of this the formation of universes – the old, old technical data from way back, one's own universe and the environmental universe and all that sort of thing

Now, that's quite important. That's important data. For any being to actually discover this data or start using it is fantastic. See, because it's totally in violation of mass, it's in violation of energy, it's in violation of space, in violation of time, so on. You're not supposed to do that! Slaves of the world succumb! You know?

You're not supposed to fly in the teeth of this kind of thing. You find out information like that, how would people like the pope and so forth make their coffee and cakes, see? I mean, be pretty grim. Do a lot – a lot of unemployment result, you know? Think of chain manufacturers: bankrupt them. Look at political contracts for the constructions of jails and prisons: up in smoke, no percentage for the politicians. Ruinous! Terribly revolutionary doctrines here, see?

Now, you want to know what starts the downward spiral on this sort of thing and how it gets denser and denser and denser – is the acceptance of an alter-is-ness as the fact! Now, that is actually and basically what a thetan knows, way down deep, that he must not do, and what every thetan that ever got himself in trouble has done. He knows he must not accept an alter-is-ness of the fact as the fact.

He gets nery when he starts to suspect this. And if he accepts too many of them, he goes into an overwhelm. He's overwhelmed by lies. And, therefore, people who buy – oh, I don't know; let's take the worship of the god Muggy-wug, or something like that. He's made out of mud and sticks in the middle of the Venusian jungles or something. And this god Muggy-mug and – if everybody – if everybody protests this god enough and protests the lie enough, and if the priesthood of Muggy-muggy is sufficiently brutal and overwhelmish, and if they can collect to themselves enough overt acts – you see, it's very, very important. They've got to collect motivators, see? Get other people to commit overt acts against the god Muggy-muggy, see? And everybody commits more and more overt acts against Muggy-muggy and after a while, of course, gets totally overwhelmed by the god Muggy-muggy, you see?

And after that you don't get a sane course of evolution from that point of acceptance of the god Muggy-muggy, see? You get zealotism, fanaticism, atheism. Everything that happens from that point tends to be chaotic. See, because they have fought an untruth – see, they've fought an alter-is of the facts. Muggy-muggy did not make the Venusian mud, see? But that's the prime declaration of the religion of Muggy-muggy.

"Oh, Muggy-muggy! Thou, who hast madeth the mudeth!" See?

These birds used to get out in the morning and storm around and wake everybody up long before they were supposed to get wakened. Developed fast days – nobody was supposed to eat, you see? Games conditions, games conditions and so forth. And before you ate dinner, why, you were supposed to go out and heap some mud on your plate in respect to Muggy-muggy, you see?

These things thetans didn't like to do! So, of course, they would get protesting against Muggy-muggy, and then this untruth would overwhelm them.

I use that quite deliberately, because it has been religion which has been – the strongest arguments and the strongest mechanisms which have brought about an alter-is-ness of the mind and form have been religious mechanisms. You might even say it's a religious universe.

And they get protested against most strongly and thetans get overwhelmed by them the most easily, and so on.

This just isn't my bigotry talking one way or the other. I listed it out the other day – it burned holes in the paper! – and then found out that I felt the same way about it afterwards! Very interesting.

The facts here are creation, assignment of. And you notice Muggy-muggy created mud, and some and some – or you've got somebody who is the – like Kali, the goddess of destruction, or something like that. But they have something to do with a cycle of action, the great popular gods, see? And it's all an alter-is. Kali had nothing to do with creating anything and neither did Muggy-muggy.

See, that's the alter-is, is the assignment of who created it. So that, naturally, is the biggest alter-is that you could make, is the alter-is of source.

So therefore, that's what – the most powerful overwhelms succeed the most powerful protests. And, of course, they're in the field of the seventh and eighth dynamic.

And well, it's not for nothing that every year there were a hundred thousand Christians killed in Alexandria during the early days of Christianity. That sounds impossible, see, but yet the rosters and records do contain that fact. In any single year, there were more Christians killed in Alexandria by Christians than there were in all of the Roman purges. It's interesting, see?

They protested harder amongst themselves than they ever really protested against anything else. And that's because they're wrapped up in a lie! See, they're wrapped up in an alter-is-ness of the fact of creation.

And it's hard to talk to you about this, because even as I speak, some people hearing this are still so enthralled in their overwhelm and protest along this particular religious lines on the seventh and eighth dynamic that they say, "Oh, God! Listen to what terrible blasphemy! And that couldn't be true," you know? It starts off all the alter-is on an automaticity in their head.

And they say, "Well, he's just anti-this and anti-that."

I'm not anti anything, except like any other right-minded thetan, I'm kind of anti-alter-is.

This is your most fruitful source, then, of lies and commotion – would be anything that had to do with creation. And you introduce an erroneous assignment of creativeness, or actually, less strongly, any part of the cycle of action; introduce – misassign, see, who created it, say something else created it, and you'll get randomness all out of proportion to everything

Walk into a – here's a – here's a kick for you sometime – go into an art museum and look at Rembrandt and point out to your companions in a loud voice – particularly during an exhibition, a white tie exhibition or something like that – point out to your companions in a very loud voice the wonderful work done by Picasso. And, man, you'll have a riot on your hands. There's other people standing around. They will come over and they will correct you and they will argue with you and they will look at you with terrible contempt. They'll become

very misemotional about the whole thing. The guards and that sort of thing are liable to come up and start trying to eject you or – all kinds of unlikely things will occur, you know?

You look at *The Cavalier*, or something like that, and you say, "Now, that actually is a very excellent example of Picasso's brown period." And go on and hold forth in great dissertation.

Or go over to the Royal Festival Hall or some such area, the music hall, and start talking outside when you hear – oh, there's something by Mussorgsky, you see? And you say, "Now, that's by Stephen Foster." You'll get upset!

Alter-is-ness of the source of creation is the most fruitful source of upset and commotion because, of course, it itself is the father of all chaos. If there's any chaos in the universe, or any lack of order, it will be found by reason of a misassignment of who created it.

We're liable to get so little upset on the subject of founders of countries and that sort of thing: "Well," we say, "George Washington, the founder of his country." See? Well, nobody will much argue with you. You don't get in much of a stink. I bet you could sit around for hours in the States in various popular and public places and say, "George Washington founded," you know, "his country." You could go on and do this and do this and do this, and nobody would ever do anything. They never say anything. It was generally accepted to be a fact and it more or less is a fact, you see? And you're going to get no commotion, that's all.

Well, if you said, "Marco Polo founded the United States of America," people would simply think you were insane. But if you came almost on the truth, see, and said, "Alexander Hamilton founded the United States of America and was its first president," you know, everybody's brains would go kind of creak, creak. You see, it's not – you know? He was at least alive at the same time, so it's a recognizable alteration.

The truth of the matter is that probably anything wrong with the United States right now, it's George Washington. Now, you'll get an argument about that because it's so much accepted to be truthful otherwise, see? The guy tore up the minutes and records of the constitutional convention! They were never published. He made sure they were burned. Nobody has been able to interpret the cockeyed Constitution since. And they keep changing it and changing it, you know, and trying to amend it and wondering what people meant by it, and so forth. And nobody can find out because they threw it all away, see? That's a fact, do you know? There were no – you know there were no minutes of the constitutional convention ever published! And I don't think it was until way into the nineteenth century, sometime or another, that somebody released a book on his demise, which gave something – I think he'd been the secretary of the convention and he gave some of the data.

And you got an operating machine now called a Constitution, which nobody is supervising. And it's starting to alter-is, and itself was an alter-is, and it's kind of going out of hand and nobody can quite make any sense out of it. And the citizens have less and less liberty, but they can't – don't quite know what to do about it. You see?

Back in 1905 somebody changed the Constitution, said the poll tax could not any longer be charged. That's what it used to say. Well, they wiped that out, so now they can charge income tax. Everybody is fined for making a living. And all kinds of wild things pro-

ceed, you see, from this point. Well, of course, there were no records to say why they had this. You know? There were no – none of the arguments as to why this existed or was put in by the constitutional convention, you see, no arguments were available to anybody to refute this proposed amendment to the Constitution about 1905. See, here's missing data of some kind or another.

And here's George! Well, what did George stand for? What did he mean? What did he want? Everybody was perfectly happy at the time of the revolution, they were perfectly interested in him. They thought he was a nice guy, everything was fine, everybody believed him. The only reason the revolution got anyplace at all was because of George – a terrific figure of a man. And this guy had the country in his grip. Actually, he had to protest many times against becoming king of the United States, see? Everybody wanted to make him king! He said, "No. No. No."

We don't know what his basic purpose was, see? We don't know what the basic purpose agreed upon by all the founders of the United States was. We read the propaganda which issues from their writings.

To give you some kind of an idea, the United – this is not quite political – but the United States Naval Academy issues the letters of John Paul Jones. And this is the most flagrant example I know of. Their booklet on the letters of John Paul Jones is what they want every midshipman to become! And, frankly, they make a bunch of clowns out of them, because they've excerpted all these letters. The true letters of John Paul Jones, without anything cut out of them, show you a very lively sort of a bird who was all over the ship all the time and believed in all kinds of things and was very enterprising and fantastically energetic, and who had many opinions, and who believed naval officers should have opinions and all kinds of things, you see, that have now been carefully cut out of the letters before they're published for the budding, young naval officer.

In return, we get the stark patriotic statement, you see? We don't get that you ought to teach midshipmen to dance. See? That's all missing.

There's an alteration here. See, there's an alteration to the goal or the basics or the fundamental. Now, he was the founder of the American navy. I won't say anything particularly against the American navy, there's no reason to. It exists.

But if I see one more ensign become admiral, fattened on the letters of John Paul Jones excerpted, I'm afraid I'll be impolite to him. I have been known to have been impolite to him already because he isn't true! See? He isn't real! There's something missing.

No reason to analyze what's missing, but basically the fundamentals of his education have been alter-ised. The things which he ought to know and understand aren't there!

And that alone would break him down into a sort of an apathy. He would sort of smell the missingness in there, see? He would see there's something he didn't quite understand or wrap his wits around. And therefore he would never really spring full-armed into a sailor of war, you see? There'd be something restraining his going-forthness. He'd tend to solidify right in his tracks. You could expect him, then, to be rather defensive, rather unimaginative, perhaps a little frightened and very, very careful of what he did.

Where's the bold sea dog that you normally think of as a ruler of a navy, you see? Well, he's not to be found. He's got a fantastic alter-is on his educational line.

Everybody thinks, well, you should teach these boys to do this and to do that, and you should teach them some more of this and you should teach them some more of that and some more of this, and alter-is it and alter-is it and alter-is it. And when we get all through, we'll have it all alter-ised, and it'll all be wonderful. You'll find it'll just get more solid, more apathetic, and more quit.

Basic purpose alter-ised creates mass. But similarly, it creates a degeneration of tone – inevitably creates a degeneration of tone.

Now, some of you think, once in a while, that I have alter-ised in Scientology and Dianetics far too much. Well, if you think that hard, you don't recognize that we're running independent of the sequence of time. We're running a backwards track. In other words, we're cutting into the most fundamental fundamental that we can cut into regardless of the continuous forward progress of time, you see? And we're swimming against the time stream, in actual fact.

All right, we suddenly come up with this, and on isolation of importances, discover that we're back in 51, 52, you see? Basic purpose, you know? Basic postulate. What's the prime postulate of the universe? Book One, Book One – actually December 1949, not even 50, is basic purpose in Book One, see?

Isolation of important materials and shedding off the unimportant materials and occasionally going down cul-de-sacs, occasionally getting into blind turns, you know, and say, "What are we doing here?"

A wonderful example is 3D Criss Cross. I had received a cheerful despatch saying, "After we've trained all of our students here to do 3D Criss Cross, is it all right for them...?" Boy, they had an air letter going out of here so fast, its edges were charring. "Don't do 3D Criss Cross, man!"

Why? Well, it actually came just before I found out about prime postulate, you see? So you do a 3D Criss Cross line or anything like a Prehav line – see, that's the ridge that I ran into just before I found prime postulate, see? I thought you could go on and list. Enough interesting things happened about listing to demonstrate that listing was quite a process. But it also demonstrated that it makes a hell of a lot of difference what you list, and you mustn't list anything at random and you must never list a wrong goal, because it just adds more alter-is to the bank. So 3D Criss Cross was actually alter-ising the pc's goal unless, oh, God, a million to one chance that you would have his line – you should have his goal in one of the lines. Ten million to one.

All right. So, we've been in little cul-de-sacs and that sort of thing. But note I pull out of them in an awful hurry and cut to a more fundamental fundamental.

And you're in the happy state right now of being on a plateau of this particular character that is just the data of late spring and early summer 1962, see? And it makes a package all by itself, and you'll get this special checksheet that contains the bulk of it. And I've just issued a policy letter for staff training around in Central Organizations which, with a few more items

added, is just the last few weeks of development is all that contains. And that's their staff training checksheet and nothing else, see?

And you, unfortunately, picking up a GAE, possibly think to yourself that you are being victimized by being put on this special checksheet. And it probably hasn't been pointed out to you that you all have to pass this checksheet anyhow. And naturally if you get a GAE, there's time for you to study on the checksheet. So you're not really being assigned the checksheet because you got a GAE. You've all been assigned the checksheet whether you're going on auditing or not.

That's modernization, but it's a plateau. You've hit it suddenly, and I haven't put up very many electric light bulbs and that sort of thing around, or fired off many rockets. But I'm at a point where, what am I going to write for bulletins, see? Interesting state for me to be in!

So I'm refining bulletins and reissuing the bulletins. And today did you a policy letter, 17 July, on the exact Prepcheck for listing goals or lines. Exact Prepcheck with – a nice Prepcheck. It's all for – it's all the slotted lines. And you put the pc's name at the top of it, and then you just run the Prepcheck down. You make out a form every time you do a Prepcheck, see, just line after line, slot after slot. And get each one of those nulled and turn it over and get the rest of those things nulled, and you've done a Listing Prepcheck.

And yesterday did your Goals Prepcheck – how do you check out a goal? It just does it on this form, and so forth. Oh, I suppose we'll go along a little while and find out that there's some other button we ought to add to the thing and reissue the Prepcheck. That's about where you stand, now, because you stand at the pinnacle of success. See? It is happening.

And I'm not making any allowance at this particular time, of whether you find it easy to learn how to do this or not. I'm making no allowance for this, whatsoever. I'm just saying, "Well, you can learn it!" I'm not just throwing it off, but because I don't know any other road around it! See? I know no way to proof the technology up so that you will never longer have to run an E-Meter. See, I don't know how to do this.

I'll tell you how far away we are on research. I am actually researching some sort of a technology that if you kicked off from Earth, or it billiardballed under atomic fission, or something like that, you wouldn't have to make an E-Meter in order to clear somebody, see? That's the echelon of research I have just entered into. And then improvement research, improving the thing, or this very high-flown "What the hell do you do about that?" Oh, I don't know. I might crack it and I might not.

All Scientologists have a slight anxiety of, "What if I kick the bucket? How much of the information would I pack along with me," see? They all have this. So, what I'm really trying to do is make out the information package you take along with you. [laughter]

But there's about where we stand. Now, as far as alter-is is concerned, we've done this incredible thing of while going forward on the time track we've run the fundamentals back. All right, now we're at a fundamental that runs out everything we've put on the time track. You see, anything developed in Scientology or in Dianetics is now run-outable by the exact technology which you have. It runs itself out rather easily. It can be put together, in other words. All right, so much for that.

Unless you follow some such operating pattern as this, you then can't backtrack this terribly complicated thing called structure – matter, energy, space, time, whether a reactive mind or a universe – you can't backtrack this terrific complexity to a sufficient simplicity to be able to do something about it, you see? Well, that's what we've done. We've brought it back now and we find out – great surprise, surprised me, too, you see? What's wrong with it? The pc's goal. That isn't what's right with the pc, that's what's wrong with him, see?

George Washington is not what is right with the United States, it's what is wrong with the United States! See?

That's pretty weird. It's a complete whizzer. We've had a whizzer run on us, you see?

This guy goes on being loyal, being loyal, being loyal, being loyal. And he goes on being a lot of other things. And he doesn't know what he's doing wrong; he's doing something wrong. And he's caving in and falling on his head and unable to do his job and betraying everybody. And eventually we sort out his goal and we find out it's "to be loyal," you see? That was probably the goal of Benedict Arnold.

If the individual is no longer able to adequately do something, it's probably his goal – if he isn't happy about doing this thing, you see? You got a goal "to harpoon whales." Well, you'll always be thinking about harpooning whale and always missing or unable to find a boat or find whales or something. It'll be the one thing that kind of makes you sigh and that you retreat from. See, a lot of things haywire about this.

It's very dangerous to tell you this because it's slightly invalidative of your goal, you see? But nevertheless, I have to tell you; it's the truth of the thing.

Now, let us consider the goal a finite truth. Now, it isn't completely true that the goal is everything that is wrong with the person. What is really wrong is the alter-is-ness of that goal. If the person never alter-ised the goal, he would probably be all right, you see? Now, you can say what's wrong with him is his goal, but it's a little bit too short a statement. No, what's wrong with him is the alter-is of his goal, the alteration of his goal, the departures from his goal line, his inabilities to commit this goal to action. See? That is what gives him his bank.

But you strip the goal out from underneath all this and the bank disappears and you find out he didn't need the goal in the first place which is all quite interesting.

Well, consider that goal, then, a finite truth. (You probably don't think so, but this is still a lecture on ARC breaks and TR 4.) It's a finite truth. It was truth to this pc; it was actually self-postulated truth. And it never got acknowledged. But all around him lies got acknowledged and this baffled him.

And if you listen to a thetan for a while, you'll find out, really, all he's protesting is the fact that lies get acknowledged but truth doesn't. See, if you listen to him for a while, that's really all he's talking about. Whatever else he's saying or however he's putting it – whether in the Demosthenian oratory and logic, or no matter how colorfully or how dully or how whin-ishly or how meanly or how grandly he is putting it – that's what he is saying! He is saying truth never gets acknowledged and lies always get acknowledged.

Some woman comes in and she says, "And I lost my husband. And there I was, a good homebody, and I was sitting there doing everything I was supposed to do, you see, and so forth. And he left me for this little flirt that would never cook and would never do anything, you see?" And you'll hear her going on and on along this particular line in some shade of gray of this argument. She, the wife, you see, was not acknowledged – and she was a true wife – but this flibbertigibbet that he ran off with, you see, well, he bestowed his whole fortune on her, and she was nothing but a cockeyed lie. See?

And you just look over these various things and you can generally trace through an argument these threads: the protest of the acknowledgment of lies and the failure to acknowledge truth. And that is the basis of a thetan's misemotion. These are the principles – above his goal, in back of his goal, and around – on which all thetans operate. There are no exceptions to this. They all operate on these same buttons. You press A chord major and you get A chord major.

And therefore, when you say to a thetan in a session, "I am not acknowledging or taking up the truth," he gets upset! And that's cleaning a clean read. And when you say to a thetan that he's got something he hasn't got, he gets upset – or, that when he hasn't got something he's got, he gets upset – because you're doing an alter-is of the facts.

He's got a present time problem, you read the meter and tell him he doesn't have one. He's upset! It's a violation of the true state of affairs. See, you're acknowledging a lie, here, and not hitting the true state of affairs. So the thetan doesn't have a present time problem and you tell him he's got one. Once more, you're acknowledging a lie and failing to acknowledge a truth. And he gets upset! And there's nothing makes a thetan get more upset than that. It's alter-is-ness. And there you get into all kinds of wild messes with a thetan.

Now, do you see how prime postulate has a connection here and how it is definitely and intimately involved with reading the wrong meter read. See? You just hit right to the middle of his "thetanesque" soul with a dagger of betrayal. See?

He's got a present time problem, you tell him he hasn't got one. You didn't acknowledge him, did you? All right. He hasn't got a present time problem, you tell him he's got one. Everything goes to hell from there on. He gets very upset because, "thetanesquely," he now wants to convince you of the truth of the situation. He's trying to impress you with the truth of the situation from that time. He then becomes the living crusader of Truth – capital T; sword in one hand, torch in the other, you know?

You haven't got a pc from this point on. You have a crusader for Truths. And how do you get into that state? Well, it's very simple – you just miss a meter read. You clean a clean or wrong-call a reaction. You get a reaction and say there's no reaction; you get a clean and say there's a reaction. All you got to do is twist these two points and you no longer have a pc. You've thrown him right into his most turbulent areas of action. He is now demanding that you do not acknowledge untruths. He is now crusading on the basis that "we mustn't have more alter-is than we already got because it's put us in the position we are in."

You've stepped all over his Scientological corns, if he's an auditor, perhaps, but you don't have to have a trained Scientologist to have this mechanism. You go out and you get yourself some raw meat, and the fellow sits down and says, "I've got ulcers."

All right. Let's say, for fun, that he hasn't got ulcers. Let's say, for fun, what really is the trouble with him is every day he drinks unfermented – insufficiently fermented wine and it upsets his stomach and gives him indigestion, see? And he knows this. He doesn't even have to know it up on the surface of his mind, you see? He's got it all set. And he sits down and he says, "I've got ulcers."

And you say, "All right. Good. Fine. Thank you very much. You got ulcers. All right. Hm-hm. Well, very good. Now, the best thing for us to do for you is to give you some Pepto-Bismol or barium meal and so forth, and we'll treat these ulcers. And if they don't get better, we'll operate on them."

He'll be mad as hell at you! And you won't quite be able to figure out – "Hey! What's going on here?" See?

Guy comes in, he has one ten-thousandth of an inch of tissue left before perforation, see, of the ulcer. See, he's just on the verge, you know – he can still walk around – and he's got ulcers to all intents and purposes, man. And he comes down and he sits down and he says, "I haven't got ulcers."

And you say, "I agree with you perfectly. You haven't got ulcers."

And, boy, he will be mad at you!

That's why you mustn't treat illnesses: because they're all lies.

Guy comes in, says, "I have a sore throat. I have a sore throat. I have a sore throat." You run something on him and the ridge moves. Yes, his throat is sore. That is a statement of truth.

But he says, "I have a cold." If he means by that, he is being attacked by virus or germs or something of the sort, and this is not the case, you can get yourself all involved in an ARC breaky situation by making him gargle.

Very interesting. No wonder the medical profession has to have law to support them! Do you see? This is under the heading of acknowledging the lie and ignoring the truth.

A guy comes in and says he hasn't got ulcers, you say, "I'll audit you." Fine. Make sure you do so if you say so.

He comes in and he says, "I haven't got ulcers. Actually, it is just some pains that I get from drinking too much ketchup."

And you say, "Good. I will audit you."

You enter into the field of what is laughingly called diagnosis, you're in trouble. But oddly enough, as close as you can diagnose is guessing what he has done, and running it out as an overt.

And, of course, it mustn't be forced on him that he has done it if he hasn't, because now you're really in trouble. You dream up a Zero question, "How about blowing up railway depots?" (he's never been near one in his life) and then insist that he find the overt. Oh, man, that session is going to go round and round and round. You're going to be in trouble all the way.

All right. Now, during the war he was a light-bomber-force bombardier and he was a specialist in blowing up railroad stations. In fact, he'd go out practically every night and blow up another railroad station, see? And you say, "Have you ever blown up a railroad station? That's null. We will go on to the next question."

Well, everything kind of goes whirry and wheely in his skull. The cogs start to mismatch. And boy, he gets mad, he gets upset, he gets misemotional, because of the same mechanism. He has blown up railroads. It isn't that you've failed to discover something about him. It's just that it isn't true, see?

You've said, "All right, you haven't blown up railroad stations," when he has. Or you've said, "All right, you've blown up railroad stations," when he hasn't. Either way, you're acknowledging a lie and failing to acknowledge the truth. And you're on the direct line of a thetan's favorite protest through the ages.

And this – out of this you get an ARC break. And that's what an ARC break is. It is an abandonment of truth and an acceptance of lies. And after that you got trouble.

So when you misread a meter, you've hung the pc with one or the other.

That's why you got to be able to read a meter every time and never miss. Because every time you miss you've entered into the session the thetan's favorite boogeyman: the acknowledgment of lies and the ignoring of truth. And you have just entered this into the session and after that he blows his stack and ... He doesn't really know why his eyeballs keep going out a foot in his face and snapping back into the sockets, you see? But he knows he's upset, and it's the most fundamental upset there can be since out of that upset comes the whole construction and, reversely, the whole destruction, not only of universes but of his own reactive bank. And you've hit right on the primary principle of construction of the reactive bank and of the universe. And you've hit right on why it is that way. And he doesn't like it being that way. And you have made the session agree with all of the slave tricks that have ever been pulled on him.

So therefore he has to protest against you. And up to that moment you were his friend that was going to get him out of all this. And now you've pulled the trick that got him into all this. You see, you've acknowledged the untruth and you have failed to acknowledge the truth. And that was the trick that got him into all this in the first place. So he doesn't want to be in there again, so he tries to get out of that session. Sometimes very loudly.

So that's why meter reading has to be 100 percent. And that's why there is no substitute for good meter reading. And that's why, in procedure, you can occasionally flub, misread a question, do something like that – your TR 0 will go out, or something like that – you don't upset the session to any great degree at all. But, brother, you just miss that one read – it reacted, and you said it was clean. You have taken a bayonet and slashed clear back to the beginning of time with this pc and restimulated every protest he's had – every protest he's had for two hundred trillion years. So you're getting violence, of course.

You can learn how to read a meter perfectly. Don't worry about it. It is doable.

All I wanted to show you is the mechanism of what happens when you misread a meter and how that compares with 3GA and how your session and sessioning, now, is totally

lined up with the actual principle of the mind. You are doing now what the mind is doing. You've got it exactly paralleled. And so therefore you can spot any error that you commit and the error is merely in that field.

But the pc protest now is the most fundamental protest that a thetan can make in a session, because you are doing exactly in a session the parallel of what the mind has been doing, and therefore you are at extreme truth. This whole session, you're running extreme truth. And that pc can feel it. He knows you're running extreme truth. And then, carelessly, you introduce the needle that didn't react and you say it did; you introduce the needle that reacted and you said it didn't. And into that extreme truth you introduce this untruth, and after that you've got hell to pay.

That's why pcs ARC break, and that's the direction that you have to take to repair sessions – you have to repair these introductions of untruth. Okay?

Thank you.

ANATOMY OF ARC BREAKS

A lecture given on
17 July 1962

Thank you.

All right. This is lecture two, July 17 AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and this – easiest thing to do is to give you a lecture, but I might give you a question period. Which do you want?

Audience: Lecture.

You want a lecture?

Audience: Yes.

All right. I'll go on and give you a lecture on the subject of ARC breaks and their anatomy. The training of metering is probably the hardest hump to cross in the absence of proper educational aids. During World War II an enormous number of visual aids were developed and the whole principle of visual aids sort of moved into view.

And at one time or another in Scientology, we've had visual aids of one kind or another, but the biggest need at the present moment is a visual aid which parades out meter reads. And we're lucky here at Saint Hill having a TV closed circuit television. And this assists to a remarkable degree and of course, tomorrow night three luckless students whose names are not yet known will benefit us with some sessions.

I wouldn't guarantee that they – that we won't get a repeat of one or two of last, you know. I saw they were – I just looked over and saw they were feeling comfortable.

Now, because one television camera is posed on the meter which the auditor is using and another one on the session and because you have a picture of the thing going on, you have it pretty well taped. You can sit there and you can watch it and so forth.

But of course, that's for a limited period of time. And although – to give you very sharp examples of how auditing is done, this is invaluable.

We nevertheless need an extension of that particular type of training. We're working right now on stereo equipment whereby one side of the tape is used to duplicate a meter read and the other side of the tape gives you the vocal. And then you hook the meter, you see, onto the meter-read-stereo line and then you hook a speaker onto the verbal side and, of course, you get coordinated meter reading. Estimate was given me the last night that we'll probably have this in a couple of weeks, which is very, very rapid.

This device of course, is exportable. By using the same stereo tape recorder and by copying the tapes on stereo recorders, we can actually put these tapes all over the world. In other words, we can put proper sessioning all over the world. Our sessioning now is very standardized in that it's a very smooth workout of repetitive commands and that sort of thing. And no great changes are expected in that, so the tapes will be valuable.

But the idea is that you'd have a number of auditors sitting there each one – this is the *ne plus ultra*. I'll expand the idea a little bit for you.

Of course, you could have one stereo tape recorder and one meter and one auditor being trained. But last night we were going into it a little bit further here, the auditor could push a button and get some help and the guy who was monitoring all the co-audit sessions could throw a switch and read the meter on the session that was going forward and so forth.

But a similar circuit to this probably will eventually be worked out whereby several meters can be plugged into a switchboard and will all read and where you either have a microphone to each of these auditors sitting there holding one of these meters or you just have a central microphone in the room, whatever is simplest.

And this thing of course, makes all the meters read, so you're not butchering up some pc. The problem is you got some pc who is sitting there and you're asking him questions; you're not clearing it up and all that sort of thing and the pc knows it's sort of a test and so on.

Nevertheless, a little bit of strain goes on the thing and I imagine before now you've probably had to clean up some of these practice sessions when you're actually in the auditing section. I imagine you've picked a few of those things up.

And that's rather hard. Particularly since TR 1 tends to be very poor at that particular stage because the auditor really doesn't want to know the answer. He's asking the guinea pig pc, you see, who is not a pc at all, various questions in order to get a meter read, not to get the answer from the pc. So this, of course, throws TR 1 and its basic fundamental completely out. It's – TR 1 is the desire to get a response from the pc. And you want a meter response from the pc, but you really don't want to know. You get the idea? So this really crosses up the wires on the poor pc.

Nevertheless, I imagine this system of instruction will continue on to the end of time. Here and there you will still have nothing but that system of instruction, you see.

You're going to teach fifteen auditors who are in lower south Pasadena and you're going to train these guys up to a point where they can read a meter. And you haven't got any stereo and you have no tapes and you have no switchboard and that sort of thing, so how are you going to do it? Well, you're going to do it by butchering up pcs, see. It's more important that you learn than it is that some pcs get somewhat upset, because you can always straighten it out if the sessioning is good. But if an auditor, you see, doesn't ever learn how to do it, you'll never straighten out anything!

So what takes priority? What takes priority is the auditor learning how to read a meter. And if you ever get too softheaded and you find yourself completely without equipment and too softhearted, you see, about the whole thing and decide this is too hard to do and decide to fake it up by lifting fingers on cans and doing other things of this particular character, my

advice to you is, don't, because the very pc who is sitting there serving as a guinea pig depends utterly, in nearly all cases, on auditors in his vicinity learning how to read a meter for his own solution of case and his eventual clearing. See. So it's sort of give a little, take a little and get a little back. And get an awful lot back, you see.

But, I'll give you that as meter training. That is the most fundamental action then of meter training – is for this exact combination to exist. The auditor sitting there holding a meter. The (quote) "pc" sitting there holding the cans. The coach standing there back of the auditor correcting the auditor on the reads. The auditor asking questions – we don't care what he is using. It is perfectly all right to use somebody else's goals list. Don't read the pc's own goals list to him, by the way. That's *verboten*. You can always take somebody else's goals list. You'll get reads on it. They won't rerun out either. Very virtue – they don't flatten.

I actually would – you'd need practice in asking rudiments questions or something like that. Well, that's a horse of another hue. You probably should use the right rudiments questions because they'll be the most likely to get cleaned up in the long run.

But the person who's doing the auditing is asking a question and getting a meter read and then calling it and getting an answer or not from the coach. In fact, he probably better not get an answer from the coach. It better be understood that nothing is to be answered. That makes it all missed withholds, but then it's understood and the reality of the situation is far better.

And then you've got this coach standing back of the auditor looking at the meter and correcting whether or not the auditor read them right.

All right. Let me show you the – at *once* the basic difficulty is we have no guarantee that the coach knows how to read an E-Meter. No guarantee whatsoever. So we just enter this fantastic piece of randomness that, for the purposes of the drill, the coach is right. That's fantastic randomness to enter into the situation, see.

The immediate result of this is going to be in the initial stages of the drill, a fantastic confusion. And it'll get so confused that out of desperation everybody sooner or later is going to learn how to read the meter. [laughter]

Now, as I say, that is the most fundamental and the crudest form of meter training. And yet I dare say in the year 2000 or 2050, why, there'll be somebody in upper Lower Slobovia having to train some auditors and that is exactly the way he will do it. It's inevitable because he hasn't got the rest of the equipment, don't you see.

Now, out of this, believe it or not, comes learning. You eventually learn it, but the confusion that results – you see the needle fall off the pin, and the coach says – you say, "That reads." And the coach says, "That's null."

The coach is forcing you to agree to a falsehood. So don't agree to it. Just let him say so. Nobody asked you to agree to it. He simply called it. Isn't that right?

I used to get by in being audited – I could be audited by everybody or anybody for the simple reason that I'd always answer the auditing question. I only came a cropper when I was given four auditing questions and not told which one to answer. That fouled me up a little bit,

but up to that time the stable datum I got by on, is somebody asked me to do something I did exactly what they asked me to do. You would be surprised how mild an approach that is to pc'ing. Just always do exactly what you're told and you don't get into any trouble, of course, because there's no alter-is in the situation.

The auditor says, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And you say, "Yes."

The auditor sits there alertly waiting for you to say something else. And of course, you don't say anything else because he hasn't asked you anything else.

And finally the auditor says, "Well, what was the problem?" And you tell him, see.

The auditor says, "Take your right hand now and put it on the back of your right hand." Go ahead and try to do it. The auditor will wake up after a while that you can't and cancel the auditing command, you see.

You can only get into trouble by saying, "I can't do that. What are you doing tearing me to ribbons, see, by asking me to do things that are impossible? And why don't you go back to the Academy and learn how to audit," see.

And you can get in trouble that way because you're protesting the alter-is. But don't worry about that. As pcs, you'll always protest the same way, so nobody's asking you to be a certain type of pc. I'm just giving you an example of the thing.

So in these drills you will get a certain amount of alter-isness and confusion. And I wouldn't be a bit surprised but what somebody – could get away more or less with reading the meter, wouldn't pass into a stage of not knowing whether the meter was actually on his lap or not, much less what it was reading, you see.

Falls off the pin, the coach says, "That's null." And the thing is absolutely motionless. It hasn't moved for a minute or more. And the question is asked and the coach says, "That's a read," see. Well, you get beyond your confusion by not getting into fights about it.

Now that is very crude – a very crude drill and so on, but as I say, it'll be used for a long time.

Now, as we improve on this drill with a stereo tape and other mechanisms, we of course, can play back play a tape and make maybe four or eight meters, something like that, in people's hands, read. And maybe, so we don't get any room lag, a microphone speaker around the neck of every auditor, so he hears the tape. And he hears the auditor say, "Do you have a present time problem?" Sees the read, you see. Then you have the coach who is working off a mimeographed sheet, because the correctness of every read on that tape has been established. And it's marked by rudiments. The first question, "Do you have a present time problem?" is followed by a reaction and it says what it is on the tape.

Now, these tapes are not perfect meter tapes. That is their main virtue. Some of them are early. Some of them are late. Some of them are on the button. And some of them are called reads when they are actually null. You know. There's a confusion involved with it. You see?

And so it says, "Do you have a present time problem?" and then right under it in a long string, "Right-right-wrong-right-wrong-wrong-right." See, that's all the coach calls. See, there are just that many reads and they are – that many were right and that many were wrong in that sequence and order. So it becomes very simple coaching.

That's just one use of the situation.

Now, your next action would be something like this. We put a whole bunch of auditors, about eight auditors in the room, with meters on pcs and we have them all onto a switchboard and that is – goes to one stereo recorder and in turn we take a section of each one's session.

We got a microphone hanging on the chest of each one and the cans pass from the pc to the switchboard back to the auditor's meter. And then they bypass off that onto the Instructor's meter, amplified and onto a stereo recorder. So at the end of the goldfish-bowling, all he has to do is start the tape again.

Have some people coach this or inspect it or look it over. They will see how many reads they are missing. They'll see – they'll see everybody's auditing. They won't see all of their own auditing, but they'll see some of their auditing, don't you see. Take some of each session that was going on in the room and then play it back to all auditors.

See how many types of arrangements that can be made on this. Well, you could make an endless number of tapes in that particular line, so that's what we're – particularly what we're trying to develop.

Now, the difficulties of teaching an auditor to read a meter are enormously rewarded by the fact that you have productive sessions. And I assure you that there is no benefit in being audited by an auditor who cannot read a meter. That's pretty ghastly because it leaves one out of session. One's statements are not being accepted. One's reads are not being accepted, see. One's no reads are not being accepted. And the net result is the pc is sitting there trying to keep his own rudiments in because, of course, the meter and the auditor have cancelled themselves out by incorrect reads here and there.

We can't have an *occasional* correct read, see. Actually, we can't even afford an *occasional* error. Well, a lot of sessions running along, early on in student auditing have an occasional correct read. And then they graduate up to only an occasional error. And then they would graduate on up to no errors. Actually, that *tolerance* can be attained. I don't have ARC breaky pcs. My pcs don't ARC break. Once in a blue moon I've chopped one or gotten mad at one, snarled, something like that along the line – even as thou. And of course, have gotten an ARC breaky pc. But then turned right around and pulled them right straight out of it so they were all smiles.

But my expectancy of auditing is a no-ARC-break session. In fact I would be quite amazed to have an ARC breaky session. It would startle me no end. And that's with very rough pcs, you see, easy ones, rough ones and so forth. I have no expectancy of an ARC breaky session.

I expect to get everything that the pc tells me. I expect to find out everything I'm supposed to find out about the pc. That's the expectancy. Now, I'm not talking about what a good auditor I am. I'm just talking to you about what my personal experience in sessions is.

So you are fighting with a problem I don't have. So give me that, because it's taken me a long time to understand what you were doing, see. Any trouble you were having was relatively incomprehensible. I have – haven't got a reality on it as an auditor, but I do have a reality on it as a pc. And of course, as a pc I never knew what was going wrong on the other side of the meter because I wasn't reading the meter while I was being a pc, so that datum was barred to me, too.

I would occasionally think that I was kind of in rough emotional condition or I must be tired or I must have too many present time problems or something like this. The pc actually never assigns the right reason for his ARC break. That you can count on. The reason for the ARC break is almost never accurate. Even if it's on the same subject like, "You missed a withhold on me" the pc will give you the wrong missed withhold, see.

The ordinary action is and what you can ordinarily expect, is that the *pc* is upset and that there is some truth in what the pc is *saying*, but that what the pc is calling the actual *cause* is *not* the actual cause, that the actual cause occurred *earlier* than the pc is telling you. That is routine. You could expect that just as much as you can expect darkness when the sun goes down.

Even if he told you exactly what was wrong in the session, that you had missed a read, it will not be the read that he says you missed. It will be an earlier read whether by five minutes or ten minutes or something like that.

If he – if he calls you on the third rudiment which is now the "PTP," see – if he calls you on that one, there's probably one in the first rudiment, you see.

He says you missed the read on the PTP. You probably didn't miss the read on the PTP – you probably did, but the one that is upsetting him is the one on the auditor. See, you missed an earlier one than he says. That is invariable. There will always be that much *alter-is* in a pc's protest. It's always earlier than he says.

But because the pc is in a state of *alter-is* anyhow – you touch a pc's bank, he's in a state of *alter-is*. You can count on that. Absolutely count on it. Touch a pc's bank, he's in a state of *alter-is*. That's one of these other – another invariable *maxim* or *figure* lines.

You run – you run ARC Straightwire and the worst pc will never answer the auditing command at *all*. Will say he did, but he doesn't. Therefore, you must never run a, "Yes" response-type process without also asking, "What was it?" Otherwise, you never spot this *alter-is*. I'm now talking about the – well, this was given in the 3rd ACC. *Alter-is*. Pc *always* does something *else*. Or does something entirely different. You say, "Recall a time you were in communication with someone." And the pc will actually sometimes think that he has done this when in actual fact he has recalled a time he was speaking not to anyone at all.

Now, that is a very *innocent* pc error, see. That's a very mild one. In the pcs that are the worst that you will have to do with – your very neurotic institutional type – you know, I mean in that band, they never even answer it as a *communication*.

You say, "Recall a time when you were in communication with someone," you see. And they won't even go so alter-is as to recall a time they spat, see.

They will alter-is *completely* over on to something else. They will mock up a dog. Not even that they ever communicated with dogs. These things are totally disconnected and disassociated.

You say to them, "Put your shoe on the window seat" and they will throw their hat out through the area over the door.

And here's the oddity. They think they're doing what you said. To look at them and to listen to them, they think you're doing what they said. But, if *you let them get away* with this you have stepped on this button of acknowledging a lie and will at that moment, by the missed command doingness, set up that alter-is in the session. So you've acknowledged a lie.

Now, Mr. Pc, let's say this is institutional stuff and you say, "Now put your shoe on the mantle" and the pc takes his hat and throws it in through the port over the door. And if you say, "Thank you very much. That's fine," you have ended the session right there because that pc becomes unauditible.

Because the degree that they alter-is monitors the degree that they protest alter-is. These things are a *constant*. They are of the same order of magnitude. If a pc alter-ises, he *screams* like mad if any alter-is occurs. That is if you acknowledge the alter-is. See, he screams as hard as he alter-ises. Got the idea?

So the worse off a pc is, is measured by the degree that the pc alter-ises in his thinking. That is a direct index of bad off. But of course, it's bad off on certain subjects because one person will alter-is on one subject and one will alter-is on another. And it's only those pcs that alter-is on all subjects that are – fall into the neurotic and – oh, pardon me, pardon me, fall into the psychotic band.

But, the worse they do it, the less they can tolerate it. So you mustn't say cheerfully, "Oh, thank you" and "That's fine" when the guy throws his hat out the door. You told him to put his shoe on the window. Now, of course, telling him to do something before you have some control of him, tell him to do some independent action that you aren't exactly monitoring before you have any control of him at all, is just asking for it.

You should be walking into this by gradients. But about the only way to solve that situation is just skip what he did with the hat, take his hand, lay it on his shoe, take his shoe off, move him over to the window and put the – put the shoe via his hand on the window ledge and then say, "Thank you very very much." And do you know, he's liable to scream at how terrible you are and what a bum you are, but auditing will continue.

So you mustn't acknowledge the improperly done auditing command because you are okaying alter-is. And that renders you very suspect. And yet the pc acts as though he wants you to and acts as though the only thing that will please the pc is the same alter-is. This is what he wants you to do. That's why you never do what the pc tells you. It's fatal.

The pc acquires this alter-is. Oh, God. Talk about logic, man. They can back it up with ENIACs and Einsteins. Every reason under the sun why you ought to do exactly what they said just now.

Truth of the matter is just before they started giving you orders they alter-ised something. They flipped a command on you, they didn't do what you said, they – something went wrong in the session. Something went haywire. And then they started giving you orders because they're trying to keep their own session in. You see what happens?

They start giving you orders when they have ceased to accept you as an auditor. It's not actually something that you ought to pay any more than diagnostic attention to.

You say this pc has some missed withholds. What's a missed withhold? Well, it's an unintentional withhold perhaps. The pc tried to tell you something and thought you didn't get it. See, that's the commonest one. The most fundamental, however, is the meter read missed withhold.

Earlier than all of these difficulties existed, you read something wrong. And you told the pc he didn't have a present time problem when he did have. You told the pc that he did have a present time problem when he didn't.

So you get – you've acknowledged something wrong in the session that is one of the deep fundamentals of the session, such as rudiments. You've acknowledged something wrong. You've done something reversewise and after that you can expect alteration, alteration. And alteration will exist up to the point where the pc started to give you orders.

Now, how come the pc's giving you orders? Well, the pc's giving you orders because the pc has ceased to have an auditor.

The gradual breakdown of a session passes through that as its low point on the totem pole. Pc suddenly tells me, "Would you like to – you should really let me go to the bathroom and smoke a cigarette and that sort of thing." If I – got to that point – I don't get to this point in session, but if I got to that point in a session – I would not say, "How am I going to acknowledge or handle this situation?" see. I wouldn't waste any time on that. I would say, "*What* was wrongly or not acknowledged, when, earlier in the session?" That'd be my first mechanism, see. Just bang. What is it? See, back there.

It would be something like this: "When did you first feel I didn't hear you?" With enough confidence in my meter to know that I didn't miss a meter read, I'd fall back on the other. I'd have to think that the pc said apples or peaches and then thought I didn't get this, see.

Pc has got an inadvertent withhold, now there's no communication existing. But it would be earlier. I wouldn't take up the idea of the pc giving me orders. I'd trace this thing right back in the session to the first time the pc had gotten an inadvertent or actual withhold or didn't do the auditing command, which of course amounts then to a withhold. See. What – what happened? When? What happened back in the – early in the session? Let's put that area right. Let's not start to cope with the building falling down. Let's not worry about that because we got something wrong earlier.

Now, the reason some people wind up not understanding that a missed withhold is the cause of all ARC breaks is they don't look early *enough* and, therefore, don't *cure* it with a missed withhold.

See, this pc says, "Well, you better let me have a cigarette now and give me a break, because in actual fact I'm pretty tired and so forth."

If your response is to find out what withhold you just missed you probably won't get it, because your pc has gone to that length, time has stretched out after the withhold and it's minutes, tens of minutes, earlier. When you've had a blow, the blow has actually begun an hour to an hour and a half before the blow occurred and it'd be a missed withhold of some kind or another.

And you've tried to acknowledge something that you shouldn't have acknowledged or you've shoved off on the pc something – like you've got a present time problem when he didn't have or something like that. Some fundamental alteration has taken place where you were acknowledging an untruth and ignoring a truth.

And that situation has existed much earlier. And when that situation first started to exist, you got the beginning of the deterioration of the session. And to trace it back, you've got to trace it back earlier in the session. Therefore, a very good way to handle this kind of a situation is to end the session and begin one.

See, that's short sessioning. That, of course, gets you back to your beginning rudiments – is where you probably missed it.

Now, regardless of the complications of what you do about it, let's handle instead the fundamentals of exactly what occurs.

ARC – this is about September 1950, California lectures and I think it's contained in *Notes on the Lectures* and an axiom about 1952 contains the data that ARC is the equivalent of understanding. And the component parts of understanding are A, R and C. I won't bother to go into the dissertation by which this is evolved, but you frankly can mathematically evolve this fact. And it's quite fascinating. Affinity, reality and communication are interdependent upon one another. And the sum of affinity, reality and communication or the absence of affinity, reality and communication add up to understanding or misunderstanding.

Low on the Tone Scale the ARC is, of course, nothing but a misunderstanding, see. You don't have any reality on Russia. Russia doesn't have any reality on you. Of course, you don't understand Russia. Russia doesn't understand you. Of course, there's no communication between you and Russia. See, it's as simple as that. Therefore, everything is misemotional from that point thereon.

Now, when a pc gets going, you're liable to attribute the lack of comprehension in the session to anything except the mechanics. You're not interested in what's comprehensible or not comprehensible or sensible or not sensible. You just got to make sure that you understand what the pc said.

When you fail to understand what the pc said, ARC breaks down, because understanding has broken down. And that is the anatomy of TR 4. TR 4 says that you *comprehend* what

the pc said. You *understand* what the pc said and you *acknowledge* what the pc said and you return the pc to session. And every time I turn around somebody's trying to give me the word that we need a new TR 4. I don't see what they need a new TR 4 for, they haven't used the one they got. Perfectly brand-new. I mean, why use a new one? They – you see that *understand* is the *clue*. That is the *key* to this.

Now, in-sessioning is, of course, interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor, of course, about one's own case. But interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor. So if understanding drops out, willing to talk to the auditor drops out and then interest in own case tends to drop out because one feels one doesn't understand as much about one's own case as one just understood.

Now, the greater the understanding the easier it is to blow things. In other words, you can start – if your understanding on something is high it goes out *zip-zip-zip-zip-zip*. And if your understanding on it is low you stand there and gaze at it stupidly. There it is. What are you going to do about it? Nothing. *Huh, da. See?*

Yet all of a sudden you say, "I know what that's all about." *Zip-zip-zip*. And that's – that's it. You've done an as-is.

So, as-is-ness depends on understandingness.

Alteration inevitably pursues lack of comprehension. Alteration pursues failure to understand. You get an alter-is when you don't get an understand. You see?

And not-is accompanies the notion of incomprehensibility. You can't understand it. It's not possible to understand it. Therefore, let's just shove it out of sight. That's what any non-sentient society or very unalert society does with its insane. Nobody can understand the insane, so you've got to put them out of sight.

And the degree that they don't understand the insane or think they don't understand the insane so they hide them. They squash them out of existence and they actually try to kill them one way or the other. In this civilization today – very modern, very kind, very genteel and so forth – they sterilize them, they cut their brains out, they make idiots out of them, they subject them to tortures the like of which wouldn't have been tolerated from the *barre noir* in the middle of the Dark Ages, you see.

Fantastic. You mean in this enlightened time all this is going on? Well, of course, they've alter-ised – they failed to understand the insane, then they alter-ised it. And now they've got it into place where they've even got psychiatrists in charge of them. You see how far you can get.

And this is total alter-is. And they don't look at what's insane about the person, they give them classified labels. They label them. And the label actually, has nothing to do with the insanity. The label has to do with the insane asylum the person is in.

Oh, you think I'm kidding you as usual. But that happens to be the truth. If a patient is moved from an area that has sex criminals, you know, he ceases to be a sex criminal and becomes a schizophrenic if he goes to a hospital that specializes in schizophrenics. Patients are now classified after the hospital they attend. See how nutty you can get. But, of course, what

is comprehensible about this situation? Well, that people don't comprehend it. Don't you see? That itself is an understanding. All they had to do is say I don't understand it and they come off immediately off the high horse of pretending to understand the alter-is and of course that is the deepest lie of all.

So you get this kind of a situation of pretended understandingness, followed by fantastic cruelty and downscale activities going in that particular cycle. So if you sit there complaining – I'm not putting you in the same category at all – but you will actually in some little vignette run this cycle.

You sit there and you pretend to understand the pc when you don't and you pretend to understand him when you don't and you pretend to understand him when you don't and the next confounded thing you'll be mad at the pc here. And you go out of session spitting your teeth out about this pc – the stupid jerk and yip-yap and snarl – and you're snarling about the pc.

When you find yourself snarling about a pc, all you have to do is recall the first time you didn't understand what the pc was doing.

Now, that is not as successful as treating the mechanics. You see, understanding is in the realm of knowingness and not-knowingness. That's a very very high echelon pair of postulates. That's right after Native State. And we're really in the esoteric wonder world. So those buttons don't operate very smoothly on people. To some degree they operate, but you'll find they occasionally lay an egg, too. They're too esoteric, see. They're *way* off, you see. That's really running the pc over his head. No, but a severed communication line is very comprehensible. That's very comprehensible.

So the missed withhold, the intention to put a communication line through or the intention not to put a communication line through, each one treated in reverse to the way it ought to be treated, is the way the pc understands this. This is where understanding comes in with the pc, see.

He sees that. He sees that and he reacts to that right now. Therefore, we talk about missed withholds, missed withholds. Actually we're talking about understanding and ARC on a very high echelon.

But you can handle the mechanics of the missed withhold – bang, bang. Everybody understands that. Because it's the cure, because it's a sufficiently low-level concept that the pc understands it and you understand and his mind responds to it and everything is dandy and it all works out when we say, "Missed withhold."

Now, what actually could be a missed withhold? We have the communication intended and not received. See, that is truth unacknowledged – recalling you to the first lecture.

Pc intends to communicate and it is never received. We express that as the inadvertent withhold. But that's unacknowledged truth, the very thing he has protested about since the beginning of the universe, see. And it sits on prime postulate and his own goal line and everything else. So he screams like a banshee when you run into this one.

He says, "It's *hot* in here."

And the auditor says, "*Sh-nyaa.*" Or the auditor says nothing.

You will then find the pc saying, "It's *hot* in here."

And if the auditor says nothing, watch the pc start to sweat. The pc will start to manifest it physiologically if he cannot put it across verbally. He's going to make this stick. Thetans are fantastic to this degree. They're always going to make it stick if they possibly can. And you're not now in a session. You've got somebody who's trying to set up a brand-new universe all based on the postulate that it's hot in here. And the session becomes a ball of universe based on this, "It's hot in here" because it's an unacknowledged truth. You got that side of it? See, that's just 50 percent of it.

Now, the other 50 percent is he tells you, "No, I have never had anything to do with women."

And you, you knucklehead, say, "*Good. Fine. Thank you very much. Here is the next (rudiment or question or Zero).*"

Now what have you done?

Understand it in terms of communication. He's put through a whopping big lie. This has no truth in it whatsoever. And you have said, "*Wonderful! Fine! Thank you! Oh, give me some more lies!*"

In either case, your session will blow up. That's how you blow up a session, see.

Now, there you can see it visibly on the communication line. As far as the reality of it is concerned, do you see that the reality also fits in there? The reality of it is the pc thinks it is hot in there. It doesn't even have to be hot for the pc to have a reality that it's hot. This is actually the only thing he's trying to put across – that he thinks it is hot in there. His commentary. You see?

And all you acknowledge is the fact that he thinks it is hot in there and everything is fine. As long as that truth is acknowledged, you don't leave him on a withhold of truth.

Then everything goes along fine because the R stays up. And then, of course, perforce, the A stays up.

Now, he put you through, "I have never had anything to do with women in my whole life." Now, he has actually posed a very low R. It's a lousy lie. He can't think much of you if he thinks he – you know, if he's postulated the A of, "You're a nut" and he doesn't like you. You see that? Because he said already, "I can't trust you with the truth," – not as a consequence to your having missed something else. This would be an entirely independent operation, see.

He says, "Well, I can't trust you with the truth" is what he's saying. He's saying you're not trustworthy. What is your A there? Your affinity's very poor.

So now you say, "*Oh, fine! Thank you! Oh, good! Yeah! Three cheers, you know. Oh, fine!*"

And he says, "Well, if this is the kind of session we're going to have around here, we're going to have A of that character where I don't trust the auditor. We're going to have R

which is a cracking big lie like this and therefore this wasn't a C at all because there was no truth in it to be comprehended."

And the funny part of it is, is you can reverse the whole triangle – flip – by making sure that you didn't buy that lie. Making sure what you bought.

Your Zero Question of, "Have you ever had anything to do with women?"

And your pc says to you, "Ah, no, I've never had anything to do with women in my *whole* life."

And the auditor says, "All right. I'll check that on the meter. Have you ever had anything to do with women? That reads."

And the pc says, "*Ho-oh-ha-ya. Ha-ha-ha-ha.* I did have a little bit to do with women. When I was two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven and twelve, there were incidents. And when I was thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, nineteen and twenty, there were incidents. And then we really got busy."

And you get these all stretched out, why, you've bought nothing from him but the truth, man. The ARC is out of sight.

You *cannot* create an ARC break by establishing *truth*. You can *only* create an ARC break by *refusing* truth and by accepting lies. And of course, the whole thing sums up under the heading of refusing truth. You refuse truth, you have an ARC break. You fail to establish truth as an auditor, you'll have an ARC break. You cease to handle truth, you'll have an ARC break. You cease to have as your primary stock in trade the ingredient known as truth and you, of course, have no more control in the session. Because you don't have a pc who is in-session.

You sit there and handle anything but truth and you're in the soup. And a lot of you go on the basis and get into trouble, because you think it'd be terribly unkind to prick this guy's bubble.

You say, "Well, I don't know. I mean he says he's never had anything to do with women in his life. Well, it'd be awfully embarrassing ..."

I feel this on TV sometimes. I'm rather unwilling to expose all of the pc's overts, be responsible for... I'm perfectly willing for the pc's overts to be exposed to me, but I am actually not willing to possibly damage the pc by exposing his overts elsewhere, don't you see. So, on TV I feel a little bit queasy like this. So I know how you feel sometimes.

And this girl says, "Oh, I'm a virgin."

And you say, "Well, that's nice. That's sweet." And you let it go by. And she's cutting your throat. And she's not in-session. What's going to happen? And you have this ... See?

You're running something like old Formula – what was it – Thirty-three? "What question shouldn't I ask you?"

And it's very very often you'll get this from a girl, "Oh, you shouldn't ask if I'm a virgin."

"All right. Are you a virgin?" – see, it was just the old pattern response.

And she says, "Well, yes, I – I – I am a virgin."

And you say, "All right. Good. Fine. Thank you." Because you think it would be unseemly or something to inquire further into this thing. You should ask yourself why the hell she mentioned it in the first place. How come she brought it up? See.

So you got – that's what you got a meter for. And later on in this session, why, she's blowing her top and way out of session. You can't get the rudiments in and that sort of thing. Well, you departed from truth. You didn't follow it down and get at truth. That was all. There was a moment of untruth in the session. It is very unkind to leave one of those things in a session – to be so diffident that you don't want to establish truth because it might embarrass somebody or hurt somebody's feelings. That's never a good enough reason to ruin a human being.

They don't suffer from having their feelings hurt, let me tell you. They only suffer from being permitted to depart from truth. That is all. And this E-Meter is not a lie detector. It's a truth verifier.

The reason it's unpopular in the world is because the police started calling such machines lie detectors. Actually, comparing this to a police lie detector is something like saying the 1886 Mercedes-Benz is as good as the modern Jaguar, you see. Because the sensitivity of the instruments is not even of the same order of magnitude. And that doesn't matter that the police lie detector costs \$18,000. That has nothing to do with it. This is a truth verifier.

An auditor is an establisher of truth. And if he can establish the truth of the situation and then acknowledge what he has established as the truth of the situation by accepting it and so forth and that he does not avoid the truthful statements of a pc and does not accept the untruthful statements of the pc, of course, never after that does he have any ARC breaks. It requires something fundamental in the auditor. It requires that the auditor is not shy of establishing the truth of a situation.

A pc will actually protest very loudly sometimes when you're trying to establish the truth of a situation. But you notice they're also blushing at the same time. It's a – it's a confusion. If you're – if you get very clever and experienced, you will always know when you are establishing the falsity, you see, of the situation that has been uttered by the pc and that you're establishing the actual truth of it. The pc has attempted to establish falsity and you are attempting to establish truth. And it's a pretty weird look on the pc when you're doing this.

I don't care how loud the pc sounds. He ordinarily won't, after a very short time, sound loud at all. The *only* way you ever come out the other end as a friend of the pc and he's a friend of yours, is if you've established the truth of the situation regardless of embarrassment and regardless of anything else.

Those considerations are entered into the track to make you more reactive bank – that we must have social lies. Very often playwrights come along and they tell you, "Well, if anybody told the truth for twenty-four hours without any difference whatsoever, he would lose all of his friends."

And it's one of the old-time favorite themes in this universe, because they're trying to establish the validity of a lie. That will establish mass and get everybody in trouble and it's quite a – quite a black operation. Whereas it's not true at all. If you were to sit out from the human race's social lies for twenty-four hours and do nothing but tell the truth for twenty-four hours and insist on nothing but the truth for twenty-four hours, he would wind up top dog. He would not be in a mess at all. Do you see that a lie has been entered on to the track here that you could not tell the truth for twenty-four hours? Yeah, you'd wind up wonderful.

In the first place, if you really insisted on the truth, you would wind up at the end of that twenty-four hours having some friends, where you only thought you had before. But it requires a very strong man to enter into the first part of that. Because it's repercussive.

I've told the truth to somebody and had them scream enough to take the roof off. By the time you've told them again four or five times, they eventually listened. Then it didn't seem so much.

It is stepping back from the establishment of truth that pitches one heels – one's heel over the edge of any grave he may fall into. That is the way down.

Now, wherever an individual sits into an auditing session with social mores and kindnesses in full play, he can wind up with the most confounded mess of junk you ever, as a session, you ever heard of.

Pc wildly out of session and so forth. It would actually be unkind to ask this girl if she had ever stolen anything. So we will say, "Have you ever stolen anything?" And then we will just ignore that read on the meter because it isn't necessary to go into it.

Actually, an auditor's mind doesn't really operate like this. He's just blind. He needs glasses or something. I'm just warning you that the wrong direction – just giving you this word of warning – a wrong direction is in the direction of buying lies or letting lies go by in a session. You're always in trouble.

And what we call this, "Letting the lie go by" is the missed withhold. Remember, there can also be the inadvertent missed withhold of letting the truth go by, see. So, if you let a truth go by without acknowledging it and let a lie go by without challenging it, in either way you're in trouble. Because you just restimulated the guy's whole track.

And of course, the ARC sinks, the corners of the triangle start to explode with small firecrackers and debris scatters around the scenery and there it is.

You want ARC to drop out of the session, why, just follow this same basis. That is why your metering has to be 100 percent. And why, incidentally, in passing along, your TR 4 has got to be pretty good. But your TR 4 will be pretty good if you just remember to understand.

All right. Let's all agree you're a complete knucklehead when pcs start muttering. Let's just, you know, take that as a basis: The pcs are rather incomprehensible and nuts on this line and that you are particularly knuckleheaded where what they're saying is concerned. You've got a perfectly safe basis. There's nothing wrong with the statement at all that prohibits auditing.

Well, you could accomplish auditing with that statement. But if you pride yourself that you always understand everything the pc says and never have to inquire into what the pc is saying and that it would look awfully stupid of you to have to inquire again about what the pc is saying, you've laid the basis to the damnedest messes you ever saw. They won't be sessions.

I'm perfectly prepared to be stupid as far as a pc is concerned. Perfectly prepared to be stupid because that's the isness of the situation I'm handling is stupidity, aren't I?

So the pc says – he says – he says, "*Yagayaga-plitzou.*" And ha-ha, I don't depend on my altitude for appearing bright. Why should you? No point in it.

You say, "What did you say?"

And the pc says, "*Wiggle-wiggle plitzboom.*"

Well, don't show any misemotion. Say, "Well, I'm just particularly stupid today. I didn't get it. You'll have to say it in English. You'll have to drive it across this wagon one way or the other so I can see what it is."

And he says, "Oh, skip it."

And I say, "No, that one we're not going to skip. I'm just particularly stupid. What is this '*wiggle-wiggle plitzboom?*' What is it? I mean what are you saying?"

And he says, "Well, you wouldn't understand."

And I say, "Well, that's what I'm trying to tell you. That's what I'm trying to tell you. I don't understand what you're saying," and so forth. I'm perfectly willing to sit there for half an hour and go over this thing.

And he finally says, "Well, I mean that the chair leg has come down on the tip of my foot."

And you say, "Well, all right. Thank you very much. Slide it out. All right. Now, here we go."

And you find out your session doesn't come to grief. The way to make a session come to grief is the pc says, "*Wiggle-wiggle plitzboom,*" and you say, "Good. Fine. Thank you very much," and go on. You've had it. You've entered pretense into the session and it didn't live there.

No, as long as an auditor considers himself an establisher of truth and as long as he refuses to do anything less than establish truth, he's all right.

From then on, why, he can't have any real difficulties, because a pc will forgive an awful lot of fumbling if, during the fumbling, an auditor has only one intention: is to establish the exact, "What is it." See, if that intention is totally clear, the pc can forgive a lot of fumbling.

Don't ever try to look brighter than you are. And never be dumb enough to do otherwise than pursue truth and you'll have it. In essence, you'll build a whole universe out of bad auditing sessions simply because you've continued to alter-is the basic truth of the pc and the basic truth of the universe. And it'll all just mess up like fire drill.

And of course, the meter is simply nothing more or less than establish a truth. And you ought to be lucky you have it. Think of the lies you lived in before you had it.

So if it'll do that, why, you at least have the responsibility of reading it right all the time. And then you're true with the meter. Okay?

Thank you very much.

THE E-METER

A lecture given on 19 July 1962

How are you tonight?

Audience: Fine.

Better?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Well, this is what?

Audience: 19th. July the 19th.

Nineteen July AD 12. All right. So be it. Let's have tomorrow be the 20th. First lecture, Saint Hill Briefing Course. The results of last night's TV demonstration, in one session that was given, gave me unlimited hope. It gave me a great deal of hope, because it shows that auditing can be done. That was pretty doggone good. But it was slowed down slightly by the failure of some of you students to recognize that it was an excellent session. And you left me flabbergasted. I don't want any withholds from you, but that's a fact. How couldn't you see that auditing presence and the fact the boy was reading the E-Meter pretty doggone well? How couldn't you see that? How couldn't you look at the pc and tell whether the pc was in session or not, see? Your ability to look and see what a good session is has got to be improved. See? Going to raise your criteria. If you haven't got one we'll audit one in. [laughs] But that's definitely a very, very hopeful sign. Very good auditor presence. Pc put into session with a slash and that was it. You got to learn to see that.

Tonight we're going to talk about the E-Meter. The E-Meter is an instrument mentioned in a lecture by L. Ron Hubbard in October of 1950. And I said if I had one, that would be very nice. And for about a year and a half or two years I had been trying to find out how to get an auditor to observe a pc, and I hadn't been successful at all. And I myself – I myself saw that one had a much greater need for direct and positive observation. And I've audited pcs with my fingers on their pulse and done other things trying to find out what was going on and if there was any detectable reaction. And out in California on, I think it was about the twentieth of October or something like that, I described such an instrument in a lecture and said it would be very, very, very useful. And a fellow by the name of Mathison went home and he put one together on a breadboard and I got it in very early 51. That is, I probably got it a little bit before that, but I got down to experimenting with it.

Now, these comments are very germane. The genus of the E-Meter is not, as one would like to say for the benefit of licensing and patenting and the law and public credence and all that sort of thing – just forget all those things – the genus of the E-Meter was exactly just that and it was no more than that. It was actually not born out of the Wheatstone bridge.

That Mathison knew the existence of the Wheatstone bridge didn't cause him to build one. The first Mathison really isn't built that way. And – this was just developed just like that, to detect an electronic impulse in a human being

Now, up to that time they didn't even have the theory of a meter straight. You must realize this. Man has had these things around but they didn't even know what they were measuring. And you yourself will run into arguments about this, so you should – you need a little of the background music. They think it measures sweat. In other words, you don't have instant reads, you have instant sweats, and instant non-sweats. And the reason for that is the early galvanometer is so thoroughly insensitive that they wouldn't know whether they were measuring sweat or what. But they think it is sweat.

We had an engineer here the other day that our TV circuit was designed and built by – Reg's engineer. And Reg had him going in circles on an E-Meter, and he was saying kind of "Well," and so on. Because, you see, he knew about galvanometers, and they think these things are – they measure the amount of sweat in the palm. Sort of on the basis that if somebody gets nervous his palms get sweaty. That's how far back the animal psychologist is in it, see? And Reg talked to him for a while and of course there was a meter up there. Of course, unobserved, why, he could take hold of the thing and fool with it a little bit and so on. And pretty soon he was rather diffidently shocked about it. He was coming to the conclusion that it must measure something about an electrical or mental impulse. See? He'd come toward that conclusion. Now, possibly there's more to the story than that but that will serve our needs at the moment. That it was an electrical read, not an electrical measure of a physical read, that it was all electrical, that – something like this. Something was dawning on him that it might be in that direction, that it really was reading thought and so on. Spooked him quite a bit. Now, this is a very knowledgeable man, you see? He knows his stuff pretty well.

And engineers in Scientology and electronics men in Scientology have not always recognized, have not always recognized completely, that this is a wild departure from standard thought on the subject; we're doing something else. The meter is designed to do something else than the old psychogalvanometer or any part of an old lie detector or anything else.

Now, if they'd known how those things work maybe they would have developed one that did work. But, as a matter of fact, they don't work. And if you get somebody who is accustomed merely to the old psychogalvanometer, or something, to fool around with a circuit or something and build an E-Meter – and he doesn't know anything about Scientology or anything like that – one of the first things he does is protect the movement. It's necessary, you know. Meter comes first and subject comes second. And they build a lag into the movement of the thing. And to this day you can see homemade E-Meters around that have built-in comm lags in them. And it's about a half a second to a second built-in comm lag. It's pretty grim. The instant read, then, occurs a half a second to a second late.

Well, this was true of all earlier meters, so, of course, nobody did any observation on it because the electronic circuit was not a direct circuit. And the Keeler galvanometer, I think, has this same fault, and I think they read prior reads.

Now, I don't know. I haven't been through their course up near Chicago. Because I get mixed up. I don't know whether that's the alcoholic cure is Keeler, see, or whether that's

Keeley. See? There's somebody down in the southwest that cures alcohol and their name is Keeler or Keeley, see? And this other outfit near Chicago is named Keeler or Keeley, so I can't even write to them. I'm liable to, you know, insult them or something so it's put me pretty badly out of communication. Otherwise, I'd go up and take their three-and-a-half-day course on the operation... [laughter] I probably would, too, and see what they teach is which. And I might know a little bit more about the background music.

I only know what I have found from police operators who have had that course. And the police operator uses a lie detector in combination with a blood pressure meter and a breath meter. And it's a muscular-strap arrangement that goes around the chest and if the guy goes "uh-ha-uh-ha-uh-ha-uh-ha-uh-ha," it registers, and if a guy's blood goes pound, pound, pound, pound, it registers. And these three needles – one from a galvanometer, one from the blood pressure, and one from the breath – are all joined together on an endless tape which has three needles, and you can make notations on the side of this tape as to what this was a reaction on. So the fellow writes down "bodies under bridges" – give you an actual case – "bodies under bridges," you see, and then asks the question, "Bodies under bridges?" and sees if there's any disturbance of these three needles on that area of the tape that says, "Bodies under bridges." Now, this is just about as crude as you can get because none of these reads are instant reads. The galvanometer's motion is protected so the actual read is always too late to be considered, of course. It's prior reads that they consider, so any restimulative word causes the police lie detector operator to immediately say, "He's guilty. Take him out and hang him."

But over the years they've become wise to this. They've gotten a coordination of cases and people have turned up often enough, after they'd burned the guy in the chair, and things like this, and confessed to the actual murder, that they've got a coordination of data, and their vital statistics demonstrate to them that it's 9.5 percent to 15 percent wrong. And their data also says that a certain percentage, which is not announced but is probably the same percentage – they would condense this data, don't you see? They'd say 9.5 percent to 15 percent of the people who are put on this lie detector machine cannot be detected by the machine. See? So they expect the machine to be that much in error, always. They do not distinguish, physiological or any other way, prior to the reading of the machine, whether the fellow will read on the machine or not, and they don't take any particular characteristic of the machine as saying whether he will read on the machine or not.

Now, the early Mathison that – no matter what Mathison did afterwards, give the man credit, see? Mostly what Mathison didn't do is he wouldn't listen. He kept building things that had long tubes and that you glued onto elephant's toenails and – I don't know, my God! He finally got up to a fourhundred-dollar lie detector that has two dials and five or six adjustments, all of which throw inconstants into the read, and about that time an auditor couldn't read any part of any of this, you see? But to this day he still carries "Tone Scale" on his tone arm. See? I told him about the Tone Scale so he drew an arbitrary Tone Scale over this, and this became known as the tone arm. He built these things for a while for chiropractors and so on. Possibly even today he builds some of them. But he wouldn't groove the machine in to practical auditing.

So the first year that I had this machine, it was refined two or three times, and the first two or three times it was refined on request. And the very first Mathison would not read on a

large percentage of the cases. I don't know what the percentage was because I didn't have enough people on it, but it – recognizably more than 10 percent. The people would come in off the bottom of the dial – see, you couldn't wind it down enough to catch some people – and you couldn't turn it up enough to catch some other people. The sensitivity knob in those days couldn't be advanced enough to separate the read of a low-tone pc. And if a fellow was sitting there in a lot of mass, you just couldn't get him on the machine. You just couldn't ever get your needle on the dial. So I got him to expand this and got him to make this more flexible so it'd take more people, and so on, and we expanded the thing, and made him adjust the sensitivity of the thing and so on. By the end of 1952 we had a pretty good meter – pretty functional.

And unfortunately Purcell grabbed the first of these things which would be a good museum piece, and it had probably been thrown on a junk heap someplace up in some junk-heap state. "Kanzarkansas," I think the name of the state is. I keep forgetting these things that have alter-ised the track so badly. I think the name of the town was Mud Bayou, Kanzarkansas. Yeah, I think so. Where the presidents don't come from.

Anyhow, I'd still – I'd like to have – I'd like to have those, because there was the original meter, the original Mathison, was not unlike the face layout of this meter; not unlike it at all. And it had a dial and it had a tone arm and it had a sensitivity knob and it had a jack and you plugged in the cans, and so forth.

Well, the thing wouldn't read mental thoughts when we first got ahold of this thing. Let's go back to that first machine and our trials and tribulations with it, and I think it will remind you of some of your own trials and tribulations with this machine.

It wouldn't read. Oh, you could jump on the electrodes. I think they eventually – they had an egg – no a tea strainer – the tea strainer electrode eventually evolved along this line. But the original ones had just a little bar and you were supposed to put a plastic bag over the pc's hand, one hand, so that he couldn't knock the cans together. And this was Mathison's first concern. He was always worried about knocking the cans together because he was afraid his meter would short out, of course. And that was a mains meter, and that – that plugged into the mains, and all kinds of valves in the back of the thing glowed and so on. And the production line of these things had the frailty of very often having the chassis grounded to the pc, and now and then you'd pick up the electrodes on a Mathison and get 110 volts right straight off the mains. And, once in a while, an auditor whose Mathison had been operating just fine would reach over to start to move the machine while it was switched on and get 110 volts off the back of the case. They were jolty. They sort of made things respected – made themselves respected in this fashion.

And the thing – the thing had tiny little bars for its electrodes and when it was first delivered up to the house, Mary Sue – she wasn't around when that thing first arrived, but she was around shortly afterwards when we were doing things hot and heavy with the thing. But a fellow named Jim Elliot was there at that time and Jim and I sat up most of the night. I finally got disgusted with the whole thing because we couldn't make it read, couldn't make it do anything.

And one of them was a projection meter. There were two, and one of them was a great big projection meter, sort of a magic lantern with an element built across a huge magic-lantern lens with a reverse Tone Scale on this thing so it projected right into – when it hit a screen. It was an interesting and a very, very good projection meter. I've never seen as good a projection meter. If it had the guts of a Mark IV to that needle across the lens, that would be the finest projection meter anybody would wish for. But he fooled around with the projection meter, and I was fooling around with the other meter, and after a half a dozen shocks and no mental reads and a few things like that I was getting awful disgusted with this thing.

And I don't know whether it was Jim or whether it was me, but somebody thought of soup cans. By increasing the amount of electrode area we might be able to increase the mental read. And so we went out in the kitchen – and I think V8 vegetable juice or something like that; and we got awful tired of that stuff after a while, you know. Because, you know, American Can Company won't sell you just plain tin cans. You've got to go out and... If they do sell you tin cans, they cost as much as a can of soup anyhow, and you can't get them. For some reason or other these big can companies won't sell you cans. Sears and Roebuck at one time had home-canning outfits, and I hoped to be able to get spare cans from them, but we've never been able to run down just plain cans! We've always been going to the grocery store and buying a couple of new brands of vegetable juice or orange juice or something of the sort that were the right size, bringing them home, drinking the stuff down and washing them all out and hooking them onto the meter. Some day somebody is going to permanently paint cans, you know, and they won't have paper on them, and we'll be sunk. [laughter] They don't realize – they don't realize what scientific advance is hanging on this whim. Hey! We'd be out of business at once.

And it must have been two, three, four o'clock in the morning when we finally hooked up these cans, and so help me Pete, we could get a reaction that was understandably and visibly and undoubtedly a mental reaction. And at that point I knew we had something.

We went on and fooled with that thing for quite a long time. Did various things with it. I put different types of people on it; studied their reactions. And to this day I go back to that work every time I turn around.

You know, you get a constant, agitated rock slam on psychotics. You possibly didn't know that, but you'll be horrified someday. You'll be down in the local spinbin; they've just laid out the red carpet for you and that sort of thing; and the psychiatrist is standing there with his staff drawn up on dress parade, surrendering the place to you, you know, handing you the electrodes of his electric-shock machine or something like that. And you'll go in there and you'll put some – with great confidence you'll put some psycho on your meter, thinking you are going to do something. And you're not going to do anything – not with a meter, man.

Fortunately, it coincides with this: when a person's needle is in constant, agitated rock slam – a manic-depressive, schizophrenic, these people – constant agitated rock... Oh, it's just horrible! Just all over the place. *Nnzzrrrr!* As soon as you pull it down far enough on sensitivity, why, you're below his read because the guy is just pounded in, in concrete, don't you see? Fortunately, no E-Meter process will work on these people and you'd use CCHs anyway. See, that's just fortunate because it means that we really don't have to develop a psychotic-

detecting E-Meter. But you will be horrified when you first see a real full-blown psycho on an E-Meter. The needle will either be stuck like the sword in the hand of a statue, or it'll be so agitated that you can't read any part of it.

Now, if it isn't that way – if it isn't that way and you can talk to the person, the person is auditable on an E-Meter. It's a fortunate coincidence.

It's just a coincidence that if you can read a psychotic on the E-Meter he'll run a Prep-check process. See? If he'd speak to you or answer the auditing question. But if it's too agitated for you to read it on the meter – we're not talking about the little dirty needles that you guys get occasionally. This is violent, man.

Your little dirty needle cleans up when somebody finds out that the TR 4 was mishandled in the beginning of your first auditing session, or something wild has been going on, and various oddball things. You know you can get a dirty needle from people objecting to the electric current they feel in their hands, even on a Mark IV? If they've got an awful lot of overts on the electrical line. I cleaned up a dirty needle one time with just running up those overts. You know, "shocking people" and things like that? Cleaned it up very nicely.

It's just a happy thought, it's a very happy thought, that if you can read the person – you can get a reaction on the person – why, you can audit them with a think process, you know? They can audit with a conversational process – you know, repetitive process of some kind or another. You get your rudiments in, everything. No matter how batty they look, or what their reputation is.

I found out also that psychiatric assignment or classification had nothing whatsoever to do with sanity, through an E-Meter. Hasn't any bearing on sanity. As I told you before, I finally found out what this was (not afterwards but before I had the answer to this), and it was the institution they're in that determines the type of psychosis they have, which I think is interesting.

So the meter, to that degree, will detect whether or not a person is auditable. I learned that very early on.

Now, I went on from there and developed this – the second model of it and a more sensitive third model and did an awful lot of work with this thing

The result of that work is still extant in *The History of Man*. Mary Sue and I worked on that, I guess, for the better part of a year. And my God, you talk about chasing each other and everybody else, and so forth, all over the time track picking up this and that. If you want to see a sixteen-dial drop on one of these things, why, just take the Grim Weeper or something like that in *The History of Man*, and you'll see a sixteen-dial drop. They're sixteen-dialdrop incidents. They go on and on and on and on and on and the needle is falling fast all that time. It's not a slow fall. And you just keep trying to free it off the pin. And your effort to keep freeing it off the pin will be something like five down ... See? Your tone arm is reading something like this. Sixteen dials. And those incidents still exist in everybody's bank.

Now, the meter, then, landed us in a complete cul-de-sac. As you know, if you stay in this lifetime with a Prepcheck you can make somebody look pretty good. But what we ran into, unwittingly, because of the meter, was the whole, open span of the backtrack. Now, the

E-Meter didn't pilot this out. I'd found backtrack earlier than that, to such a degree that the board of the first Foundation was resigning all over the place if we – if I dared go on and re-research past lives. It was the damndest thing I ever heard of. Anyhow ... And it was the first time they found out I could get mad. And they said afterwards that was what really shocked them, you know? That sort of thing. They had to pull themselves out of the plaster from the wall back of them. And that really shattered them. That was probably the beginning of the end of the first Foundation, right there. But I thought, "There can't be people around to tell you what to research and what not to research, man. That would be the end of all."

But it wasn't until we had the E-Meter that we went back and found out how significant all this was and how fantastic all this was and the number of engrams that actually exist on the whole track of the pc. And the number is infinity. Whew! And don't kid yourself, that was an awful research blow. And that was pounded right into view by the E-Meter. Because it meant that Dianetics was wrong. As far as I could see, Dianetics was wrong.

Now, what I had been doing previous to that was taking this lifetime's engrams, taking these engrams, taking something like conception and birth, something like that, and on a case that could run an engram you could clean that case up and make them look awful good. Oddly enough, we've come right back to it again in Prechecking. As long as you keep somebody around this lifetime, you can make them look awful good by just running this lifetime.

But this was an end of track, as far as I could see at that time. I didn't care why this was, or if there was any saving graces about it. It became absolutely positive and obvious that to make a Clear Clear – exclamation point Clear – by first-book definition, which is to run out every incident and every engram on the track, that this was impossible. You just didn't have enough time to do it, that's all. There are too many. And that was where the first E-Meter landed us. And that was an interesting research datum. You can do it to this day. If you want to fool around for a year or so with an E-Meter, you can plot up whole track on people in the most general incidents and so on. It's pretty hair-raising. But you will soon come to the conclusion that if we had to do it engram by engram, or even chains of engrams, if we did it on a whole-track basis, we're in for four or five lifetimes of engram running. And that was the first thing we learned from an E-Meter.

So Suzie and I went down to the library, and we started hauling books out and looking for words. And we finally found *scio* and we find *-ology*. And there was the founding of that word. Now, that word had been used to some degree before. There had been some thought of this. Actually the earliest studies on these didn't have any name to them until a little bit along the line and then I called it anything you could think of. But we found that this word *Scientology*, you see – and it could have been any other word that had also been used – was the best-fitted word for exactly what we were – wanted.

Scio means knowing in the fullest sense of the word. It is one of these ultimate or exclamation-point words. Translated across it becomes *scien*. And we went down and we made sure that that was the right word and that was what we were trying to do and that was what I was heading for and so forth. And she was very good about it. She was lugging the books and I was turning the pages. You know, proper division of labor. And we said, "Well, that's what we've got to do."

Now, one of the reasons this was so is because we had to move out – I had to move out of the field of studying the mind into studying knowingness. Simultaneously during this work, I wrote the first axioms of Dianetics (doing the first E-Meter work) and the first axioms of knowledge. And that was a wonderful weapon in itself. I assembled the means by which this was done. And the mind is only a vessel of knowledge. If you want to know the conclusion I came to, it was just that: it's just a vessel of knowledge. So what are you studying the earthenware for, see? That's what that amounts to. So it required a brand-new approach. And it was. It was a completely reversed approach to what we had been doing before.

Exteriorization, other things, started coming up. We went on down to Phoenix and I kept on studying this and that and well, we had fifteen-dozen ways of trying to study and view this idea of looking at a thetan and so on.

And one day Evans Farber – one night – he showed up on the front porch out in the desert there, and he wouldn't go away; he had to see me. And I'd had a hard day and I was there watching Mr. Farber decide he wasn't going to go away. And I was feeling mean about it, as a matter of fact. I was just feeling darn mean. And by golly, he went out on the front lawn and he lay down and he wouldn't go anyplace. Well, Evans had had many wild ideas at one time or another and he'd occupied hours in trying to relay these things. And I was very tired, I'd been lecturing all day, and I just was bound and determined I wasn't going to see him! That was all! Just mean. And I finally said – conscience got the better of me – said, "What the hell. He's lying out there on the front lawn, exposing himself to the Arizona night."

So I went on out the front porch and I said, "All right, Evans, what have you got?" Well, actually, Suzie was pretty cross at both of us the next morning because we'd been making so much noise the rest of the night, and so forth, she couldn't sleep. But it was the "Try not to be three feet back of your head." That works to this day.

He'd taken two lines out of a bulletin and combined the two things, and he'd looked this over, and then he had decided that it would be a reverse vector. So he had put the magic words – not "be three feet back of your head" but "try not to be three feet back of your head." And he found out he was getting the largest proportion of people he addressed these words to – they would fly out of their heads like they were shot from guns. He was having a ball. So he blew me about halfway across Arizona, and I blew him out of his head. Nobody had said it to him yet. [laughter] We went around patching things up.

The things I've been through. What I have done for you, my God! [laughs]

Anyway, old Evans was very elated with all this and he finally went off home. And that was practically the end of the E-Meter. Because you can't register a thetan out of his head.

I came over to England. We fooled around a bit more with E-Meters, we were still using E-Meters on detection, we were still working with E-Meters to some degree, but it wasn't making any real advance, don't you see, because I wasn't depending on them. And I tried to develop a thetan detector. I took one of these magic eye things that had just been designed – it's a little bar; it's not the round magic eye but it's the little bar magic eye – and by amplification was trying to test exteriorization. I was up at 30 Marlborough Place up here in London for a long time. And we were trying to test exteriorization. How do you test an exteriorized

thetan? See? And the difficulty with the meter was, if a being in his head or out came within a circle of about ten to fifteen feet from this antenna it started registering. Now, you could blow somebody out of his head and make him sit on the table or around the antenna and you'd get the read, providing the auditor then didn't approach the antenna; or if he was within ten feet of the antenna didn't wiggle his head. You get the idea? It was very unparticular on what thetan it registered. [laughter]

Now, the gimmickry on that was really – not really worth preserving. I've even forgotten exactly how it was amplified and so forth, but it was mostly because it was such common electronics that any good electronics man could reapproximate this thing. It just super-super-superamplified and then you read the thing on an expanding beam of light in a tube. You got the guy – or you could put it on just ordinary E-Meter providing the meter was far enough away from the antenna.

We made several mains E-Meters. We had trouble making E-Meters. E-Meters were around for a long time. We used them more or less. There was no real improvement in E-Meters and about 1955, 56, something like that, I think we stopped using them entirely. Didn't have anything to do with E-Meters for quite a while. And then all of a sudden we moved in toward the first Clearing ACC over in the States. And I did assessments on a lot of people with the E-Meter. But, basically, it was on this basis that E-Meters revived.

There were several chaps around the Washington organization and to give any one of them full credit along this line would be a mistake. Well, Dale had been around talking about this sort of thing, and Pinkham, and there'd been a lot of this sort of thing over a period of time and they'd done various things with circuits and meters and so on. And I wasn't paying much attention. I'd listen, but I wasn't paying it any real attention because I didn't have an immediate or real use for this machine.

Till all of a sudden one or another of these designed the first transistor meter, which is the direct grandfather of the Mark IV. About 1957 that thing was released and the immediate result of offering this E-Meter, you know, in an auditing session and taking the amount of material that it could give you and so forth – the immediate and direct result of this was leading directly up to clearing. And we made a whole bunch of first dynamic Clears (something on the – I've forgotten the percentage; it was fifteen out of sixty, or fifteen out of seventy or something like that; it was some fabulous percentage) on Help – a 5-way bracket on Help. And there was only one bug to the process. There was a big bug on the process. It was, I had to do the assessment. That's a horrible fact.

We were assessing on machines and factories and all kinds of circuitry. We were assessing circuitry. And there were three types of circuitry and – there's an awful lot of technology all mixed up in this, you know? All these types of circuitry – oh, I guess, I look around here; some of you were there – and you could detect this circuitry, and then if you got a terminal that fitted that circuit, of course (we know now) you had the name of the terminal, you see? So therefore, everybody who had a beingness goal (this we know now, didn't know it then), everybody who had a beingness goal and who happened to choose the terminal of that beingness, you see, goal... And we ran a 5-way bracket of Help on this thing, we got a first

dynamic Clear who might fall in again because we hadn't got any of the GPM really out of the road. We just got it keyed out.

In fact, let me see, there's somebody right now I just remembered that is here – Tony – and we had something on you that was heading for the direction of Clear. And if they haven't got his goal right this minute, I could exhume what this was, do a list like I just did on Jean. I knew that the word *doctor* was kicking around because she went Clear on this down in South Africa, so the goal must have contained the word *doctor*. Had her auditor do a whole list of these things after she was – I beat her a few times and managed to get her to do it. And got a whole list of these goals with the word *doctor* in them. They assessed out this short list and they got the goal. See? Tricky, huh? We could probably do the same with Tony. I just remembered it.

In other words, you could clear anybody with these technologies, whose terminal was also his goal. Do you see the basic limitation of this thing. Terminal was also the goal.

Well now, how I did these original assessments – because I assessed everybody on that ACC, the whole lot. I did them in two afternoons, fifteen minutes per person. And the – the trick of assessment, you see, was to find exactly what the – I don't know if we were using the word *Rock* but it was what the Rock was, anyway. I didn't remember if I applied the word *Rock* till the later part of the course or the early part of the course. But anyhow, this was the Rock, whatever it was, and naturally that would be – if that flukily coincided with the wording of a goal that would clear them; we had a Clear.

Well man, the meter was in. The meter was in. It proved itself right there. There wasn't any more monkey business about this. I couldn't find out how you could do it otherwise. That was it. Took this type of assessment. Well, before, assessment had not been this vital. But it became obvious to me at that point – about 1956, 57, during that period sometime – it was getting more and more obvious to me that you weren't going to clear anybody without a meter. And this was horrible because I'd never been able to teach an auditor to use one!

Ah, the cat is out of the bag! I'd never worked very hard; I'll give you that. I'd never worked very hard to teach auditors. But I used to watch auditors sitting around with a meter in their lap and the needle's wagging – particularly if they got one of these whizeroo Mathisons that had to be driven in on a truck. And the needles would be going back and forth in conflict and dials ringing and gongs going and... We've even got one of these old beep meters upstairs. I'll have to break that out because it proves something else entirely different than E-Metering.

But we were in. That was it. You weren't going to clear anybody without an E-Meter, because you had to be able to look into their bank and find the anatomy of that bank and find the proper button to press; and if you pressed any other button – as some of you either have learned or may, I hope not, learn from experience on a pc and I – certainly not on yourself – the bank beefs up and goes *blooey*. Everything goes wrong if you get the wrong button.

You're going to run the wrong button long enough or hard enough on a pc with a clearing process and you'll practically ruin him. The remedy of it is to find the right button and run that. But they're awful uncomfortable. And the Step 6 phenomena that we ran into in clearing, shortly after all that, was wrong button. You get the pc mocking up something that's off his goal line and the bank beefs up because of the goal. And it isn't that creativeness

mocks up the bank. See? Finally been able to understand the rest of this Step 6 phenomena – why Step 6 worked on some cases and didn't work on others. Naturally, if you had the guy's goal run out, or desensitized, he could then do all types of Creative Processes which are not in conflict with his goal. That's Step 6 phenomena. You're not terribly concerned with that one way or the other, but I just mentioned it in passing. It's actually running the wrong goal.

I mentioned to you in a recent lecture that the phenomena of alteration of creativeness was your highest pin. So therefore religion and who created this universe plays an enormously strong role in banks and that sort of thing. Well, you run – you collide with that when you get the wrong goal for the individual, and just everything starts to beef up and go solid.

Now, when a bank goes solid, that's no fun. That is no fun. I can tell you that by experience – personal experience. I've had my own bank beefed up to a point where it was just nothing but concrete and you practically had to take small hammers and chip them off of the area in front of my eyes so I could see, you know? What I've been through for you. Anyhow... [laughs] – a very good subjective reality on that. And of – one of the things – reasons I've "been through things for you" – not putting it that way – but one of the reasons I've been through these things: I very often will refuse to subject a pc to an experimental process that I halfway feel will knock his block off. So I feel I could dig myself out of it and usually have.

Now, the difficulty, though, of auditors finding the right Rock loomed enormously, because I've never known a proper assessment. I've never known of one.

So from that point till now, two things have been in action, two separate things: is technology which unwound any accidental out of this package of clearing. We must understand everything there is to know about clearing. There must not be any unknown data. And the data we do find must be interpretable by an auditor on an E-Meter. Well, this required a meter. And the first British meter was simply built, I don't mind telling you, as a mere copy of the American meter. I didn't even possibly think it would be as good. I hoped we could build as good a meter over here as the 1957 American meter. Sounds funny, doesn't it? Because I should have known from my earlier experience with British electronics people that they're pretty sharp on an individualistic basis.

America is the mass-production area of the world. See? They will build it better, they will build it so it works more automatically, they will build it so it works longer with less repair, and they will build more of it than anybody could possibly have any use for, see? But they won't, and apparently almost can't, build a little of anything on a company or manufacturing business.

And I might have realized that these boys Fowler and Allen, when I first collided with them – I'd collided with another E-Meter manufacturer uptown and a few geniuses on the line and that sort of thing, but none of these could really answer up to what we wanted. And when Fowler and Allen came along, why, I thought, "These are pretty sharp boys." And I started telling them what it was all about and that sort of thing, and they made the first of these present series of meters. And they didn't have any reality on what they were making; they were not Scientologists; and they were just hooking wires together. They took the green and gold meter that somebody was making uptown up here (which was a copy of the American meter), and they didn't like this meter. They didn't like the meter they were copying it from. So they

asked me if they couldn't do this and that, and I looked over some of the stuff they were doing, and I said, "Well, that's good. That's fine. Just so it works." And they built the first of these meters.

Well, one day, Fowler, no, it was Allen was sitting across the desk from me and I told them how these meters worked. And of course, they thought they were building something that looked like a psychogalvanometer, you see? And they were trying to add up all this theory together and they – and so forth, and they didn't have a clue what they were doing.

So I sat this fellow down across from my desk and I ran a responsibility process on whatever he was looking at, and put him on the meter and asked him a few things and located a couple... oh, a dead war companion and his feeling of overts against that one and some things, and then found out that he was just looking at blackness but – surrounding a window. But he had a window. And I thought, "This is intriguing." So I asked him what part of that scene he was looking at could he be responsible for. (I don't know if you've ever run this on a pc or not, but the results are sometimes quite fascinating.) And the next thing you know, he had more and more room. He was seeing more and more room, you see, in the picture. He was backing up from this window, and he saw more and more room. And all of a sudden the atomic bombs went off through the window, boom, boom, boom, boom, boom, and he turned around and ran away from the window, ran out of the room, jumped into his car (small space opera-type vehicle) and took off over a hill with full kinesthesia. Sitting right there in the chair across from me, you see, he got the *full* operation of jumping in the car and the car speeding off and accelerating, and then going over this hill, you know. And you know how light you feel sometimes when something goes over a hill fast. And he didn't have this picture anymore. And he didn't look the same either. And they became rather mystic about it all. They weren't quite sure what had happened, but they knew something had happened.

Well, on numerous occasions I explained to them bits and pieces of the operation of the E-Meter and odd bits of this and that, and they finally began to recognize that it was reading something, and they learned how to read it on each other a bit, you know, and that sort of thing. And they got accustomed to what we were doing, and I got them to do some work on the OT meter and – eventually. But that's ahead of the story.

On this meter, they went on and built the Mark II and they built the Mark III and I smoothed that out, and built the Mark IV, the present meter. Well, they built the Mark IV by the time they were pretty knowledgeable about things, and they changed a lot of things around. For instance, the early meter can occasionally get a big rock slam on the thing and you'd have to throw the dial – this is true of the American meters – and they have to throw the dial back and forth hard to clean the dust out of it. Well, this has got a pot in it that that can't happen with. There's several oddities here that have been built into it that are quite distinctly different. But more than that, the circuit is a bit shifted here and there and sensitized up, and the thing has its own balancing mechanisms and so forth. And they've solved quite a few interesting electronic problems, such as the drift of the meter during auditing and so on.

And they have also built two or three monstrosities as prototypes for this and that, and they have been rejected. In other words, there's been a lot of hunt and fumble here. There was one meter that – you would have laughed; it had – and you wouldn't have used it either. It had

two dials down here and you switched the meter on and then you adjusted the needle to set with one of these dials and then you waited for one minute – I can see you waiting for one minute – and then you plugged it in and adjusted the other dial to set and actually after that it would not creep either way. That was fixed in but they balanced it twice. We rejected that.

Anyway, they finally not only got the meter's design we finally wanted, but also did this so that it's a good – a pretty consistent production. And although we check these meters out, there's less and less variation from meter to meter. They smooth these things out as they go along. They find parts that wear in them and they make sure that the next time they build a series that the part doesn't. And the meter, although it's a Mark IV, is actually in constant state of refinement as far as the actual parts are concerned. For instance, they just offered me a new cord today that could be buried at the bottom of the sea for 150 years without any deterioration. But you're not going to be auditing down there, so I... [laughter, laughs] It felt just a little bit sticky to my hand and it smelled slightly medical, so I rejected the stuff. Anyway ...

I just designed a case for these things, by the way. I don't know if any of you have seen those E-Meter cases or if any of them have been shipped in. Maybe they're under manufacture at the present time. They take a clipboard the size of an auditor's report. They take the meter, and they take two soup cans, and the lady's powder puff and a few things like that, and then flap over and strap over your shoulder. And the more important part of it is, the case can be rolled up into a relatively small ball and still protect the meter when the meter is in it. Odd things like this are going along.

But the meter, as far as that's concerned, is still designed to do just one job. And that was from 1950 on forward. And that job is simply to detect what the pc has in the reactive bank. That is the job the meter is designed for. And it is actually incidental that the meter detects what the pc is thinking or doing or withholding or anything like that. Somehow or another we could probably get by those later points. But we would never get by "What does he have in the reactive bank?" You see? That is the basic mission of the E-Meter.

And you go on and start fooling around with meters or trying to design them or trying to do something with them and start stressing that it's just what the pc is thinking, what the pc is withholding from you, does he have problems and that sort of thing, as the important line, you could totally miss this other one. And that is what the meter is built to do. And the meter is not built just to keep rudiments in or something like that. Those are auxiliary uses of the E-Meter.

The meter therefore must be sensitive enough and must be built around this one point of the detection of a prime postulate in an individual. If a meter will not detect a prime postulate, that meter is useless – just pointblank – because you wouldn't ever clear anybody with it.

Now, I probably haven't talked about this for a long time. You probably knew a lot of this or maybe it set some of your data straight because some of the propaganda issued in the early days and so forth – not necessarily totally factual. And I've given you a very – a very straight story of this E-Meter.

Now, the greatest liability of the meter has not been a poorly built meter. We have always been able to refine a meter down to a point where it would read the prime postulate. It takes pretty fine doing. It has to be a very sensitive meter – far, far more sensitive than you

would dream of. Because when you really find one today after listing 850 goals or 1,000 or 1,500 goals to where there's no tone arm action left on the goals list – and by test there should be no tone arm action left on the goals list before you start nulling the first time – when you get down to that point the goal probably reads something on the order of about a fifth to a quarter of a division of the dial at sensitivity 16. And that would be the absolute minimum sensitivity that a meter could have to operate with. That'd be absolute minimum because you couldn't detect below that point. But if you have a meter that is too sensitive, it picks up all the body reactions and everything else the pc is doing – digesting, blinking his eyes and twitching and anything else – and it becomes an unreadable meter. Now, there's possibly design ways to get around that but they haven't been designed to do it.

Now, this meter – this meter has the liability of auditor reading. And it has always had that liability. And I had not realized until just last week – to show you that a terrific advance has been made here ... You think it's just done so that you would be kicked around, but that's not true. A terrific advance has been made here: E-Meter reading has been singled out as – given the existing technology – as the weakest point of auditing today and the one point which must be corrected in the auditor before he can be called a safe auditor. That is the one point. Now, that has always been the toughest point about an E-Meter: getting an auditor to read one.

Now, so much technology has gathered around this point because of so much difficulty in getting this done... See, I learned how to read one of these things in 1952, and there's never been any doubt in my mind about it as to how they read or what the read looked like or anything like that. Well, I'm way ahead of you on practice, and additionally I'm probably ahead of you on just the basic idea of obnosis. I'm perfectly willing to sit and observe what's happening without dreaming up any reason why it happened or anything else, you see? And I'm willing to sit there and look at the needle. One day you will acquire this. You won't do anything else; you will look at the needle and then you will act.

And the gist of this is that the meter has been abandoned on at least one occasion for a period of two or three years because I despaired of teaching auditors to read the meter. But at that time very little had been articulated about meter reads. A tremendous amount of information now exists on the subject of meter reads because I've been analyzing everything I've known about meters all these years and everything that's done with these meters and how they respond and behave, and limiting down exactly what auditors do wrong with meters. And I've had a great deal of attention on that.

And I find, in the final analysis, that it is simply an auditor has yet to acquire an every-timeness for a clean or a reaction on the part of the meter, and that's the only thing that an auditor is missing on. And that's what he is missing on.

Some auditors choose to have trouble with coordinating the last syllable of what they are saying with the read of the meter in order to get an instant read on the thing. Well, I don't really buy that that is any difficulty at all because I never watch a needle for any read until I have enunciated the last syllable. See, let's say *out* was the last word in the goal or something like that or the line or the rudiment, and it's basically – not even bothering to look, you see? Let's say, "How would you find out?" You see? All right. "How would you ..." It's really this

way: "How would you find out?" See? But that introduces a comm lag, so your trained response is really this: "How would you find – out?" And then your eye is on the thing during the period of the articulation of the *t* of *out* and of course you see the read. But you're going to wear your eyes out looking at it. "How would you find..." Who cares? See? "How would you find..." You introduce fantastic quantities of eyestrain and that sort of thing into meter reading. It's just like the needle must be on the dial at the moment you say the last syllable. It doesn't matter whether it is or not before that moment.

You could be looking at this. You could look at the pc. "How would you find out?" Yeah. And your coordination between the enunciation of the last syllable and the instantaneousness of the read is then done all in a split second. You lift your eyes off the meter or don't bother to look. Can you fix your eyes on something without looking at it? You can. You can. There is an additional action called looking that has nothing to do with pointing the eyes. Learn the difference sometimes. Just fix your eyes on the wall and look at it, and then don't look at it. Look at it, don't look at it, see? Look at it, and don't look at it. It's looking in that instant that is giving you the trouble on some cases.

But the technique of how you read one, the drills of how one should be – read one, should contain equally "it isn't reading" with "it is reading." "All right, point me out some no-reads," you should, as coach, tell the student. "All right, give me a no-read." And he's got to show you times when the meter is not reading.

"Not reading, not reading, not reading, not reading."

"All right. Give me some times the meter is reading."

"Read, read, read, read, read."

Just watching a needle, no instant read. Just the thing drifting around.

"Give me some not-reads."

"That's a not-read, and that's a not-read, and that's a not-read, that's a not-read."

"Give me some reads."

"That's a read. That's a read. That's a read. That's a read."

Get the idea? Just that type of drill. Then let him hook it up to his own vocal cords. Because that's a separate action.

But now I believe we *know* how to teach people to read an E-Meter and if we don't know I'll jolly well find out, because I have made up my mind not to any longer retreat on this subject. If you're going to clear people, you're going to have to be able to detect the thing in the mind that is keeping the person from not being Clear. I know of *no* other way to do it except with an E-Meter. If you're going to clear people, going to have to learn an E-Meter.

So I have finally made up my mind – which I never had before, completely – that you've got to learn how to read an E-Meter. Also, that you can and will learn how to read an E-Meter. That is all. Because there's no way around that particular impediment on the track. There isn't any other way around it. There isn't anything else can be done for you except that fact. We can give every assistance in the world in learning how to read one but we've got to

cross that hump. And that's what you've seen happen here in the last ten days or so. And I've given you a resumé of all of this oddball oddities of history just to show you that there's quite a bit of background to the E-Meter, but there's never been this background to it: You've got to learn how to read one and you will be able to read one. See?

So that's the background we have added to this, because it comes along with this other datum: that the only reason one auditor seems to be better than another auditor is because one auditor can read an E-Meter and the other auditor cannot. Presence is marvelous. You can acquire all these things. The drills are very interesting; they're very easy. Everything is very smooth. You can smooth a session out. You can do all kinds of things. You can get your auditing questions answered. You – all of these things are fine, but in the final analysis it's whether you can read a meter or not read a meter that makes you a good auditor or somebody who can't audit.

All right. I have spoke my piece on the subject of E-Meters, and I've had it on my mind, and I thought I had better tell all.

Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: GOALS LISTS, FIELD AUDITORS

A lecture given on 19 July 1962

Okay. We're going to Q and A now. This is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 19 July AD 12. A Q and A.

I do have an announcement to make before I do this. For those of you who have not noticed, we have a TV demonstration on Wednesday night. And this has been so successful for two consecutive weeks that next Wednesday night we're going to repeat this and the formula by which auditors are chosen for this demonstration is just by formula. It's not as some of you believe – that you have protested or are afraid or something like that. It is – there's one GAE – somebody who is off auditing because of errors. There is one person who is going along fair and there is one person who is pretty good. Now this could include of course anybody after their first week on course. So some of you needn't be too – feel too safe about it. I mean there's always a point where you shouldn't feel safe. Yes, very, very vicious.

The truth of the matter is that you have been learning so much from these things that I should feel very odd if I left them out. And perhaps I will resume my own demonstrations. But if I do, there's a possibility that it will be on a fourth night. So you just figure – just figure this; that there are some hills that have to be climbed and take this in your stride as just one of the liabilities of being on course. There's actually no sadism connected with it.

None of the instructors take any particular joy out of the smell of fear. And if I knew some way to teach you more smoothly, I would, but in this particular instance, this is a – this is a bomb. This is fine.

It has this virtue. Those that are on the demonstration sure as hell know whether their auditing is any good or not when they finished off. We tell them in no uncertain terms. And sometimes somebody's been riding along sort of blaming the pcs, you know and that sort of thing and then they turn on the wrong end of the totem pole after something like that and then they scramble like mad on their theory and practical and so forth and all of a sudden, they don't have to blame the pc anymore because the pc's getting along fine.

It's quite mysterious. You sit there on a pc, the pc's terrible, is doing awful things and have him getting ARC breaks and a very nattery pc and it's just no good. That's all – that's just – the pc's just no good, you know. And then you smooth out your E-Meter reading, you smooth out your auditing and that sort of thing and you sit there and do it right off the text-book and so forth and you come back and audit the same pc and he's just quiet as a lamb and he's good and everything's fine and goes along. And you know something? The pc didn't change any in the time the person's working out his GAE.

If you ever find yourself in the position of a D of P or anything like that, just remember that. Just remember that. It's very important. You as the D of P can make the most serious mistake possible for a Central Organization by trying to audit the pcs through the auditor. That is the most serious error that you can make because you'll inevitably come up with unusual solutions. Now that's very serious.

The only thing you can possibly do is handle the auditors who are auditing the pcs. That becomes an entirely different operation. You can almost differentiate between good Ds of P and poor Ds of P on that one basis. The good D of P is handling the auditors and he makes sure that the auditors can do their job and that the auditors are doing what they're supposed to be doing. And the poor one tries to handle the pc without any recourse to the auditor.

Now oddly enough, the fellow who's trying to handle the pcs, if he's got very bad auditors who don't know what they're doing, probably will get better results for a while than the Director of Processing who is handling auditors, see.

When you run into the fact you haven't got any trained auditors working for you, you'd better handle those pcs because nobody else is. But this lays in its own trap. In the long run, you'd get far further bringing those auditors up to the point where they can handle the pcs. And your results also will be better and improve as you go along. All this is quite important. You wouldn't think that that much – that there'd be that much difference in just those two points of view, but there is a terrific difference. I look at the auditors reports from a – from HGCs coming in from all over the world and I can tell you at a glance whether the D of P is handling auditors or pcs.

All right. Q and A. What question would you like to ask?

The oracle is open. Yes, Merrill.

Female voice: On this, you know, testing for a complete list on goals ...

Testing for complete list on goals.

Female voice: Mmm. I'm wondering if you could null, say, part of the list and there's a question, see, if you know the list is complete, you go back and give the test, you know, like reading half a dozen goals or more to see if you get any TA. If the fact that you had nulled, see, those goals – these are the ones at the beginning of the list – would this make any difference as far as that TA...

I can tell you that it would make no difference.

Female voice: Hmmm.

If the list is not complete and the rudiments are in, you will get TA action on an incomplete goals list. That is something on the order of, "If you wind up a clock, it runs. If you don't wind up a clock, it doesn't run."

Female voice: Thank you.

Yeah. That's one of those open and shut data. There were some 3D and 3D Criss Cross tests for completeness of list. Any one of those tests could be applied for the completeness of a goals list. It's about all that we ever salvaged from 3D Criss Cross which we're not using

anyplace now. With *horror* I read through from an organization the other day – after we had trained everybody on 3D Criss Cross, I sent a dispatch out *no, no, no, no, no, no, don't do that. No, no, no.* Abandon it. Go around the organization and tear them all up. But actually there was still a datum in 3D Criss Cross that was quite valid and that was there were a number of tests for complete lists and all of those are very valid for the tests of goals. You can take and read as little as a half a dozen if you're really watching your meter – half a dozen goals and tell whether you got TA action or not. Man, a complete goals list is the flattest, limpest fish you've ever handled. It's as floppy as a president's handshake. No kidding.

Okay. Thank you, Merrill.

Female voice: That leads me to a second question on that.

Well, I don't know if you can have a second one or not. Go ahead.

Female voice: Well, if you were making a second test, see, after going on listing some more, would you use those same first goals or would you go on ...

Honey, it doesn't matter what set of goals you used. You know, you could even use the ones you thought you'd nulled. I mean it's that much of an open and shut question. Because one of the things they won't do is stay null on an incomplete list. Oh, they pop in and out like jack-in-the-boxes. You've never quite noticed this.

Let's take some list where the goals have stayed in and had to be rubbed out with a – with a branding iron or something like that, you know. You could just *hear the grind* going on in the session. "*To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. Grrrrrr. Grrrrrr.* Still in." [laughter]

Get the pc's rudiments in, polish him all up. Get everything all fine. Get a Prepcheck done on listing and then go back and, to your horror, those that you think you have erased will have some life in them. It's something on the order of trying to jump up and down on a bed made out of steel, you know. It doesn't sink.

Charge on a goals list is expended only by listing of goals, not by nulling of goals. It's only by listing. And you really got to get that list flat. What was your exact question?

Female voice: Umm. On making a second test ...

On making a second test ...

Female voice: The – the, yeah – for completeness.

Yeah.

Female voice: You use those same first goals.

Yeah. Well, it doesn't matter whether you use first goals, last goals, but I actually would take, just because it's more seemly to the pc, I would take some goals I had just done. I'd just tell the pc to shut up and read them once. Just read them once. Not try to null anything. Just spend all of my time watching the meter, see, you know. "*To catch catfish. To shoot tigers. To ride waterbucks.*" And keep that thing in the center.

You know that a complete goals list stays in about three goals on a page of thirty or forty. Ohh, that's ... And I can tell every time by looking at that part of the goals list, which was added on and has been nulled. You can't tell by the number of strikes opposite the first of the goals list.

Let's say a fellow did a goals list last April. And the first five pages have got X's and slants after them and they've been nulled out four times and all of that sort of thing and they died hard, you see. And, you can't take those first few pages and tell anything about how easy the thing is nulling because obviously those are old goals that have been gone over before the list was completed, while the list was still charged. So to make a real test of the thing, you just glance at the pc's goals list the auditor has been doing on the pc and take that – a section that he has been nulling since he added the last goals. Well, that doesn't mean three or four goals. You could add three or four, I mean you went into a long business of listing, see.

Now, when you go down and null those things, that's the page to look at for the test. And you just look at that page and you'll find in, in, in, out, in, in, in, out, in, in. Oh, come off of it. Come off of it. That goals list is not complete. That is all there is to that. It's not complete. You can actually test by nulling, you can test by reading to the pc, you've – there are numbers of ways of testing given in the 3D Criss Cross info letter and they're just all – that list is charged. You want it to go out, out. This is just on three reads, see. In. Out, in. In. Out, out. That's the end of that page. And then you really know. You really know.

Now, in view of the fact that it really doesn't take much charge off the case to list goals, it's – you sort of had it, you see. Hence, your long, long lists, the long, long lists; because listing a goal doesn't take much charge off per goal, see. It's not like listing items. You list items and the charge just goes off in all directions. *Zoom, zoom, zoom, zoom, zoom*. But not listing goals. You don't get proportionate quantities of charge off. And when I first looked at this, I myself had found enough goals and had them stay in without making long and arduous lists, that I was obscured on this particular fact and after a great deal of study, of what I was doing – not just what you were doing, but I also myself was doing on goals and the trouble I had had occasionally on goals and so on – I recognized you had to list the charge off the goals list. And if you got the charge off of the goals list, why, *viola!* You'll find the goal, bang! Just like that. Stands up like Pikes Peak, you know. It's very obvious. But if you haven't got all the charge off, it's mixed up in all this other charge stuff.

Now, don't feel that you could list the list until no goal would read. The goal will still read. Now, theoretically and only theoretically, you could list goals until only the goal would read three times for three reads, see. Theoretically. But you'd probably have to list about 50 percent more goals than you would have to have, see, just to take the last bit of charge off.

Rudiments really have to be in for goals listing. Otherwise the charge doesn't blow as you list the list, see. Listing goals is auditing. Another question's going to come up in line with this.

I probably should have given you a 3GA lecture this second lecture, but I was half of a mind to do so, but I got a piece of technology that's in the middle of something here. And un-

til that's wrapped up, I didn't care to really give you a lecture on it. Now I haven't even got a withhold on you.

And, but listing goals can be done by a pc all by himself, see, perfectly happily. Perfectly valid. It is not self-auditing. Don't put it under that category. They've been doing this kind of thing all their lives, sitting around wondering what their goal is. It's just life, you know. So let them go ahead and make a goals list and even keep whanging them along with the end of the towel saying, "All right. All right. So you're all run down at 350. Well, go on. List it up to 850."

You know, just keep pushing them that way. You're not bothering to get their rudiments in or anything like that and then give the list a test as your auditing action to find out whether or not it gives TA action. But to do that, you'd better get the rudiments in. You'd better give them a little bit – you'd better give them a Prepcheck like the June 11th bulletin, see. And then give that list a test. And if you got TA action, you could go on listing, and probably will, but don't be harassed if the pc keeps going home and turning out lists of 50 or 60 and bringing them in. Feel this is fine, not otherwise. Perfectly okay.

Now, when we get into listing lines of items from that goal, we get into a slightly different proposition because I myself am piloting through and figuring out.... A lot of individual listing without an auditor can be done with the resulting gains. There is no doubt about this. It's possibly five or six to one, however. You spend five or six hours if you were listing by yourself to accomplish what you would accomplish in about one hour of listing with an auditor. It's quite interesting. Quite interesting that you can do individual listing. I'm doing a lot of listing like that myself right now because there is no way you got any auditing time for me. Everybody's studying, processing. No time to process, you know. That sort of thing.

But listing only gets out of hand – if you're doing it personally and individually – if you don't get an occasional Prepcheck to straighten out the subject of listing, you see. Now, a guy doing a Prepcheck on himself in order to continue listing, now, now, now we're in trouble, see. Now, we're going to go to hell in a balloon if we don't watch it. So if individual listing were taking place, you would have to have at least a Prepcheck going on by an auditor. That would be your minimum requirement.

You have to watch also an equality of list. You have to make sure those lists stay the same length. And people listing by themselves get careless about this. And they run on and all of a sudden they're 250 items ahead of any other list. And they get sick at their stomach and dizzy and they feel terrible. They go around in horrible shape for three or four days and then they suddenly say, "I wonder if one of these lists is longer than another."

The best way to check it is not by numbering items but just by numbering pages. You don't have to be accurate – 400, 400, 400 – because about the average number occurs on a page. If you write very small, you can take a double spread of your legal-size paper. You know. And put four lists on that double spread. You can see whether or not they're even fast enough. But just do it – "equality by pages." There are this many pages and this many pages, you know, that many pages. So don't try to do it by number of items. Do it by number of pages. You'll come out much better in the long run.

But apparently listing all by itself as an action – whether of goals or of items – apparently don't come under the heading of self-auditing. They don't – they don't have the same thing. But listing of items – you apparently get lots less charge off, or listing of goals you get lots less charge off than you would under an auditor, see. So just be prepared to list lots longer. But it's a good thing to know that.

You get swamped with pcs sometime and you got four pcs going clear left and right and they are standing around on one foot and then the other foot and you figure if you keep going this way, by the time you've delivered a thousand hours of auditing necessary to clear them by Christmas and it's to your interest to clear them fairly rapidly, why, just keep giving them a swift kick and tell them to list and bring their lists in and prepcheck them, see. And then list awhile after you finish the prepcheck and get them – lists equalized again and let them go list awhile, you know. They won't do themselves any harm at all. This is actual experience on this line.

They will do this. They'll change the lines. They'll wobble. They'll just decide the line should be worded wrong – differently. They all of a sudden reword their line, particularly if it's right there ahead of a very heavy item.

The reason I didn't give you a lecture on 3D Criss Cross tonight is definitely in the direction of listing lines, lines, wording of lines. I'll tell you something about that. I'll give you as much as I know about it.

You've got four vectors. There's the vector of inflow. There's the vector of outflow. There's a bulletin on this. And then there's the inhibition of the inflow and the inhibition of the outflow. On beingness goals, the wording want-not-want, oppose-not-oppose, is apparently adequate. At least it's cleared to date an awful lot of people. But they all had beingness goals. How interesting. Or they had goals they were interpreting in this way. Or they got by with it somehow. Now, we have just collided with doingness goals. And there's doingness goals and there's havingness goals. And the horrible thought has reached in to the midst of this happy state of affairs that maybe the lines for a doingness goal have to be worded differently than the beingness goal and maybe the lines for a havingness goal have to be worded differently than the other two.

At the moment, I'm only working on a doingness goal and now this is a – quite a problem. If you draw on your sheet there two – go ahead and draw – two arrows facing each other. Just draw two pointed arrows facing each other. Name one outflow and the other inflow. And then below that draw two little arrows facing the opposite directions. In other words, on the inflow, draw one facing the opposite direction. Little, short arrow. And on the outflow draw a little, short arrow which is facing against the outflow. Get the idea?

Now, you draw these four arrows. The inflow and the outflow are the main flows. But those little, tiny arrows are the things that oppose the main flows. You've got to list at least this many things to make the package unwind on a goal and the pc go Clear. Now, it's very fine to have that inflow one and the outflow one and so forth. To have all of these nicely coincidental and just worded "want" you see, "not-want." See, that'd be the little short arrows – "not-want." That's the opposition to "want" and then the other one to be "opposed" and the

little, short arrow under that one to be "not-opposed." That wording has been adequate so far in the goals worded.

We're all of a sudden starting to run into a strata of doingness goals where this wording is not adequate and where this situation has begun to exist: where the pc confuses – because there's – isn't any seeming difference between them to the pc, the "not-oppose" and "not-want." So he actually is wording the outflow, the inflow and a third line. The inflow and the outflow and a third line – which overlists one line, doubles the listing on one line and omits another line entirely. And on that four – four-line wording that you have there, the pc usually is listing only these: The "want" – call that the outflow line just for the fun of it – the "oppose" which is the inflow line and then "not-oppose," because "not-want" when you get into doingness, is too identified with, "not-oppose." And actually all he really does is, "not-oppose" mostly "not-opposes" all the way down the line. Or he could go in reverse and list only the "not-wants" and just skip the "not-oppose." In other words, when you ask him "not-oppose" he just lists the "not-want." In other words, it isn't articulated enough for the pc to get this thing straightened out.

It is on a beingness goal, but it isn't on doingness goals, so we run into this limitation. What we really want, is the outflow line can, of course, be designated as, "want to do this goal" whatever it is, and the inflow line would be "oppose this goal" whatever it is. You don't – you're not using the word "this goal" that I'm just giving you "this goal" instead of fabricating a goal for you.

And then on the inhibition line – you see, the inhibited outflow – you know, your four flows: outflow, inflow, inhibited outflow, inhibited inflow. Those are the four basic flows. If you haven't got that many, it won't go together. Of course, God help us if we have to list sixteen flows or something like that. See, that would give us all the flows there are, but you don't need that many to clear a pc, fortunately. But you do need an articulation of these four flows so the pc never makes a mistake. He never comes a cropper, he doesn't. And to do that, you'd have to word them something like this: "Want to goal." And then that inhibition line down there, "pullback" or some such wording "from goal."

You see, there's your outflow. Then there's the "pullback," see. This "pullback" vector has got to be just called just that on a doingness goal. Something that gives this distinct idea that it's a pullback of an outflow. In other words, taming and slowing down that outflow. And then over here, on the inflow, well, you have "oppose," well, that's dandy. It's all perfectly all right. No reason to change the word "oppose" or the wording of that line who or want – "who or what would oppose goal" – undoubtedly the i-n-g form of the goal. That's fine. But how about the opposition to the opposition? We'd have to have something that said, "pull back the opposition."

"Who or what would restrain opposition to the goal?" You see that other line? "Who or what would restrain opposition to the goal?" And we get a whole new series of packages. So you got – you got wording that goes something like this: "Who or what would – Who or what would – pull back someone or something from, 'to catch catfish?'" See, goal. "Who or what would pull back something or someone – someone or something from catching catfish?" see. "Who or what would want to catch catfish? Who or what would oppose catching cat-

fish?" And "Who or what would restrain opposition to catching catfish?" That would be the fourth line. Well, this would probably clear even a doingness goal, you see. But this is under present action. It is better to have just that wording you've got right now on any kind of a doingness goal than the earlier wording. The earlier wording's liable to get you into trouble if you have a doingness goal.

We've all of a sudden come up with several doingness goals. We hadn't been listing them before. Apparently, beingness goals are easier to find or something like that, see.

Now, you know what I'm talking about? It's got to communicate to the pc that he's got to list a bunch of items that would want to do this goal, see. Whatever it is. And a bunch of items that would pull him back from doing this goal or pull back items from doing this goal. And it would oppose doing this goal and something that would restrain opposition to the goal. And then we get the four main flows expressed properly, particularly for a doingness.

What has entered the complication on it is a thetan who has a doingness goal usually winds up in a stuck flow and then he has a hell of a time for himself. See, he's stuck flow. Let's say the goal is "to shoot buffalo." Well, man, he's not about to be able to shoot buffalo after all these trillennia. The mere thought of shooting buffalo causes him to put on the brakes with a scream, see. And you've got to list what's putting on the brakes with a scream. Now, only this little question enters into all of this. Apparently, he could also get answers on "could" and "can't" for the goal, making six lines, throwing everything to hell, throwing it all out of balance and in actual fact you're moving on up toward your sixteen. Those four lines, as far as we know at the present moment, would operate as a clearing action.

Now, I am fully prepared to have a havingness goal require a different set of words. Life is interesting, isn't it? Get something all buttoned up and then somebody falls in your lap and says, "Hey!"

Of course, all the laws of motion are active in these goal lines, you see and the poor guy who has an outflow or a reaching or a "meet up with" type of goal has gotten on a stuck flow, so he's accumulated tremendous numbers of things which are inhibiting him from performing the goal. And frankly, he is much more likely to perform the goal than not to perform the goal. The mere fact that he has that goal is giving him trouble in executing it. The fellow who has "to throw away bread" as a goal, you see. You let a piece of bread – just sit – put it on the kitchen table, the far corner of the kitchen table, you see and without any human volition of any kind whatsoever, I guarantee you that piece of bread or that whole loaf of bread is going to slither across and slap him in the face. He's going to be the damnedest collector of bread you ever ran into. And yet he might stand for hours in front of a shop window realizing he couldn't possibly even come close to that bread much less throw it away. And that nobody could ever truck bread or do anything with bread. These are the social convictions he is now saddled with. They're not being expressed in the goal form, but he wants to really do the goal form, but he is in a position where he would – really would hardest dramatize something the complete reverse. And then he will also tell you if you omit these lines that his case isn't moving, that nothing is happening, that nothing could happen, that nothing is reaching anything. And, of course, he's just telling you what the basic goal is. But that's because you're omitting

this restrained outflow line. And the restrained outflow line is the one he never notices. And that's quite interesting.

Now, how we get over this particular hump – this is an easy one. We'll get over this hump, but it is a hump that's been brought on. For instance, we've had a pc here that had a – had an outflow goal which is kind of an outflow around inflow goal, see.

And a redesign of lines – a redesign of lines lets it come up easier on the pc. But this pc's lines were misworded. She might have gone Clear on the first wording without any difficulty whatsoever if they hadn't been overlisted and if the wording hadn't been completely changed. The pronoun was changed in the goal and made a different goal and so forth. Made a mess out of it. Well, anyhow, how are you getting along with that?

Female voice: With what?

The goal.

Female voice: Her auditor's on GAE.

Huh?

Female voice: Her auditor's on GAE.

Oh, your auditor's on GAE. All right. How do you like that? Not only is it not moving, but the auditor then gets put on GAE. People don't have any luck at all.

All right. I told you all I know about that. It'd be safest to word by the wording I gave you on any goal if you want to know the truth of it. And then any little falderal on the situation wouldn't mess you up. You had to be just a little more positive. Completely in spite of the fact that we've had nine people go free needle with the original wording, see. But the interesting part of it is that the doingness and reachingness type of goal wasn't going free. So the old man suddenly pulled up his socks and said, "Here it is. And – the Marines are about to land." Landed, figured it out and triggered it up and so on. What are you going to do when I'm not around to fix that up?

Anyhow, let's have another question. Yes, Jean.

Female voice: Um – question on listing.

Yeah?

At what point can you begin to allow your lists to go uneven towards the end of listing?

At what point can you allow your lists to go uneven toward the end of listing. Now, you mean the – when needles are going free?

Female voice: Yes.

Ahhh. At what point? The point of the first free needle. At what point can you allow your lists to go uneven at the end of listing. And by that end of listing, she doesn't mean in the session. She means in series of intensives adding up to clearing. She's talking about clearing now.

All right. And that is taken care of by the law of the free needle. You never list a free needle. *Never. Never. Never. Never. Never. Don't. Don't. Don't. Don't. Don't* ever list a free... I've had guy after guy around here, Jean, who's try – been trying to list free needles. They don't recognize that a free needle is total expression of the cleanest needle you can get, see. So never, never, never, never, never list a free needle. That answers your question. You list exactly to free needle. You say that needle is free.

Now, just for Esther's benefit, you don't sit there and say, "*Wow! Look at that. A free needle. Hey! Hey! Look at that! Ha! Ho-ho! What do you know? Lying to it, I got a free needle. You won't look. Look. You know.*" [laughter] Poor Esther. That was what happened to her first free needle back in June. Gruesome, man. Huh?

Female voice: I – I'd like to know how come that you can have a free needle when the wording is wrong on the list.

No. You could – you ...

Female voice: That's what happened to me.

Yes. But you could have had one that was a reinterpretation and you were reinterpreting as you did it and so forth. And you see, clearing isn't really all that touchy, but you walk down and you must have been very close to it and then, was it one line or two lines went clear?

Female voice: One.

One line went clear. And that's pretty easy, you see. So what happened to you actually is one line went clear and you had in effect a first dynamic Clear all of a sudden created with the other three lines not free. Freak. But it could happen very easily. It's not even mysterious.

Now, your question, first free needle. After that you don't pay a doggone bit of attention to the length of lines. I'm very glad you asked the question by the way, Jean. Don't pay any attention to the length of lines after that. You just list a free needle.

Female voice: And you never go back to the one that's had a free needle. That's the point that I'm making.

Oh, yes, you do.

Female voice: Ooh.

Because it's not going to be free now.

Female voice: Yes.

Your free needle is a sporadic phenomenon.

Female voice: Yeah.

So, you list line one and all of a sudden you've got a free needle on line one. Take it in the swim. Don't fire off rockets. And say, "Well, that's it." See? Good. The needle's free. There it is drifting. You might have done two or three before you suddenly realized you had a free needle on your hands and you say, "All right. That's it. That's the end of that line ... " Go

to line two. All right. You'll find that the second you start asking for line two, you haven't got a free needle. This is the phenomena that demonstrates itself, see.

And you list, list, list, list, list, list, list and if you're listing, all of a sudden pretty long, not getting anyplace and that sort of thing and the pc is starting to grope for things, it's just as you were doing before. That you've had a free needle doesn't interrupt your behavior with line two. And then you go to line three and you list and you go to line four and you list and maybe line four goes free. Well, the second it goes free, you drop it.

Go to line one. You'll find this is very unfree now because of the four flow manifestation. See, you've moved a lot of bank in on this guy by listing the other three lines, you see. So you list that down. And supposing it doesn't go free. Well, you just list it the normal length of time that you would list a list, don't you see.

Female voice: Yes.

Now, you – maybe you'll find two going free. The second it goes free, you come off of it and go someplace else. You got the idea? So you're keeping up your equality as long as something isn't going free. But then you're going to get to this interesting stage. That's the early stage. That's your first free needle and it cuts in and out and you'll see it a couple of times in the session. And each time you saw it, you come right off of that line, you see. And you'll eventually settle the thing down to where you'll list a line to a free needle and then list the next line for a while. The needle's not now free. And it doesn't go free. And then you list line three and that goes free. And so you go immediately to line four and it doesn't go free. And then you go to line one and it goes free. And you stop right now on it. And shift to your next one, line two and it goes free. And you go to your next line three and it doesn't go free now. And you list that a reasonable length of time. And then you go to list four and it goes free. And the next thing you know, you've got line one to free needle, line two to free needle, line three to free needle, line four to free needle, line one to free needle, line two to free needle, line three to free needle. They go off. They'll shut off every time you start to list the other line. And finally, it doesn't matter what line you list. You're going to have a free needle. And at that time, you don't list another single item. You just – you're there. What you do then is let the pc go around and acclimate himself and – to the operating atmosphere and have him get up in the morning and look at himself on the E-Meter and wondering if he's still at the clear read. You know how they do. And you just assess for a new goal. And maybe his old goals list has come alive again. But probably the safest thing to do is assess for a new goal. See, you have brand-new goals now.

Goes through the whole procedure again, but it takes less long. And once more the law of the free needle is never list beyond the point of a free needle on any given line. Never do it. The reason you never do it is because you're going to list him into the next GPM.

You can overrun a free needle. It's not serious. But you can list a free needle for a half an hour and have the next GPM start coming up. Everything starts pulling the wrong way. You get a terrific rock slam. Everything starts going wild and so on. You're just pulling the next section of track up where it has no business to be at all. And then you run into a little bit of trouble. And your pc's going up and down. Your pc doesn't know what's going on and that

sort of thing. Well, actually, it's a violation of the Auditor's Code. It's running a flat process. Listing a free needle is running a flat process. That's all. Does that answer your question?

Female voice: Yes, sir.

All right. Probably even more thoroughly than you thought.

Female voice: Yes.

All right. But you appreciate it.

Female voice: Yes.

All right. That's better. All right. Yes, Esther.

Female voice: I'd like to know about the – the difference in these goals that are beingness, doingness and havingness goals.

They just say it. They say be and do and have.

Female voice: What I mean – I – I know what the difference is between do, have and be.

No. They – they say it.

Female voice: I know. That I know that, but what I need to know is something different. Can you ...

All right. She wants to know the difference between a beingness, doingness and havingness goal and ...

Female voice: Can you tell ...

Can you tell ...

Female voice: ... the um – how far back these goals would go by the difference in the goals whether it's a doingness or beingness or havingness. Whether it would be further back on the track or so? That's what I mean.

Whether a beingness or doingness or havingness goal would be the furthest back on the track and that sort of thing. I don't think you could tell a thing about it.

Female voice: You couldn't determine that?

I don't know. I have no data on that whatsoever.

Female voice: That's what I'm curious about.

No. I have no data on that whatsoever. By theory, by theory the beingness goal is earliest on the track, the doingness goal is mediumly on the track and the havingness goal is the late one on the track, but that is by theory and how these pancakes are stacked on the griddle and eaten on the plate, God help us, we don't know. Okay?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. Yes, Merrill.

Female voice: I've got something sort of wild here. I wonder, you know, if you ever do find out after you've listed on a goal and everything, sort of what cycle it was. You know?

If you ever find out?

Female voice: Yeah.

Oh, I'm sure you'll know someday.

Track opens up and you suddenly remember where it was and ... Trouble is nobody ever comments on it because the time the thing is run out it is totally unimportant. All right. David?

Male voice: Got a question that's not sequitur to this actually, Ron. It's um – what would you like to see a field auditor leaving here do?

What would I like to see a field auditor leaving here do? Now, that's a – that's an unfair question because its answer is a divisional – I mean I would like to see a field auditor leaving here, help out in a Central Org for a short time just to help himself out. But next to that, I would like to see him sit down somewhere and accumulate any and all people who have ever been trained in his immediate vicinity and start winding them back into the line, pick up any and all pcs he ever had around and straighten them up and start them back into good shape again. In other words, this process is basically an ARC-type action. If you pick up the ARC breaks in your immediate vicinity, or pick up the unfinished cycles in your immediate vicinity, anybody leaving here now at the state of training he should be in, would actually be able to accomplish some rather remarkable things, not at a great sweat. People are more likely to fall on your head if you tell them you're there, you know, than otherwise. There isn't any great action.

For instance, Dorothy Broaded went back to Seattle area and, I don't know, she had about sixty people and all kinds of things were going on and everybody getting very excited for her. She'll have a hard time staying out of the running like I used to do. I had more difficulty not auditing than I did auditing, see. People on the front doorstep all the time and that kind of action.

Now, there are certain – sometimes in a vicinity there are quite a few people who have been trained at one stage or another. Didn't really finish their certification or requirements. Some of them did. Some of them aren't doing anything. Some of them are. There's some Book Auditors around that did this and that. There are some people who are just interested who did this and that, but they're sort of hung up, see, to some degree, or not hung up at all. They may still be going forward, too.

Well, anybody who has his hands on good training and good performance and can do something like that would only have to reach in their particular direction just to some slight degree to get the show rolling. And a lot of the auditors who have left here that – I've had to come down on them with a club. They're just auditing day and night, you know. I mean that kind of thing. And very busy doing lots of things.

So what would I like to see them do? Well, there's lots of things I'd like to see people do, but I know inevitably what they will do. They'll either collect the Scientologists in their

area and see that they get some auditing and straighten the thing out and keep it going or they won't. All right. You bet. Okay.

Male voice: Oh, to carry on with that, John told me when I stopped up to see him that "Don't go out in the sun and cast a shadow because the people will trip over it and you'll be completely snowed under."

Yes. Yes. Poor... That's a good thing. He says don't go out in the sun and – Saint Hill graduate here – don't go out in the sun and cast shadows because people will trip over and you'll be snowed under ever afterwards. That's true. I've gotten some letters from people that he hasn't deigned to write to and they are very upset with him for not instantly getting them 7,640 hours of auditing and that sort of thing. He got more than he bargained for. Yes, Ian.

Male voice: Ron, E-Meter reading.

Right.

Male voice: How soon are we going to get some visual aids on this?

How soon are you going to get some visual aids. Your best visual aid – somebody was telling me a couple of weeks or something like that and I see from a head nod here that it's probably still that same estimate.

Male voice: Maybe a bit earlier.

Huh?

Male voice: Maybe a bit earlier.

Maybe a bit earlier. Your best visual aid at the present moment is not asking questions or putting some guy quasily indifferently into session. The student sits down and takes hold of the cans. Another student sits there and watches the meter. And nobody says anything except the coach and the student. The coach stands behind him. Or no coach. I just sit there and watch the meter. And just call the reads. And call 50 percent of the time no reads and the other 50 percent of the time reads. Now, that in itself is terrific training if entered in upon without messing up anybody's bank or anything like that. And I think possibly anybody doing that here oh, probably at the other end of the line, will be grooved in enough when he's really good at that to collide with the first visual aids we will have. And I think that would get us over the jump. Does that answer your question?

Male voice: Yes, thank you.

You bet. Okay. Any other questions? All right. That's fine. Thank you very much. Have a good auditing day tomorrow and a good weekend.

Good night.

ROUTINE 3GA, PART I

A lecture given on 24 July 1962

Thank you very much. This is the what of what?

Audience: 24th.

The what?

Audience: 24th of July.

It is? Imagine that. It's gotten to be the 24th and you didn't even know it.

First lecture, 24 July AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

All right. Now, I'm going to give you a lecture now on bits and pieces of Routine 3GA. And I do not intend this lecture to be a complete summary lecture on the subject, but it covers changes, up-to-dateness and improvements on 3GA which will make it easier for you to get along and find the pc's goal and get your job done.

Now, although you have seen over the past couple of months a new plateau in auditing formulating rather rapidly and it was quite apparent that I must be working exclusively on things like Prepchecking and that sort of thing, that isn't the case. Most of my attention is very squarely on Routine 3GA and lots of Clears. Now, that is very much to the point – very, very much to the point.

Why you aren't getting Clears goes something like this: The first Routine 3 cleared those who were lucky enough to have found on them a goal which contained their terminal name. It's as simple as that. They found a goal, offhandedly found a terminal and then it turned out that the pc could be run on the goal which included the terminal; that's – we have an example right here.

Now that was the first of the Routine 3 successes and, of course this wasn't a very high percentage because the "to be" goals are in the minority. And we had a "to be." If you had a "to be" goal and you were lucky enough to have found the "To be (blank)" that "blank" as the terminal for the goal that was found, why they went Clear and that was fine.

Now, the next thing that was necessary was a better method of handling this particular goal. And the first Clears made way back when, were found by isolation of a rock. I did the assessments. That doesn't count. I could probably clear people with fifty dozen different technologies, but the point is not whether I can clear people. That's not what we are trying to prove. We wouldn't get very far if that was all that ever happened in Scientology. It would be something on the order of two a year or – you know something like that – three a year between fishing trips and... You know how idle I am anyway.

But we used the same 5-way bracket with the addition of a – of a Prehav Scale. With 5-way bracket – was on the original twentieth Clears – and then we used this same thing, but we additionally added in the Prehav Scale to that and that isn't actually adequate to do more than key out the GPM.

Now, it is rather remarkable that you can key out the GPM, because if you found two, three, four, five wrong goals on a pc and tried to list each one in turn, you'll find this, this GPM is enough to get him down on the mat and break his flaming neck. You know, this is nothing to monkey with.

There's practically nothing disturbs the GPM; that I can guarantee. All experimental activities in an effort to take the Goals Problem Mass and dispel it by ordinary repetitive processing have failed. The best they have ever done was when the goal was very accurately found, was to key the goal out temporarily up to the time the person made his next heavy postulate.

Of course, you've improved him to a point where he can make better postulates. That's great. That's a self-defeating activity, isn't it? At any given moment he is liable to make a postulate of, "I don't have ..." And all Clears go through this stage for the first few weeks, you see – "I really don't quite know whether – what I'm walking a tightrope and dare I breathe." And this sort of a state of mind exists and they have been known to say, "Well, I miss talking to my fellows and I feel all out of sorts with everyone and if I were just aberrated again why I would be happier," see. And they've had it, see. "I'll be aberrated," they say.

Now, the GPM was there to help them out and it would key back in again. In other words, you put an individual into a temporary state and improve his ability to do something and then he goes on and does this thing and if the temporary state you put him into is a temporary state and not a permanent state, why he, of course, hits the banana peel right at that point.

Now, I want to call to your attention that everything that has come along in states has been achieved, at least temporarily, many times. The data on this is good.

Now, early Clears were freed from engrams by an accustomment to masses. You accustomed him to confronting masses by gradient scales was the first method of clearing That's clear back 1948, something like that, see.

Now, any observation that I have done as it comes along is based on the actual observation of the critter. Now, you bang somebody out of his head, you take a – take a roaring psycho and you bang him out of his head and he goes out of his head clean, not dragging a mass with him and he's out there, twenty, thirty feet away, but still talking through his body – you've just got about the sanest, wisest man you ever had anything to *do* with. This is quite remarkable. He would stay that way for minutes. You talk about achieving a temporary state, if you wanted to be excessively cruel to somebody, just do this several times to demonstrate to people how you could change things and you'll louse him up but good.

But that temporary state of Theta Clear has been achieved many times as minutes, days – but in no case longer than five or six days, that I have any record of.

A guy is beautifully Theta Clear – this is why the principle of banging him out of his head, don't you see, you know and he's exteriorized. And he takes his car and he drives downtown and he gets interested in the skyscraper tops around him, you see and he forgets the car as it is sitting there and there is his body in the car at the stop light, you know. And the next thing you know everybody starts hooting horns and there is a lot of confusion. And then he suddenly realizes he's totally capable of abandoning both body and car and he goes back in his head and the next time you can't get him out with an hydraulic jack. The same action will not work this next time, because he has learned that he can't trust himself and all the mechanisms of aberration are still there ready to snuffle him up again. See, he's got all the ridges all ready to pounce, see. All he's got to do is hit the right associative restim-stimuli and bang, there he goes.

Operating Thetan to a lesser degree, but observed, but observed. People have spoken in the middle of the room. People have lifted match sticks. People have mocked-up something that was a shimmering something sitting out there and everybody looking at it saying, "uugghhhh," you know. And of course everybody said, "uugghhhh," and the guy didn't do it anymore, you know. [laughter]

Release – oh, there probably isn't a person in this room that isn't a Release. But the state is so downgraded in relationship to other states, that very few Scientologists ever realized they've ever attained it, you know. They just know that they're on their way and they'll get better and everything will be fine, and so forth. They never think of this in terms of a Release.

And we've got a bunch of Release buttons. If you want to apply for a Release button do so. Beautiful little S and double triangle with a great big red R in the middle of it. Those pretty little stick pins is what they are and they'll be along shortly. They are coming from Ireland. I think they are probably held up in customs.

The future of the British nation is held up in customs! Anything – anything you haven't got, why if you want to know where to lay your hands on it, the *best* chance is just customs, you see.

We brought a little boat in the other day from Norway and customs is just down there worried sick. I mean the customs officers are pacing up and down the dock. They're afraid they won't get their few pounds duty for the stamps, you see; and they were on the phone to Peter. The engines had hardly cooled off, you see, before they were on the phone.

We had no complaints though. They held up – all they did was, it – I think it was only a month or two that they held up the children's toys from America recently. They were doing well. The beep meter I think was held up for a year.

So if you've lost anything or aren't receiving anything, phone customs. Probably get it there.

Well, customs on a national scale is a sort of a ridge. If you don't believe it go down to any customs in any country and you'll see the stuff trying to get out of the country banged up against the stuff trying to get into the country and it's just about the wildest ridge you ever laid your eyes on.

I remember the first time I ever mentioned this during the Philadelphia lectures. And one of the boys there in that particular unit had to go down to customs to get some books that Mary Sue was busy mimeographing over in London. And he had just heard about this, you see, in a lecture and he had thought, "Well, it's one of Ron's exaggerations, hyperbole, you see and metaphor." Or something like that. And he came back and his eyes were as round as saucers, you see. He couldn't even get into the shed because of this ridge, you know. It was the wildest ridge he'd ever looked at.

Well, a thetan advancing to higher states, if he advances through the barbed wire, ridges, barriers, impasses, trigger mechanisms, booby traps that the mind is replete with, of course moves into these states bypassing these things. Why, he's taken too short a cut and the next thing you know he winds himself up in a ridge or something. And that's what happens, that's how they – how they nose dive. You can shortcut any of these states, in other words, to some degree. And then because you haven't actually solved *why* he is in that – in the state he *was* in and then he gets pulled in like a demonstration vacuum cleaner, you see?

Now, the isolation of *why* and *what* pulls him back in marked a tremendous upsurge in clearing because we had our paws right on what happened to the bank, why the bank was that way and so forth. And we called this Goals Problem Mass because the individual has had problems. And he has had problems as identities and these problems as identities of course, found *him* as an identity part of a larger problem. And, of course, he was the mass, the identity and the mass, which was countering another identity and mass and you got these two masses counter-opposed – and you made a problem which hung up in time, very exactly balanced. And then he got to be another identity and this hung another one up and then that was opposed to another mass. And then, then he gets along and his conglomerate aberration by this time is enough to pose him – as a problem to other masses and other masses as a problem to him, don't you see.

And you get this thing and it's just adding up. And if you want to know how many of these identities there actually *are* in the bank, irrespective of the person's goal, just go by doubles. Do about five hundred doubles and you would have the first trillion years of his existence, you see. About five hundred doubles. Now, how many is five hundred doubles?

Well, is – if you – if you started the first day and saved a penny and you doubled your money every day thereafter at the end of thirty days I think you have some, oh, it's – I think it's better than a million dollars.

Doubling goes very fast. So this as an individual is opposing the world as an identity and the world is opposing him as identities and we eventually get this thing stacked up and it becomes pretty wild. And he packs this around and we call it a reactive mind.

Now, the anatomy of the reactive mind is what we are attacking when we are clearing somebody. And if we want this fellow to assume a stable case gain then we have to get out of the road what is going to unstabilize the gain we give him.

So the problem of clearing is actually not making a Clear, but making a Clear who will stay Clear. That, that is the – that is the problem. This state has been achieved temporarily, you see, many times. Some of them quite with good longevity, as far as clearing is concerned. Not speaking now of theta clearing. But the GPM had been keyed out and there it was still

waiting – and he looked at the wrong blond or something like that and – *bow!* There he went again. That was his favorite oppterm, don't you see, and snap and bang and we have the GPM all confounded and complicated once more.

In other words, we are dealing here with a conglomerate mass which goes in pairs, but the pairs oddly enough do not come apart easily unless you get the other pairs restraining the pairs. You are really basically dealing in pairs, but you have another identity opposite each one of the pairs. Don't you see? So it's a four, it's a four-item package by the time it gets up into its full, highest blown complexities.

You've got just the pair, which is the Goals Problem Mass and then just for good measure the thetan stacks in two more identities outside the pair, each one of which reinforce the collision of the pair.

These last two went undetected until some months ago, and then realized that we could smooth it out much faster by taking into account these others. You don't go above this four.

You, by the way could go to sixteen because frankly, fortunately for you, they blow. But outside, you see, these first two, well, you actually could pressure in and get rid of the collision of these two and disintegrate the mass. That's theoretically, see, but you do it much more easily by taking in the retarding pair on the outside of the identity. See, so you got four.

Now, in actuality there are two more outside those and two more outside those and two more outside those, up to the number of about sixteen. And then frankly, added into the GPM, but not particularly – you pay no attention to it in clearing. You have a whole new sixteen known as "the other," see. So now you've got sixteen versus sixteen. Do you see how that is? Well, there's thirty-two flows, you see. And of course you can get a terminal that represents any one of them. You'll find them in cluster.

Now, of course if you wanted to be idiotic about it, you could spring it on up the line, if you had to and you don't have to. You'd have thirty-two versus thirty-two and you could also have sixty-four versus sixty-four. And then, of course, you could have the hundred and twenty-eight versus the hundred and twenty-eight. You get the idea? And then you make up another few years of a thetan's travail on the track.

And by the time you've added this up by doubles on top of the – of any cycle that the fellow has lived on the track. Oh, well, let's say the last hundred million years, see. Let's call that a cycle. That's very, probably a very short cycle. Cycles ere as short as sixty thousand years, ten thousand years, and so forth. But for goals purposes, the way we are assessing now, you will find out that the cycles you're handling usually exceed a hundred million. They are greater than that. We've reached that far back and we're probably cleaning up dozens actually of – of cycle GPM. You see we have reached that far back into the bank.

Well now, look at the multiplicity of items. Now, how many items do you finally list? How many items do you finally list when you are listing out a goal? Well, a very ordinary figure is four lists of ten thousand each. I would consider that an ordinary figure.

In actual fact it isn't quite that wild. I mean, I wouldn't – I wouldn't be *upset*, you see, if it took that many. See, that's within an auditor's expectancy. Four lists of twenty-five hun-

dred each is about, I think from first glance if I remember rightly, it would be considered more or less normal at the moment. We've got data on this now, you see. We've got quite a bit of data.

But we don't care how many. All we care about is how Clear? That's the thing. We want a free needle on each one of the four lists we are going to list from the goal found. Each one listed to free needle and then you're fairly – you're fairly well off then in a stability.

Now, why are you well off in a stability? I mean, why do you think this fellow will stay Clear – any clearer than a 5-way bracket by the Prehav Scale? Well, it's because we're taking what was alter-ised and unalter-ising it, if you follow me.

The fellow made a basic postulate of some sort or another. He had this basic postulate and then he couldn't follow out this basic postulate and every time he tried to follow it out or didn't follow it out, why, he'd run into alter-ises. And these alter-ises or alterations of his basic would form mass and this mass thus formed accumulated and accumulated and accumulated.

And it's something like there's one log can be pulled out of a log jam and cause the whole log jam to go swish down the river. See there might be millions of logs in the jam, but there's just one key log. You pull that one out and nothing else can hold.

Well, the difference in the simile here is that when you pull out the key log, the goal and so on, when you pull *that* out the logs vanish, see. You – when you finally listed this thing out no logs go down the river. See, the trick is there were no logs there in the first place, that weren't alter-ised logs, see. The log existed because it was an alter-is of the prime postulate, see. So in the absence of the prime postulate you haven't got any logs. And that's why we know it doesn't key in, because we have reached the state of "ain't."

Now, it took me quite a while to find out, even after we started these later – these later Clearing Processes, it took me quite a while to find out what happens to the logs, see. Where'd they go, you know? I thought they might go backtrack. I had to be sure, you see. They might go backtrack or they sort of, you know, disappear somewhere on the track or they fit themselves on the track and there they sit, you see, so they are not bunched up now. And the fellow is safe for a long time because they won't bunch up like that again except by accident.

Well, that doesn't happen to be the case. The answer is there are no logs. See, because the logs are composed of an alter-iness of the basic purpose and that is the mass of which they are composed. That's the only way they can continue to exist and that's the only mass in them. And when you get the alter – the thing that is alter-ised out, you get no mass. So that it's a vanishment of mass. It's not an erasure of mass, it just – because all the mass is just an alter-is.

All this is quite fortuitous. You're just lucky, that's all. I didn't plan it that way. Needn't thank me when your bank as-ises. Only thank me for the fact that it *does*, not why it does, you see. Because the basics of the thing are, of course, have been hunted up.

Now, it's on the basis of the fact that what a thetan made he can unmake. And it is not based on this premise of the thetan that *anything* you make is better than making nothing, because this bank is wholly composed of things he *wishes to Pete* he had never made. And that's why it's so invisible to him. It's the things – it's the things that if he just sat down and

thought about it for a little while he just wouldn't want to have anything to do with it at all. So he puts it into an invisible crush. He makes a superinvisibility out of this bank and only after you begin to audit the right goal does it start showing up to any degree. And then all of a sudden he becomes aware, "Where did this come from?" You got it? "Oh, no wonder I squinch my eyes all the time. You see there's a black ridge been sitting across from..." as the thing dissolves, you know. Where did it go? Well, it didn't go anywhere, see. It was composed of an alter-ness, which now not alter-ised, isn't.

It's like making taffy. It's like making taffy and then uninventing sugar and water. Of course, there would be no taffy. You've uninvented them. You picked them up prior to the time you made the taffy and then of course, there is no taffy. This is the – no matter how sticky the taffy was of course, if you took a time prior to the time you made it and made the sugar and the water and the flavoring cease to exist, then, of course, the taffy's gone, too. No matter how many times you'd pulled it or anything else, it would still go.

That, by the way, is a happy thought to those who had been stirring their banks for a long time. [laughter]

Now, it doesn't happen to matter – it doesn't happen to matter what happened to you in auditing or what got keyed in, if you get the basic postulate and that section of track from then till now goes. Because, of course, any bad auditing or upsetting situations in auditing or ARC breaks or not liking this, that – those all go. They're all pieces of log, too, that are made out of alter-is. Don't you see? And you don't have to go back and erase all the bad sessions you have ever had or something like that, after you have gotten Clear. You're also lucky there, if you have ever had any.

Now, to a large degree clearing depends upon an automaticity of perfection, which isn't an automaticity, but a truth. You see, if you'd look at it, you say, "If you took off all of these other things, why, something would be left." Well, fortunately for you something is left, which is you. But you have a sort of an automaticity which isn't an automaticity. I mean it – it's just an is-ness. It's a total is-ness.

Your predilection for perfection is the only thing that causes you to find fault with the universe and this manifests itself on lower scale in nattering. And on upper scale just things straighten out.

Now, frankly, as a philosophy of existence this is much, much too simple to pay anybody who is writing at so much per word. The is-ness of the individual is perfection. It's only his alter-ness that is imperfect.

When you get an individual up to a point where the things he has alter-ised are not causing him now to think in an alter-is, he thinks in a perfection, which is an automatic sort of perfection, don't you see. I mean there it is. We use this word automatic in another way in Scientology. I just say it goes on without his paying any attention to it, which is also a very interesting point and once more you are lucky.

Let us say you had always – you always – well, it'd give you a very, very easily understood – let's say you had motes in front of your eyes. You always had these motes, little sparks and so forth and whenever you looked at things, why you normally saw these motes.

Well, now you *don't* see those notes. See, when you've got the bank cleared up, you see right. That's what I mean. There's a – let's instead of calling it automaticity of perfection, let's call it a – the is-ness of perfection. It simply exists. You see right without any further effort or action. That's where you're lucky, you see.

Now, a body can go beyond the point of no return and it does not right itself to a totality – well, particularly if it's been tampered with surgically or something like that. But within meaningful limits and these are interesting enough to be very useful to us. That is the meaningful limits of this situation, the body, to the degree that it is possible, reverts to a perfection.

Now, the individual, let us say, had always suffered from ulcers. Well, you clear him up, he ceases to suffer from ulcers, you see, which is quite, quite interesting. In other words he doesn't *do* anything else to patch up his ulcers.

This is so much so that you could say that this universe is only an accumulation of imperfections. It's, as I say, it doesn't make a very wordy philosophy and that is why the thetan protests. But by his protest and his effort to attain perfection by a *doingness*, he of course alters the existing *imperfections further* and fixes them right there – *boom!* There they are.

It's something like a fellow having dents in the fenders of his car and he goes out and with a big wrench and a hammer, you see, twists the fenders around. And he says, "Well, they look more crumpled than before. Maybe if I banged the car for a while against the fence the fenders would come straight." So he does that and he goes around and he looks at the fenders and he says that, "You know, that isn't so good. Those aren't so good," and so forth and "Maybe, maybe if we – maybe if we got out in thick traffic jams, maybe other cars butting up against the fenders might iron them out." And that doesn't work either. He tries that. He has a final solution – he had two final solutions – he finally rolls the car up in a ball, you know. He can do that in various ways. Take it down to a junk merchant. They have these pneumatic presses.

Actually it's very funny to see a car after it's been hit with one of these super-ton pneumatic presses. It's a – it's a flat sheet, but you can still see the impressions of head lamps and things. So he does that and rolls it up in some fashion or another. But look, if he couldn't actually sell it or get rid of it, you see, he'd have to have that around the yard. So he has a solution for that. He doesn't see it. Those are his last two solutions, you see. Squash it up in a ball. See, that's not so good, so he doesn't see it.

Now, when he's done all these odd actions he now has some – some bits and pieces that he can't account for. And in view of the fact that these bits and pieces are collided with other bits and pieces, with nicely balanced velocities and that sort of thing, you get a built-up GPM. And that's how it is, see.

He lives this life correcting imperfections, you see. You know, straightening out the fenders with sledge hammers and smashing the car up. Finally he rolls it up in a ball and then doesn't see it. It's a sort of a give up of the whole lot, you see. He's sorry he ever started it in the first place.

Well, nearly every thetan has free track and if you take too much free track away from him he often gets unhappy. You know, he's got a nice picture of a brunette and she's got a

picture of a muscle man, bulging muscles, superperfection of some kind or another. I dare you to try to erase one of those one time. If you can find one on the pc, try to erase it. You're not going to get anyplace trying to erase it, see. That's the old secret in Book One of why you couldn't erase pleasure moments. You couldn't do anything with pleasure moments.

So you do have free track. Well, this free track is visible and you can run the pc on it. And you can actually erase less unhappy incidents on this free track and you can actually straighten out what we once called his whole track. But it is whole – something like the idea that you have a thousand-mile-long fence composed of a stake every foot. Got that, a thousand-mile-long fence, there's a stake every foot. All right. Let's omit all but one stake per mile. Just leave one stake per mile on this thousand-mile fence and that would be a fragment of his free track. One stake per mile.

What happened to the other stakes? Well, they're over in the field back of the fence, crunch, and we don't see them anymore. Those are the ones he wants nothing to do with.

Now, these things are compounded into identities. Actually every one of these balls is an identity and it contains in it a full track all by itself. And you will sometimes see one of these things start disintegrating and it will scare you half to death because it looks like you've suddenly accumul... oh, there's various phenomena, not necessarily this one, but it will look like you have a fantastic magazine of 35-millimeter-slide pictures or something. And, "Where are these from?" you know and you start pawing away at these things and all of a sudden everything goes black.

But for a little while – for a little while it's very interesting. Everything is sort of down in size and there are all kinds of little mechanisms that thetans use, not necessarily the 35-millimeter mechanism. They have many more. Sometimes they are in motion-picture reels that just unreel. He suddenly pulls off part of it and he'll get something unreeling. How interesting, you know. *Clank!* "I'd better not go through that." [laughter, laughs] He forgets himself, you know.

Well, you've got various phenomena associated with this sort of thing, but you start running him up and down free track and one day you'll run him into an engram that has a black edge. You'll say, "I wonder what else is over there." And you just say, "Well, go up and down the free track."

"Oh I'm not so sure about that, mmmm-mmmm. What's that little black edge? What's in there?" you know. And he looks very hard in there and there is a shattering sound and a big chunk of the GPM closes in and he doesn't – "Where's the track? It's dark in here," see. That's the immediate response.

What happened? Well, the only thing that happened is all these pieces that he has carefully scrunched, all these lives he has lead that he doesn't want to lead anymore and he's carefully scrunched these things, you see and then has said he isn't going to *see* them anymore, they're not-ised totally. What's happened is, is one of these things has come back and he has seen it against his postulate of never seeing it again.

Fortunately, that's not much of a basic postulate and doesn't get in the road of clearing. But it certainly makes life rather incomprehensible. It makes it exciting to say the least. You

start somebody up and down the free track and he has beautiful, clear, three-dimensional pictures, except the train of the wedding gown in the marriage is black and that whole corner of the church is black, actually. And he says, "What's over there?" And you run him into there and, well, actually probably what's beyond this is half a dozen lives as the Master Inquisitor, see, using churches for the sole and exclusive purpose of saving souls by burning bodies, you see. And he'll have all of these lives stacked up and when he went to this wedding – first time he'd been in a church for a long time, you see – and something that he had beautifully not-ised and said he isn't going to see anymore, you see, that has appeared to a point of where it is slightly noticeable.

This is a tremendous magnification of the ordinary manifestation of somebody being uncomfortable in a locale. This fellow isn't uncomfortable. He thinks it's getting married. You trace it down, it will be all these lives as a Master Inquisitor, don't you see. And it's the church that keyed it in. He didn't even know this.

He goes along after that thinking it's marriages upset him. That won't be the case at all. He goes near a church and goes kind of *screek*. Every time he goes near one he sees a little plainer this mechanism of the blackness, don't you see. And he finally says he doesn't like noise so that's why church bells get on his nerves, you see.

And oddly enough he has some predilection for graveyards. He seems to find them very nice and soothing to walk in. As a matter of fact, there's sort of a sensation comes over him, a sort of a – a beautiful sadness comes over him. So he stays away from churches and walks in graveyards, you see.

Well by *staying* away from the church he's keying it in. By walking in the graveyard he's keying it in. By going in the church he's walking it in and staying out of graveyards he's keying it in. He hasn't got a prayer, see. That is the life he lived. That is part of his experience. That is part of the recorded experience of that individual which he has packaged up and said, "This is an individual and I am now dead and this is all put away and I won't have anything more to do with this. And now, I am all reborn again and isn't it wonderful."

It's something like the fellow who has a number of murdered bodies in the closet. And he's put just a few too many in the closet to close the door and he never can really get the door shut. Now, he'll take anything rather than open the door. He will just suffer anything – arthritis, rhombosis, medicos, he'll suffer the most fantastic things rather than let that door open another crack.

The funny part of it is he doesn't *dare* let it open. He hasn't dared in all this trillennia, because aside from Scientology there was nothing could have as-ised it.

I know whereof I speak because I've tried to do a number of things with the GPM and no ordinary repetitive process works on the GPM. Nothing works on the Goals Problem Mass, to date, except just exactly what we are doing with it.

We finally find the prime postulate. He said, "I am going to be good." That's what he said, trillennia ago. And then he ran into men who were bad. So of course, he'd better straighten these fellows out.

You find this fellow with this postulate sitting in Sing Sing, you see. And the odd part of it is he'll still tell you the computations from the basic postulate. "I'm just a good boy" and all that sort of thing. He'll give you the lot.

But of course this thing has been going on. Now, it isn't one every life. You can actually find a postulate or a goal, if you please, in front of every engram, in front of every life, in front of anything and everything you can find a goal. You don't get anyplace much running these things.

There is a process if you're interested that would be handier than others to do something with and, "Tell me something you have decided." That's a sort of a reverse angle on a postulate. Not, "What goal have you made?" but, "What decision have you made after the facts?" And it's quite interesting in helping out psychosomatic ills and that sort of thing. But it doesn't do anything really to the GPM.

No wisdom which has come up before Scientology has even scratched the GPM. People could learn to live with it, see. People could suffer themselves, they could suffer themselves to be sufficiently able to act in spite of, don't you see? Or in an effort – in an effort actually to experience and condition themselves to it; if they could do this, this is always the hope – if they can experience themselves sufficiently, why, they would no longer mind it and it would go.

These were philosophies of one kind and another. Seldom has man had the fortitude to get up to a point of experience where he no longer minded it. You see, this was not a very general track.

Now, if there was – you'll find this philosophy around. You will find some people in Scientology, I remember one of them in Brisbane. He thought after you ran an engram you had to experience for a while in order to right the engram. All right, okay, that's true. You have to be in the environment a while, see.

But let's go further than this. This philosophy has existed, *in extremis* – undoubtedly has worked. But is there any other way of attacking the situation whereby you suddenly find yourself missing this GPM. Now, that's what's interesting to us. Yes, well, there is and you have to examine the anatomy of this thing and you find out how it got there. And you got there from a man's lack of integrity to himself. And that is the basic evil.

You want to know what evil is – it's man's lack of integrity to himself. Hamlet, Act 5, Scene 3 – Act 1, Scene 3, can't quite – "And this above all to thine own self be true." He knew whereof he spake, undoubtedly there's a lot of other advice in the exact speech – same speech that isn't true. But the point – the point here is one's lack of integrity troubles him, that is to himself, it is not to others, troubles him to such a degree that he has to forget what he is being faithful about, in order to live at *all*. So the hole that a thetan can put in his own is-ness of perfection is to be false to himself. He makes the postulate that launches him off on to a career and then he cannot be true to that postulate and he accumulates masses and he goes astray and he accumulates imperfections and all sorts of wild, bad experiences exist and he has to bury that thing. He doesn't unmake it, he just buries it. And he goes on and on and on with that, dragging that buried corpse behind him of his own lack of integrity to himself.

Now, oddly enough man actually can betray families, sell West Point – do all sorts of mad things and find himself not greatly affected over any term of lives. Oh, it will make one go smash, you see – but he recovers from that sort of thing.

It's not even in the same order of magnitude to be faithless to oneself, one's own postulates. Not even of the same order of magnitude. Unfaithfulness on the first dynamic would rank as high, let us say, as the Washington Monument. And unfaithfulness on other dynamics would be about as high as a blade of grass in the park alongside of it.

That is not any invitation to sin, but if you are – if you think I am weighing heavily upon you to be awfully good these days because I want you to pick up your overts or that sort of thing – think of me looking over your shoulder and supervising your behavior because of the overt-motivator sequence. You can take that off during Prepchecking and that's just dandy. And it does a very – bunch of nice, little, interesting things and it will straighten out this and that and make a person feel happier. And you pick up his missed withholds and he will be nicer to his fellows and all that sort of thing.

Well, when you are handling Routine 3 you are up to the top of the Empire State Building in terms of magnitude, you see. This is tall. This is big as the other is small. And what you are doing is picking up the basic overt against self. And the basic overt against self that a thetan is capable of is to betray his own postulates.

You see some of this. A fellow feels real bad sometimes. He makes a bunch of New Year's resolutions. He says, "I'm going to be nice to the little woman. I'm going to give her some of the paycheck," you know. And, "I'm going to be – I'm not going to shout at the kids anymore. I'm going to stop running over dogs for fun," you know, all these sort of things.

A few weeks later – a few weeks later, why, he comes home and he's got the paycheck and the wife's had a hard day, you see and she's sort of nattering around one way or the other. And he said, "Well, why should I give her any of the paycheck?" you see, "after all." And he sticks it in his pocket. He sort of feels a little bit degraded about it. And then the kids come roaring out of the – out of the street and shout and scream, something of the sort, just as he's sitting down to read his newspaper, you know. And he looks at them and he says, "*Shut up,*" see. And somehow or another he feels just a little bit degraded, you see. And then he's going down the street and a dog starts barking at him. It's a particularly mangy, ornery-looking dog, you see, so that lessens the overt and he all of a sudden steps on the brakes fast, swerves the car and runs over the dog, you see. He goes on.

And he's talking to a friend about a week later and he said, "Well, you know, I used to when I was young have a lot of pride and that sort of thing, but these days, you know, I realize that as you go on in life that – that life is a degrading sort of thing, you see and being married is the most degrading." You see. He'll have some big rationale, don't you see. No, he just disobeyed all of his New Year's resolutions – that the overt against self is of greater magnitude than the overt on any other dynamic.

Now, of course, underlying and back of all postulates there is another overt, which is an unspoken overt. He didn't postulate anything ahead of this overt, see. I mean, he didn't postulate this one. This one *is* and he actually can have an overt on himself greater than an articulated postulate. He can simply be imperfect. That – it's quite interesting.

And if you have a heart-to-heart talk – if you want to – if you run into Socrates or something and you don't know what to talk about and – or if you run into somebody who is terrific in the field of philosophy and he's a great figure-figure merchant, why, you can tie up the whole evening or the whole debate just on the subject of man's recognition of his own imperfection. Honest, it's a subject that they just can't help but discuss with you. Not recognition of the imperfection with others. They all know about that, but this other is a more fundamental fundamental – man's desire and reach for perfection of self and so forth.

Now, most of them – most of them will go at it on an entirely reverse vector. They will say, "Man is evil, will be nothing but evil and is trying to attain nothing but evil." That's how far they have lost sight of it. And when somebody starts to preach that philosophy, you know how many overts he's got against the first dynamic. You know how many of his own postulates he has thrown aside and you know how big his GPM is. You can also estimate the number of times he's going to be sick. You can do all sorts of things, see. That's your – those are judgments that you can make along this line.

Now, people with high critical – people with other manifestations are actually – are actually not as bad off as people who are not critical at all anymore, but they get in our hair so we often detest them.

Well, remember there's a state below that, that's probably normal. It's, "Well, why should I interfere with the other fellow? Live and let live. That is none of my business. Who would want any responsibility for that? Well, I would have no business interfering with the lives of my fellows." Don't you see, all of this sort of thing.

That is all saying, "I've had it." It's also saying by this time, "I am – you want to know who I am," you see the fellow was saying to you, "Well I am a GPM, that's who I am." And you can also hang a sign on his nose and say, "No thetan lives here."

But the significances of clearing are based upon the mechanics and fundamentals I have just talked to you about. It's out of these fundamentals and mechanics that you get an understanding of clearing. And I've given you – in spite of the rapidity and colloquialosity of it – given you the basic fundamentals from which you could extrapolate or predict what it would amount to or what you could do wrong in attaining the state.

Now, it points out, for instance, that if you clear somebody you don't wind up with a criminal. See, it gives the moral aspects of clearing. And if you fail to get a prime postulate, that all you were doing is adding more logs to the logjam by running it, because you've not pulled the key log. And you've pulled the wrong log and of course it just gets more jammed up. At least more water appears to be jamming up back of the logs. And it tells you that alter-is-ness of the bank itself will increase the mass of the bank and increase its activity or reactivity.

Well, that is what you are finding in a pc, but you are not actually looking... This is why I have always told you. "Don't process what's *wrong* with the pc, see. Process against what's *right* with the pc and you'll win." You must process the thetan, you see, not the engram. And if you process directly and immediately at the target of a prime postulate, you will find that the GPM gets in your way to the degree that you are inexpert in reaching back toward the prime postulate, directly.

Now, the less expertness you have the more GPM you collide with in trying to audit the pc. So, if you were just sloppy, sloppy, sloppy in all departments and activities – terribly sloppy – you would collide with *nothing* but GPM and you would never clear the pc.

This is quite interesting. The more rapidly that you can locate a goal, the more chance you have of finding a goal. You see, it gives you all that kind of a maxim to go on, you see. The less directly you reach for the pc's goal and find it, the more GPM you are going to collide with. This is quite interesting. And, of course, then, the more alter-is you are going to introduce into the sessions and the bank and so forth.

You spend any time condemning a pc for being aberrated during an auditing session and after that you've had it. You've had it. Now, you've got lots of GPM to monkey with because you keyed it in like mad because that's what he's against, see. The pc, you will find, is almost uniformly, no matter what his manifestations are in session, will go in the direction of the decent thing, the good thing and that sort of thing. And the more you recognize that fact, the easier pcs are to audit.

So a missed concept of the nature of man can stand in the way of an auditor as it has stood in the way of all people who have tried to attack the problem of the human mind over the trillennia. A misconception of the nature of man. Therefore you should have a fairly good concept of the nature of man and his anatomy, in order to do anything about man.

Now, the states that we produce are producible on the route of Routine 3GA, all pcs, to the degree that we can find the basic postulate and audit that out.

Now, therefore, you see, my time has been spent as it has been spent for a long while, but is spent very successfully over the last two or three months getting together more rapid, faster, more positive clearing technology. That is the important sphere of auditing. Oddly enough, the contributive factors to this are – because if they are dropped, make it impossible – as important as the fact of clearing itself.

I wish it were simpler. I had one the other day, I thought, "Well, I've got it now. Everybody all has the same goal. I'm going to make a test, if everybody's got this same goal, why" – you know just taking the, taking the Axioms and Factors – "if everybody's got this same goal, if we can reach it in all pcs you never have to assess goals anymore."

I worked like mad, did some tests on the thing – worked like mad to prove it up. I – I just worked on that like mad. All I had to do was tell you what the pc's goal is. Then you suggest it to him and then run out the suggestion, [laughter] and you've got it, see and you're right on the road to listing it once and so forth. And this was a brave effort and a beautiful thought and, it doesn't work.

So I'm still chugging away at it even though you've got Routine 3GA. Meantime we have a workable technology and at the present moment I don't see much signs of it getting much simpler. I can simply tell you more ways to do it easier, but the same fundamentals are in our road and the way we are tackling them at this moment are successful.

Thank you.

ROUTINE 3GA, PART II

A lecture given on
24 July 1962

Okay. This is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 24 July AD 12. Another lecture, briefer one on Routine 3GA.

The way you detect whether or not a person is running well on Routine 3GA is as follows:

They've got tone arm action, and the tone arm is routinely and regularly coming down as well as going up. The pc looks good, and the pc is not very ARC breaky, and the Want line gives the pc an occasional somatic, by which I mean pain. Pc wants to know what pain is, take a pin and shove it in him, that's pain.

Sometimes a pc will tell you, "Yes, I have somatics." And by that they mean a sensation or a dull thump or a twitch, see? Now, we want pain, actual pain, pain on the Want line, occasional pain on the Want line, and nothing else on the Want line. No sen – no sensation – you know, *wog-wog*, dizziness and that sort of thing. And on the "pull back from" the goal, occasional pains. See, that's the old not-want line.

And on the Oppose the Goal line, sen, winds of space, *wog*, *bzmm-bzmm*, twitches, thumps, see, but not pain. I would say so far as maybe occasionally, why, the pc get mixed up and name the wrong terminal, and they get a small pain on that line. But it would be *wog-wog*, *mug-mug*, and the "who or what would pull back the opposition to the goal" on that fourth line, or whatever the third – line three of listing is, also a bit of sen – sensation, dizziness, motion, that sort of thing – that occasionally turns on, or winds of space, momentarily, not to any great excessive degree.

Now, that's what happens when a pc is going right and the auditor can read the meter and it's the right goal and the lines are being listed okay and the mid ruds are being kept in, and so forth. That's what should happen.

If that isn't happening there are certain things going wrong, and I will tell you what those things are on the whole of Routine 3GA in a moment.

But let me tell you what happens if 3GA is going wrong. It doesn't matter whether it is in – at what stage of listing the goal these things happen or at what stage of nulling or something of the sort – that is nulling goals – you haven't found the goal yet, don't you see, so the only thing that can be wrong before you find the goal is actually bad sessioning and bad metering. That's all that can go wrong, see; that's the only thing that can go wrong on finding them. There is something wrong with session form – well, TR 2 is bad, TR 1 is horrible, audi-

tor can't read the meter, this sort of thing. And I can give you a lot of other materials to make sure that that goes right. But if that is really going wrong, then it is just bad sessioning or bad metering. And pc isn't ARC breaky, nothing is really going haywire if your – if your sessioning is all right and your metering is all right, you know.

But let's take after the goal is found. Let's take after the goal is found and you start listing it. And now we're going to find several symptoms if it is the wrong goal. And these things are very, very important for you to know, because by George, no pc ever went Clear on the wrong goal, because you list the wrong goal and it's just more alter-is and more alter-is and more alter-is.

There are four things out which can make a goal read. It's the wrong goal, but it'll read – boy, will it read, beautifully every time. Something has been suggested on the goal, something has been suppressed, something has been invalidated or something has been a failure to reveal – something has not been revealed.

You in actual fact only have *three* of these which are capable of making a goal read that isn't the goal – only three of them – but the fourth is supplementary to it: Suppressed. Because the wrongness, you see, won't read. If you've suppressed an invalidation you don't get the invalidation to read, don't you see?

So you've got – that's right, you suppress an invalidation, you can suppress a failed to reveal, you can suppress a suggestion and you can't get the thing to read. So you get Suppress in first. First you get in Suppress and then you get in Suggested – if you want to know the actual apple pie order here – and then you get in Invalidated and then you get in Failed to Reveal.

Now, this is quite elementary because anybody can tell a Failed to Reveal. It's the dirty needle. It's the little, tiny, minute rock slam; that little agitated rock slam multiple read. You say the goal and you get a multiple read. You say the goal and you get a multiple read. You get – say the goal and it goes *bzzt-bzzt-bzzt*. Well, that's a Failed to Reveal. You can always identify a Failed to Reveal. A Failed to Reveal never reads any other way. It can be such a tiny *bzzt* that at first glance it might look like a tick, but even that is rare. Usually it's a – it's a *bzzt* usually about at sensitivity 16 that is about an eighth of an inch wide, or something like that. If you can imagine a rock slam an eighth of an inch wide, well that's that dirty needle, and that's something hasn't been revealed.

So that leaves only two things that will make a goal tick-tick, and one is a suggestion, which is evaluation, our old two first lines of the Auditor's Code, for God's sakes, way back then, and the other is an invalidation. The two "-tions" and that's the only thing oddly enough that can make a goal go tick-tick-tick, like a goal when it isn't the goal.

Now, any goal on the list, any goal on the list can be made to read like *the* goal by a knuckleheaded auditor – any goal on the list. We've got a goal "to catch catfish," and it is no more the pc's goal, see, than "climbing clouds" is, see. But the auditor looks very hard at this goal, and he says "to catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish. Say you know, that reads every time. To climb clouds, to climb clouds, to climb clouds, that doesn't read," and so on down the list. Now, he comes back through, and so help me Pete, "to catch catfish," tick, "to catch catfish," tick, "to catch catfish," tick. It'll go right on through till the end of the session,

too. It'll go right on through to the end of the goals list, too, *huh-huh*. Why? There was a hidden invalidation along with the evaluation. The auditor seemed to give the goal an is-ness. The auditor, in any way at any stage, even at the end, misreads his meter, or he's got an invalidated goal that's already invalidated, and looks up brightly, and looks like he's found the goal, and he says, "Well, that-that-that reads; that reads every time."

Now, just prior to that, as the auditor went over the final list, let us say – usually this is a condition happening on final lists because the goal has to be a little bit sticky to get into this shape – as the auditor went over it the pc might have said to himself, "To catch catfish, that's a silly damn goal, ho-ho."

On the next pass around on the nulling the auditor says – of course now, the thing will tick every time because the pc has invalidated it – "Now, let's really hang this thing up but *good*, let's just drive it in with spikes and make this thing look just like a goal."

The auditor says, "Well, *hahhhhh*, that reads every time. To catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch cat-."

The pc has already said, "That isn't my goal." The pc says, "Are you sure?" – see, invalidation number two, see?

The auditor says, "Oh yeah, yeah. It reads. To catch catfish, to catch catfish. It reads every time, *ha-ha-ha-ha*."

Pc says, "My God, that doesn't sound like my goal." Invalidation number three, evaluation, invalidation, evaluation, inval-. Get the idea? Bang, bang, bang, bang.

Wow, this thing will check out by any knuckleheaded checker, and you start listing it – here we go. The tone arm will start going up and stop moving. Maybe this is after ten or twelve hours of listing. Don't expect it to happen right away. Usually four and a half, five, something like that, sticks. Pc starts to look awfully bad, *bla-bla-glaa-glaa*, and so on and sort of caved in.

In session they are ARC breaky as hell when you're trying to list. Yap-yap-yap-yap-yap, chop-chop-chop-chop-chop, you just can't keep your rudiments in during listing. And the somatics are wrong. If you get any pain at all, which is highly unlikely – so unlikely that you say: An absence of pain equals wrong goal. No pain: wrong goal.

The pc gets sensation, dizziness and so forth, on the Want line. Who or what would want goal? And now the pc after a while, after ten or twelve hours, starts going *wog-wog-wog-wog*, gets sensation, winds of space. If there is any pain at all occurs, it will occur, perhaps, on the oppose – which is highly unlikely that any will occur – but oppose is more comfortable to run than want – Want line. The other two just compound the felony.

Oddly enough a pc very often, if it's anywhere close to his goal at all, will run it with great, apparent satisfaction; will go around and tell people this is his goal; will figure out his life by it, although there are some blank sections that don't quite add up. But he won't be unhappy with it. He won't be going around telling you it's a wrong goal. Matter of fact, may even get mad at you when you try to tell him it isn't his goal, because he's so anxious to have a goal, don't you see. Any goal is better than no goal. It gets him off the horror of search,

search, search for the goal, don't you see? He's more likely to hold on to it than he is to give it up.

And those are the only symptoms: high TA that sticks, pc looks bad, pc ARC breaky and the somatics are wrong. They are reversed if they exist at all. They're all opposition somatics, actually. Opposition somatics are sensation, dizziness, winds of space, that sort of thing, and anything he lists gives him those.

Now, if you keep going in this direction you're adding more and more alter-is to the bank, and the bank gets heavier and heavier, and thicker and thicker, and the pc feels all bowed down and crushed.

Now, in actual listing of the right goal there is a certain amount of bank gets thicker, there is a certain amount of wog, there is a certain amount of these other things, so very often a pc will persist hoping that they will go by and they will run out. But they do not; they get worse and they get worse and they get worse and they get worse and they never get any better. And that is the difficulties of running a wrong goal.

Now, a wrong goal is found by bad sessioning and bad metering, and by not hitting the thing right or checking the goal out right at the end. It's pretty easy to find a right goal.

Now, I've told you what is the symptoms of bad 3GA are. Somebody doing 3GA wrong after the goal has been (quote) found (unquote), you get those manifestations that I have just given you. Those things occur in the pc.

And the remedies of 3GA are these: In listing on goals, the goal is unrevealed – it's unrevealed yet – so get list complete or find out why pc won't give it. That's a highly generalized statement. These are the things that you as – if you were a D of P or something like that and somebody said, "Well I just can't find the goal," and so forth, you know. That's number one that you would tell him, see. "Well, your list is incomplete so go on listing and get the goal," you see? That's that. That's what you'd tell him, just automatically.

There aren't any other reasons except this one: bad metering. We assume the fellow is running 3GA, don't you see. Let's not get picky as to whether or not when he reads the E-Meter he is holding his pinkie at exactly fifty-three degrees from the horizontal while he shifts the tone arm. You understand? That is not what's wrong. See, that's not what's wrong. It's the goal isn't on the list or the metering is bad. See that? It's elementary my dear Watson. That's the only two things that really go wrong, assuming that the guy sits in the chair and goes through Model Session and gets the goals listed and nulled. You are not even assuming that's good, and you are not going to find fault with it particularly. That's not what you are going to pick on.

You are D of Ping some auditor, and he just can't seem to get to first base, and he can't ever find the goal; then you are going to tell him two things. "Well, the goal isn't on the list so get it complete," or "Your metering stinks." It's one or the other, and of course bad metering would have missed the goal. Precheck would have revealed a wrong goal. You see? All that would have been – been remedied actually in the – in just the standard rundown of 3GA. So only these two things stand out as being things that could be wrong with trying to find some-

body's goal, and those are the things that are wrong – goal hasn't been revealed or the metering is bad, one or the other. Could be both, you know, too.

And the next one is when the goal has been found and the pc is turning up with these upper symptoms, which I've just given you, and the goal has been found, then this is what you do: There are only three things that can be wrong. In listing from a goal, the only thing that can be wrong is the goal or the lines or the metering. Now, that's all that can be wrong.

And if you were D of Ping somebody and he was listing on lines, and the pc was starting to get a high tone arm and it was sticky and the pc looked bad, let's just say, "that's enough." Nothing else going on, the pc isn't particularly screaming, and – and the somatics – well, he's not getting anything. He really can't tell about the somatics. No, he isn't getting any sensation, or something like that, and yet you're listing, and this is what you'd pick on. Or if the pc was *screaming* ARC break session after session after session, he just couldn't hold any rudiments in at all, these three things are what you do: You recheck the goal and recheck the lines and remedy the bad metering, see?

And if the somatics didn't exist, there was no pain of any kind whatsoever, and there was plenty of sen, sen, sen, and the bank getting thicker and thicker, and bearing the pc down harder and harder, and more and more, and all that sort of thing, then it's these three lines that you would check, see? These three things, is recheck the goal, recheck the lines and remedy the bad metering. That's all you'd tell this auditor. Don't tell him anything else. Don't say, "Well, we've got to reform the lines, and I think the best thing that we can do in the reformation of the lines – I – I – think you're better – perhaps it's your TR 4, or maybe the pc has a missed withhold."

I'll tell you a missed withhold a pc had who was very ARC breaky in session. One of the lines was wrong, and no auditor would listen to him. It was a missed withhold. It was totally missed on and on and on, and the pc only required a few more hours of listing to go Clear after the line was corrected, which is quite interesting. See, missed withhold.

So we just don't go into those things. Don't go into the mechanics of anything. There's only three things wrong if 3GA starts wrong, and that's you recheck the goal and you recheck the lines and you check the metering. That's it.

Now, it's very fortunate for you that nothing else can be wrong with 3GA. That's all that can be wrong because we assume the fellow – the auditor can sit in the chair, we assume that he can go through his Model Session. We can assume that his TR 1 is understandable. See, we can under – we can assume all of these things because they vary in degree from auditor to auditor, and it isn't their varying in degree which causes the pc to have a high TA, to look bad, to be ARC breaky and have sensation instead of pain, see? It isn't those things doing it, so don't ever look for anything small.

Now, you think you're jumping off for something adventurous when you try to find out a pc's goal. That's nothing compared to jumping off for listing his lines, because you have now hit the silk, and it is in the lap of the gods whether the chute opens or not, see. It's just that. You've jumped off into nowhere. You're committed because if you are wrong, the next time you try to find the pc's goal it's going to be much more difficult than it was.

And supposing you found two wrong goals on the pc, one after the other, and listed both of them. Well, the thing you'd do would be to find – try to find the right goal again and you take a third one. And supposing that was the wrong goal, how harder – much harder do you think the goal will be found next time?

Well, I know whereof I speak because I've had five wrong goals found on me in the name of research. I could go on the – the mother plea, you know, "What I have suffered for you children," you know?

But actually I know what I am talking about here. Very much on the groove, both from watching you, subjective reality, experimentation on it. It has not been easy to pioneer this particular track into 3GA because the GPM is nothing to stand up and box with, man. And I would say this, I have been standing up and boxing with it without any information about it at all, originally, and it's got teeth, man. The thing's got teeth. Boy, you never felt some of the somatics like can turn on when you do it *completely* wrong. Let's *really* be wrong with it. Man, that's a matter of waking up screaming.

I'm not trying to exaggerate this. 3GA is pretty good, but you mishandle the GPM, you mishandle auditing, you let auditors start auditing goals and finding goals on pcs that don't know – even know how to sit in a chair, you'll regret it. I can hear it now, two o'clock in the morning your telephone will be ringing. "My God, what do I do?"

Well, the pc, after they've been wrong listed for a while, are not in a state of mind to have another goal found on them, because any auditing at this point starts to beef up the bank. Now, that the bank has started to beef up, anything goes on from there and beefs up the bank further. And they don't want to be audited, and that is another little manifestation that you can put down. A goal that has been wrong and it has been listed – that person will then pretty well routinely tell you they don't want any auditing. And the only hope in hell for them is some good auditing.

So you see, I'm not trying to make you scared of the GPM. I'm not, I'm not, because I go on the basis that if I could stand up and box with some critter, you can. And it won't kill you dead; you'll just *wish* you were, but you'll come out all right.

Now, how do you go about these various operations? Well, I'm not trying to give you a summary lecture of all of 3GA. You've already got the parts of 3GA. I want to give you a few little modifications and changes and some stuff that I've dug up here in the last few weeks on 3GA that will be of great value to you.

You must complete the list. I've already told you that it takes about 850 goals plus to get a complete goals list. A pc can do this on his own. And actually I'd keep – if I had a pc, I'd just keep kicking him in the head till he gave me a goals list 850 long. Why? Because it's un-embarrassing for him to sit in the quiet of the evening with nobody around and write down these appalling goals, you see? In fact, you are more likely to get the goal on the list, see. He isn't embarrassed by your presence, or she isn't embarrassed by your presence, you know? They write down the goals that occur to them. So you want about 850 plus. That's absolute minimum, 850.

But what makes a minimum goals list? It is not for your benefit, because you've been having a hard time establishing this, an absence of TA action. Take that as a matter of course. It's actually an absence of needle action.

You want a goals list so complete that when you read a series of goals on that list to the pc, five or six goals, half of them will give you no twitch at all; another one will twitch maybe once in three reads; another one will possibly twitch once, and one will twitch twice to stay in. And that would be about it. It's about – actually six is an unhappy number – it's more like – more like ten. You want about one in, in ten.

Now, this violates a datum you've had for a long time, that if the needle stopped twitching on goals – you're going to get a twitch anyway someplace or another. I find, recently, on very careful experimentation, that you can list the goals list down so completely that goal after goal, read after read, three reads per goal, and you get no single twitch for three and four goals in a row. And about the time you decide the middle rudiments must be out, out, out, why, all of a sudden one ticks. You say, "Well that's nice." You get a tick, so you know the pc is still reading on the meter. But that's about all it would tell you.

On first nulling you get three in per page – per sheet. And on second nulling, why, you get almost a scrub. It goes down to about thirty goals. Now, that's how complete a list can be. These ticks that you get are specific ticks. If you get a little, tiny rock slam when you read a goal as an instant read – of course they're classic instant reads. None of this slightly early, or anything like that. Man, you really got to watch that with goals, you see? You could leave something in if you weren't sure. Don't go beating your brains out because it isn't important whether or not you leave it on the list the first time. But don't go to the point of leaving them all on the list the first time because the pc has a constant dirty needle. That'd be nonsense.

But you've got all of these goals, and they're falling off left and right, and they're nulling down, *bangety-bangety-bangety-bangety-bang*, an occasional tick is all you require to tell you that the pc is still reading on the meter. Goals lists can be complete enough to leave a completely limp goals list.

Now, if that goals list doesn't add up to a complete limpness, make absolutely sure that it isn't your rudiments that are giving you action. Rudiments might be wildly out, you see? Make sure your rudiments are in well.

When you're reading that list don't be alarmed if two or three times a page, particularly early in sessioning – if your meter reading is good this can happen to you – I mean even if your meter reading is good this can happen to you – that early on, on nulling of a goals list your pc goes *bzzt* all – every once in a while, and tick, tick, tick, tick, and slash, slash, and then constant dirty needle and *oh, dah* and random, and don't be upset if the pc's needle goes to hell. You just get competent in straightening out pcs' needles. That's all.

Now, I've seen a pc's needle straightened out in many different ways. The easiest way to straighten them out is get a fast check on the middle ruds. That is the most predictable and easy way. Now, you can introduce a lot of corny rudiments and dream ups of one kind or another. You can introduce a lot of extraordinary activities here to clean this thing up, but fish and fumble, of just sitting back, is something that you are eventually sometimes driven to. You can't get it in with the middle ruds, and you don't know what the hell it is. You're just in a

drift. Well, sit back and say, "Well I'm going to see what this is doing," and just do it by steering, fish and fumble. You see the needle go *bzzzt* and *bzzzt*, and over again. You say, "What did you think of then? Whatcha looking at? There. There. There."

"Oh, nothing, I – I just – just the pattern of the table here in front of me, that's all I keep looking at. It's just like my mother's boudoir table, you know!" *Bzzzt, bzzzt, bzzzt*, you know?

And you say, "Well, anybody miss a withhold about that?" or something like this, see?

"Oh yeah, I broke all of her perfume one day, ha-ha. I nearly forgot about that." And so on.

The needle is fine, goes. That's kind of an extraordinary solution, but I have been driven to it.

Pc's needle becomes utterly unreadable. It doesn't matter whether you are reading a goal to them or not reading a goal to them, it just keeps going *bzzt-bzzt-bzzt-bzzt*. You don't know whether it's falling on this or falling on that, and it's just gone dirty in the process of reading the goals no matter how limp the list was. Doesn't mean the list was charged. The pc gets kind of anxious, the pc goes out of session, and remember those goals are awful, doggone restimulative, and they kick in Prepcheck chains, and they do all kinds of weird things.

But don't go on struggling against reading goals with a pc's needle dirty enough to be washed by the Empire Laundry, see? Don't do that. Don't keep trying to read through a dirty needle. What the hell are you doing that for? The pc's out of session. You don't know what the goal is reading on. Even though the pc's rudiments are in, the pc is out of session as long as that needle is ticking on other things that you've got nothing to do with, because you are not talking to the pc. The pc isn't re – the pc isn't reacting to the things you want him to react to, so therefore the pc's out of session.

So you keep going, and you keep going, "Oh God, there's that dirty needle again. Let's see, 'To catch catfish,' all right, it's equivocal, ah, 'to catch ...' That's it. It's still doing it, I'm not saying anything. 'In this session,'" – you are shortly going to see a change for goals processing in the middle rudiments, by the way – "is there anything you have suppressed, suggested, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of? That read, Careful of. What's that? What's that? "

"Oh, I'm just careful not to think. I've been sitting here concentrating, care... concentrating on not thinking."

And you say, "Good. Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. All right. In this session is there anything you have been careful of?"

"Yeah, just not to think, ha-ha."

"Good. Thank you. I'll check that out. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? That's clean. Do you agree that's clean? Do you agree that's clean? All right, thank you very much. To catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish, see. To hit polar bears, to hit polar bears, to hit po-. Okay. If it's all right with you there, we'll ... " Because the second you started to say "to hit polar bears," it started going all the way across.

After you've done this for fifteen or twenty minutes with a pc, then all of a sudden – you've cleaned it up two or three times – this starts happening: The auditor will say "To catch catfish," tick, tick, "to catch catfish," tick, "to catch catfish. Yeah, well, that's out."

Once in a while be bright enough to stay in two-way comm with your pc because very often the omission of two-way comm means the intermission and intervention of a tremendous amount of middle rudiments.

This is the way to handle something like that. This is the kind of answer you get. You say, "What's going on? What's happening?"

"Ha-ha, knew when you read that slow that my needle had gotten dirty, and I was worrying about what I might be stuck in now."

You say, "Thank you," and the needle clears right up. See, two-way comm is always marvelous. Two-way comm has this limitation: If you can't find out by asking once, you shut up and do something else. That is the rule back of two-way comm. You can always ask any question of the pc. It's not a metered question, don't you see, in the line of two-way comm.

Cut comments to a minimum. The more you comment the worse off the pc will get. Don't comment. That's an evaluation of sorts. But you can ask the pc any kind of a question you want to. You can ask, "How are you getting along?" You see a dirty needle start up, you can't read through it, "How are you getting along?"

"Oh, I've been very nervous the last few minutes ever since you read that goal 'to hit lions.' I've had a feeling here like I haven't got any top to my body."

"All right," you say, "thank you." Dirty needle continues. Get in your middle ruds, see?

Don't go on and on and on, "Well, what about this lion? When did you first think about this lion? Have you always been troubled with lions?" No, you are not running a session having to do with running engrams connected with lions. And you go on and violate this rule of "It's all right to ask him anything once," you violate that rule – that's a good rule, you can ask a pc anything once – you violate that rule and you'll find yourself running engrams and whole track and God knows what and all messed up and then running an engram so that you can clean up his needle.

Oh man, it's just getting dirtier and dirtier, and stickier and stickier, and messier and messier, and of course the less auditing you do the less auditing he gets, the more anxious the pc gets, the dirtier the needle gets. You see how it defeats itself? Because you're doing an alter-is, you are jamming him up in the bank, you see? Just go on the basic principles of what the GPM is. So the more you alter-is what your intention is here – your intention is to find the guy's goal – and the more you depart from that, why, the unhappier the pc gets.

Now, it's when the pc begins to realize that you can read a meter, you're not leaving him hanging, or her hanging in midair, you know. "Do you have a present time problem?" The pc is about to say, "Yes, as a matter of fact I was sued for a thousand dollars today, and as a matter of fact the court is going to hold me in contempt, and let..." He's about to say something like this, you see? The pc says, "Ahhh," and the auditor says, "Do you agree that's

clean?" Pc goes into a little bit of a state of shock, see? He's been not-ised, see? TR – meter TR 4 is very poor at this point. You only have to make a few of those mistakes and the pc doesn't have any confidence in you anymore.

Now, you make him straightway. You make him, you know, calling it every time, calling it every time, right on the button, never miss a read, you know, bang-bang. Pc eventually forgets about the meter and his problems. He knows you'll take care and he'll sit back further and further and relax more and more and life is wonderful and he sure doesn't get in your road in a – in a Goals Assessment, see?

And after you've been assessing him for a day or two, and he's learned that you are to be trusted, and that sort of thing, the needle doesn't dirty up. But the more extraordinary solutions, the more meter goofs, why, the dirtier the pc's needle is going to get. That's for sure.

And after you've been doing goals on a pc for a couple of days, a couple of days, and you find out his needle is getting *worse* than it was, then that means that every time you put in the mid ruds you must have driven half of them out, see? That's it, that's it. You just miss, miss, miss, miss, miss. I mean, there isn't any argument with this. It isn't because your tone of voice is this or you're that. It's just bad metering. That's the end of it. Bad metering is what makes the needle go *bzzt-bzzt*.

All right. Enough of that berating. The point I'm trying to make here is you want to audit the right goal. That is desirable. That is productive of live thetans. That doesn't leave you in the embarrassing position of the pc all of a sudden can't use his legs and can't hear by reason of the auditing session. That doesn't leave you in the interesting position of having a pc with a siren going off hour after hour that you can't hear but he sure can.

There's no substitute for the right goal. It is thoroughly recommended.

Now, how do you find out if you've got a right goal? And I'll tell you exactly how to do a fast check on a right goal. This is an Instructor-type check, but you can pull this thing off in ten or fifteen minutes rather than make yourself look silly. There is no real reason to give a Prepcheck every five sessions, mathematically. There's no reason at all to do so. There is every reason to give a Prepcheck every time you're having trouble with the pc. That might be oftener than five sessions, and if you're that smooth it might go up to ten or twelve. You understand? Five sessions was given as an arbitrary figure, entirely and completely arbitrary, just to make sure that you did prepcheck the pc. But there's no real reason to do it oftener than is necessary, because it can amount to no auditing for the pc, and can give you a roughed-up needle because of the anxiety of the pc. And you come out the other side of the Prepcheck with a rougher needle than you start into it. See? All right.

Now, the way you do a fast check is based on the data I gave you earlier. A goal reads on itself, as itself, on it's own charge in the bank, or it doesn't read because of invalidations or evaluations. That is a true goal.

Or a goal reads because it has been invalidated, and after you have cleaned it up, it for a moment doesn't read, and then starts to read again on it's own. But the only thing that make a – can make a goal read wrong are Suppress, Suggest – Suppress because of course you don't get the – the needle action – Suppress, Suggest, Invalidate, Failed to Reveal, see? Those are

the four things. There are no others. There isn't concentrate upon a shift of attention, you see, and there aren't a whole bunch of other buttons.

Of these, only two can introduce a goal-like read. Failed to Reveal introduces a minute rock slam which is quite recognizable. But Suggest – which is Evaluate – and Invalidate can, either of them, introduce a goal-like read which is indistinguishable in size, frequency and magnitude from a true goal. Indistinguishable.

You can take a wrong goal, evaluate for the pc on it and make it go tick, tick, tick. Which after that, if you did not, if you did not check it, if it wasn't checked out well, would look like the pc's goal, and thereafter would be as wrong as a Confederate seven-dollar bill. And that's how people get on to wrong goals.

So here's a fast check that tells you whether the goal is the goal or not. You read the goal to the pc, "Bark, bark, bark," you know, and you say, "That reads." Now, a read of a goal at sensitivity 16 is never more than about a half a division. It can be cleaned up to a point where it might register a little bit more half of a division, but you are really priming, you are really pouring the petrol and alcohol into the cylinders, you know. You're not adding to its power, but it is so clean that it – nothing can stay that clean, and five minutes later it'll slump. But that is the most it reads, and it always reads with a fall. It never reads with a rise.

Now, if announced, however, against a rising needle it will cause a stick, and against a very fast rising needle will cause a slow. But in actual essence its action is a fall, a tick. And that tick is – well, you just won't see one more than – more than one and one-quarter dial divisions here, meaning about, I don't know, three-eighths of an inch. That's big, see. And the one that you will normally see, when you first see it, is about a sixteenth of an inch fall, instant fall. You say the goal, and right on the last letter of the goal, the last letter in the whole line, it'll go tick – sixteenth of an inch. That can be as small as a thirty-secondth of an inch. It can be as small as a stick, depending on how much invalidation-evaluation is on it. And if there is tremendous invalidation and evaluation on it, it cannot read at all. In other words, the true goal can be squashed right out of existence and not read.

So a false goal can be made to read with an invalidation – evaluation, and a true goal can be made not to read. Oddly enough if you invalidate a false goal enough it will cease to read again in its turn, and a real goal invalidated enough will cease – will star – start reading in its turn once more on the false reads for which you can make it go through the cycle. You can make a bad one go through the cycle of read, not read, read, not read, read, not read, just with repetitive evaluations and invalidations, don't you see? And you can – whether the goal is right or wrong it will go through those cycles.

Now, they – keep that in mind that those are the only four things that have to be remedied to make sure that a goal does read properly. You can recognize the Failed to Reveal, but you're going to use it in the check anyhow. The Suppress does not give a tick, but can make the Evaluate or the Invalidate squash out of sight so that you can't find them. So you have to use a Suppress.

So, you compose a repetitive Prepcheck which simply contains these four things and the name of the goal.

Now, I'll go through this thing fairly rapidly for you just on demonstration. You say to the pc, "All right, I'm – I'm going to give this goal a fast check, and I want to read to – the goal to you a few times and then I'm going to carefully get in the four goals middle rudiments, and then I'm going to see if the goal reads, and then I'm going to give it a fast check and then read the goal again and then we'll know for sure what that is. What do you say to that?"

And the pc says, "No, I don't want that." And you go ahead and do it.

The pc very often says he doesn't want this. You have to persuade him, say, "Wouldn't it be much better to have your mind completely at rest?" The goal is at rest, you know. The goal is "to be active," and the pc says, "No, under no circumstances do I want my mind at rest." You know.

So, you say to the pc, "To catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish. That read. Thank you very much. We are now going into the repetitive rudiments," – sensitivity 16, you see, of course – and you say, "On the goal 'to catch catfish' has anything been suppressed?" That's run repetitive, you see. And same question, same question, same question. The pc finally says, "No." And you say, "All right. I will check that on the meter." And you look at the meter and you do, and you find another read and you look back at the pc and you give him the more repetitive. And you finally get all the suppress, suppress that you can possibly get off this goal, and then you go tearing in and that suppress is good and clean. That's polished up like Dutch cleanser, see? That's bright.

So we move over then into our next one which, of course, is Suggested, and we run Suggested. "On the goal 'to catch catfish' has anything been suggested?" over and over and over until the pc says, "No." And let's check it on the meter, and you find one. You look back at the pc and you ask him again, over and over and over, until he finally says "No" again. You Check it on the meter, something like that. Anyway, this thing is eventually clean.

Similarly, you handle the word Invalidated. "Has anything been invalidated?" And you handle that till that is clean and polished. By the way, it is a very good policy at this time to be in a state of operating a meter where you miss no reads, ever, and you miss no cleans ever, see? That's optimum. In fact, it's the only way this check will work.

So you go through that; and then Failed to Reveal. And – see how that would be worded? "Is there anything you have failed to reveal?" is the best wording there. "On the goal 'to catch catfish' is there anything you have failed to reveal?" All right, let's get that all clean by repetitive, and so forth. All right. That's that. Don't bother with Careful of.

Now, let's go through this thing, and we say, "All right, I'm going to read the goal to you now, 'to catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish'." And tell the pc what's happening, see. Tell him, "Well, that reads." It possibly will if it's the real goal. "To catch catfish," three times, see, bang, that's it. You say, "All right, that's reading. Thank you. Now, I'm going to have to do a fast check of these same rudiments, and check the goal." And this is what condition you've got to get those first four repetitive questions in so that you get a no read, *pshaaaw*, right across them, you see?

All right, you do it just like this: "On the goal 'to catch catfish' has anything been suppressed, suggested, invalidated or non-revealed?" Wrong wording. "To catch catfish, to catch

catfish, to catch catfish," see? If it's not the goal, if there's no read anywhere on that line, that's it, man. But you get the trick here? Don't go puttering around picking geraniums. Don't give him any opportunity to invalidate or evaluate or breathe while you are saying that sentence. Just rip that thing right off *brrrrrrrrrrr*, see. Even omit the acknowledgment, who cares?

Ordinarily you would say, "Thank you. To catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish," see? Bang-bang-bang-bang, that's the goal. If none of those read, if none of those mid-type ruds read, and the goal read, the chances are a thousand to one that that's the goal. And if none of those read, and you, by repetitive check, had found answers, you know, your meter is active on the pc, and none of them read, and the goal didn't read, it isn't even a cousin to the right goal. And that's how you do a fast check on a goal. And you tell the pc, "Very much – thank you very much."

Actually that's about a – that's really in actual practice, that's about a fifteen, twenty, twenty-five minute fast verification of a goal. And that's the way a goal has to be verified. If a goal won't beform – perform this way, it's not the goal.

Now, you understand that if you've got a read on Invalidated, and ignore it, and read the goal, you are going to read the read for Invalidated, and it will be just exactly like the goal tick. If there's an Evaluate, there's a read on Suggest or Suggested, see, and there's a read on the goal, that's Suggested reading on the goal. And if the goal reads with a dirty needle, it's simply a – it's a missed withhold on the goal. The goal is – withheld it from somebody – has been withheld, that's all.

Now, that's the way the pendulum swings. And that's how you verify one of these things, and this is how you tell if it is the goal, and if it isn't the goal.

Actually, there's no arguments about this. I mean that is the way it is, you see? And you could do it that easily and that well. But remember you have to read your meter perfectly. You have to read your meter every time, and when you read off that last sentence, *brrrrr*, you have to read that without a lot of halts, or gulps.

If you read it something on this fashion, "On the goal 'to catch ... catfish,' is, ah, there – anything ... ah, that, ah, you – no, I mean, ah, that you have suggested," why, it then reads, see. You say, "No-no, no-no. I mean suppressed, excuse me." See. Well, don't be so confounded upset if you've done your TR 1 that poorly, that to be surprised if you get reads on these things when you just cleaned them because the reads just happened. The pc invalidated your reading of it or something like that, that'll now read. So now you have to go into it and you have to clean up those rudiments, see.

Now, this is what happens if you read that across the line, you got a read on some. You clean it up on a fast-check basis, see. And you clean it all up on a fast-check basis until you've got all of them, and then you don't read the goal after this until you've got them all clean on a fast-check basis, see? Then when you've got them all clean on a fast-check basis you read that goal "to catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish. Thank you." That's his goal. You see what happens there?

Now, on the actual goal, oddly enough, the read will disappear off of the goal, and appear over on the Invalidate and the Suggest. And when you take them off the Eva – Invalidate and Suggest, it will reappear on the goal.

And when you've got this thing over here – you've got a *wrong* goal reading with a read, you'll find Invalidate reads, or Suggest reads. And you take the reads off Invalidate and Suggest, clean that all up, see. What happened to the goal? Where did he go, Charley? Which way did they go? Where? Where?

That's dead easy to get a wrong goal. Don't be upset about that. You come tearing down the last summation sheet, and you've just gone across "to bully potatoes." And the pc says, "What the hell was that?" you know?

You go tearing down the line, and then you come back to it after you've nulled everything else, and you say, "Well, I've got two left in, 'to bully potatoes' and 'to soar gracefully.'" And, "To bully potatoes, to bully potatoes, to bully potatoes. That reads every time. To soar gracefully. To soar gracefully. Doesn't read, that doesn't read, now. Well, I guess we got it, ha-ha-ha, guess we got it, reads every time, 'to bully potatoes.'"

Brother, it's going to take an artist to pull that thing apart, see. Boy, that's in there because hidden is the invalidation of the pc, and what's apparent, you see, is the evaluation of the auditor. And those two things will lock against each other and you try to clean this up. First you'll get Invalidate read and then you'll get Evaluate read, and it may be lost clear back there during the assessment sometime, and pretty occluded and suppressed.

The pc said, "Well, I really want a goal at this time, and he said so, and he's a good auditor, and who am I to argue," you see, and suppressed it. And then casual inspection of this doesn't – doesn't locate it.

Then you find yourself listing a wrong goal. And then the tone arm rises and goes up to 4.5 or 5, and the needle gets very sticky, pc starts looking terribly bad, gets very ARC breaky in the sessions and the somatics are all wrong and backwards. And obviously your lines are right and your metering seems to be okay. What is it? Can't be a wrong goal because we get a read every time we say, "Has it been suggested?" Must be the right goal, you see.

"I keep asking him 'Has it been – would you suggest this as a goal,' you know, and I get a read every time, you know. And I keep telling him it's his goal, and he just – he finally has accepted it." And it does, it reads every time.

Now, the funny part of it is that a heavily invalidated goal will read better than a real one, because it doesn't blur out. It doesn't have nasty tricks. It doesn't fade and dull things like that. It just keeps on going bang-bang-bang every time, a thirty-second of an inch. Never varies, nothing does anything to it except the second you pull the invalidation – no goal.

All right, there's one more thing I could say about it, is that a goal, routinely and normally, fades out when the rudiments go out, and comes back in when you get the rudiments in.

Now, when during listing a goal starts to disappear is very hard to say, but it probably isn't until the last three-quarters that it's totally gone and then the read is still detectable at the

end of the lines. But an awful lot of listing has to be done before that goal goes so that you can't check it anymore. And it never starts reading early and latent and other screwball things. If the goal starts to read screwball, it isn't the goal.

The real goal, when the rudiments – the four I just gave you – are cleaner than a wolf's tooth, fires every time, fires every time except at a very fast rise, because the impulse of the fire, you see, merely gives it a tiny slow and you might not see that tiny slow. If you've got a fast rising needle you won't see this every time. But every time the needle can be influenced by the goal, and not a fast rise, you'll get that *snap, snap, snap*. It's just marvelous to watch one of the things fire.

If you want to know what a goal looks like, and if you want to get very, very critical and investigate it very thoroughly, get ahold of somebody and pick up the goals list, take a goal at random and say, "Which one do you favor on this sheet?"

And the fellow looks at it and finally says, "Well actually, to kiss blonds, you know."

"Well, that isn't actually your type of goal. I know by experience. Actually, here is a goal here 'to whistle at men.' Now, that's really – I think that's a better goal. Let's put you on the meter here for a moment, 'to whistle at men,' 'to whistle at men,' to – it reads every time – 'to whistle at men' – reads, reads, reads, every time, you know – 'to whistle at men.'"

Then you can sit back and just by the hour say "To whistle at men, to whistle at men, to whistle at men." You will get exactly what a goal looks like. And until you suddenly turn around to the pc and say, "Has anything been suggested on this goal?"

And he'll say, "Yes, damn it, so and so, and so, and so."

"Anything been invalidated?"

"Yes, I said to myself every time, It cant be." You see, and yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, you get it all cleaned up, and so forth.

And you say, "To whistle at men, whistle at men, whistle at men." There's nothing. You can make any goal read.

If you want to know what a goal looks like reading every time just invalidate the hell out of somebody's offbeat goal, and you'll see a goal read. Interesting, isn't it.

All right, well, that's 3GA. You want to continue your list until the ticks you're getting are about the size – and if you do continue a list that long hit it at sensitivity 16 for the whole list. If you can get a list that long first crack out of the box, or if you've been adding to a list that's been well nulled, and that sort of thing, do all the rest of it at sensitivity 16 because you won't get any other reads if the list is that limp.

And I'd say a list done as I've been telling you, and so forth, listed completely should be thoroughly, completely and all of it done at sensitivity 16 now. I know of no other immediate changes.

Okay? Thank you.

Good night.

ROUTINE 3GA DATA

A lecture given on
26 July 1962

Thank you.

What's the date?

Audience: 26th.

Male voice: June 9th. [laughter]

Thank you! All right. July 26, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one.

I'm going to talk to you about 3GA. Now, don't consider this a summary lecture about 3GA, it's a data lecture. The last two I gave you were data lectures. The basic summary lecture on 3GA was given some little time ago, and most of the data in it still applies, there have been a few changes based upon the usual reason. [laughter] Yeah, it's tough!

I don't give you unusual solutions, I keep taking solutions out. *Dianetics: Modern Science* – oh, no, it was *Dianetics: Evolution of a Science*, talks about the introduction of an arbitrary. Every time you introduce an arbitrary into an action, you inevitably will develop a little confusion around that arbitrary. This is a law.

Governments basically and originally started getting in trouble with me by the number of arbitraries they can introduce. The number of government employees and that sort of thing, the tremendous expansion of units and agencies and finally, the final asininity, "the man in Whitehall knows best," all of these things come out of just one thing: People have introduced arbitrary after arbitrary after arbitrary. And it is very difficult to avoid the introduction of arbitraries, because people demand them of you, constantly and continuously.

HCA/HPA – a practice, not your type of practice but the handling of Academy courses, has just been changed. Too many arbitraries have been introduced into it, and a person couldn't get his HPA/HCA Certificate until he had done an extension course, and – took him a year – and until this and until that, until the other thing, and it was sixteen weeks, and after that they retreaded, and on and on. There were all kinds of reasons why you couldn't make an auditor. That's all they added up to.

They were an effort, however, to get people to complete their courses and know their business. But why, then, did we have to start introducing regulations? It must have been that the instruction of Academy courses was deficient. So we introduced regulations, you see, to

make the Academy course more efficient. And then, having introduced these, we introduce a few more. And then we have some demands from somebody for a clarification and a ruling. So we introduce a few more regulations. And then somebody else has a problem, and we solve that for them in the line of training, or the Academy, you see. And we have a few more arbitraries introduced, until all of a sudden we can't make auditors. I mean, that's the final culmination of the introduction of that many arbitraries.

Now, let me show you exactly how this occurs as a cycle: I swept these away a few days ago by the issuance of a policy letter that said there would be no limit on the number of weeks that a person would be in an Academy course. In other words, I wanted to make auditors – that was the main thing. Let's make auditors – that was the main point. And that it wouldn't be this many weeks or that many weeks; and that there would be no extension course, you see, not make it necessary, before they get any upper-grade training, that they have to have completed their extension course or – and if they complete that, validation seal, something like that.

But let's not make that a condition for a professional certificate and then stop people from being certified, you see? Let's fix it up so that a person goes through – this was made possible, by the way, by the simplification of what we are doing these days with auditing – and a person should be able to go through and at the end of the time he knows his business, he can pass his examinations and so forth, and he is at that moment given his certificate. Yeah, that's the way it ought to be.

Well, I streamlined it all down to that, by simply saying there would be no limit on the number of weeks and no arbitraries about their certificate. The person would be examined and be issued his certificate.

Well, I said, "That's a job well done. We've got our material now, our technical material is sufficiently simple that – so forth. A person can push in some sort of a job on this, and without getting people into too much trouble; and a lot of complexities dropped out of it. That's fine."

I dusted my hands off, feeling very, very complacent about the whole thing, and I was walking around happy as a clam this afternoon. And I walked into the telex office and here sat Peter, sitting there, hair streaming down in his eyes, pounding madly away on the telex machine answering a despatch from London. Well, actually, Peter knew better than to show me this despatch, and I probably never would have known about it if I hadn't gone in and actually started looking over his shoulder wanting to see him about something else. Such as "Who has just dug up the grounds without permission?" You know, some minor thing, see. [laughter, laughs] And I read this, and my teeth sort of fell apart and my jaw muscles became rather slack, and I quickly buttoned this up and discussed this in an intelligent fashion with Peter, but actually I was a bit stunned!

Because what was demanded was a clarification of this order and some ruling so that the order could be implemented. Went like this: I said, "that anybody would go on being consecutively trained unless they left the course, and leaving the course would be defined as two weeks." See, gone off the course for a couple of weeks, why then if they came back on the course then they could retread the course. And this applied to all old auditors who wanted to

get new material, they could retread the course for 30 percent of the cost of a professional course without discount, you see. Just 30 percent of that, and that's a retread fee, and that's all fine and that's all very simple. *I* thought it was simple, anyway.

Nope! Apparently this is not a simple problem. "What if a student leaves course with the D of T's permission? Now, is that included in the order? Now, what if he's ordered to the HGC for auditing for more than two weeks? And that would cause him, if he came back, to retread, wouldn't it? And what if he blew the course and was gone for more than two weeks, you see? Does this include blows? HGC retreads? Or people given permission to leave the course for a short while?" you see. And Peter was saying, "Well, the wording may be ambiguous, however..." And he threw the whole thing off, you know; and you know, sort of – on the basis – you know Peter, he'd say it very mildly – well sort of "To hell with it." But that was exactly what should have been said. He said this very politely.

But here you had an introduction of arbitrariness into a simple order which was an effort to take out the arbitrariness. Now we're going in and put more arbitrariness in this thing, don't you see?

Now, the reason for arbitrariness is the lack of judgment and the unwillingness to assume an initiative. Wherever we have a zone or action where we have an unwillingness to assume initiative or responsibility or take terrific judgment on the thing or to use one's judgment or judgment is poor, then we get this phenomenon of the introduction of arbitrariness.

Now, games consist of freedom and barriers. And remember that a game does consist of freedom and barriers. A lot of the chaps running around saying, "Three cheers, we're going to have a revolution!" see. This revolution which is going to come up at any moment, is going to give everybody freedom – everybody freedom. They're all going to have freedom. Yes, sir! Of course most revolutions have the kind of freedom like the fellow says, "When it comes to revolution, we have strawberries, everybody eats strawberries."

And the guy in the audience says – the guy in the audience says, "But I don't like strawberries."

And the speaker on the stand says, "When it comes to revolution, you'll like strawberries!" See, in spite of the fact that the revolution is all in favor of freedom, we still seem to have a barrier sitting there.

Actually, a game cannot exist without freedom and barriers. It must be *and barriers*. You know this old principle, we've had it around for quite a while.

Now, a game ceases to exist when you have too much freedom or too many barriers. And the trick is to keep something like a practical percentage of freedom and barriers. There must be an interrelationship of these which is compatible with a game. Otherwise we never get any action at all.

You talk about M1 and fast highways and the hundred and eighty-four-pass cloverleafs that came over Telstar's broadcast the other night. They showed a cloverleaf outside of Detroit. I don't know why they picked that particular one because there are a lot of them bigger than that and they only had one car on it. I thought it was a rather poor choice of shots but

then I guess it was just the time of day, or something like that, and the placement of the TV camera.

But if you look at those very carefully, that is a freedom of travel. And then they start putting stuff up at both sides of the road, see. And then they start putting "go slow" signs up. And then they put radar traps, see, and signs about radar traps. And then they neglect the highway and let it pit nicely, and sometimes they go so far as they did down in Texas, of putting deep dips in the road; so if anybody hit one of these dips at fifty miles an hour, or above the speed limit, you see, why all the car springs broke, and so forth. And after that the road's impassable. And then you get the total freedom of no road at all!

All you've got to do is imbalance the ratio of barriers and freedom and you get a complete hotchpotch and it's no longer a game. A country does not exist well without some laws. They form basic agreements on what they're doing, you see? And a country exists very poorly without too many – with too many laws. And of course, although perhaps just by the nature of technology, we tend to go in the political direction of anarchy – yes, that happens to be true – but of course anarchy is always something that arrives when there is no political philosophy extant in that particular time and place which is applicable or acceptable to the problems which a – the race is meeting at that particular time.

You finally get a political setup where the political solutions, called political philosophies in light moments, these political philosophies become so overwhelming as far as the individual freedom is concerned, that eventually all one can think about in the zone and area of politics is just "Let's be free of it. See, let's not have any more to do with it."

Well of course, if that took place, you would have no government at all, and by definition that's anarchy. But that's not saying all Scientologists are anarchists. But it says that's the only political philosophy that you tend to approach. But there's quite another reason why, if you thought it out very, very carefully, you would see that anarchy was a very proper and fitting target. You see anarchy has never been possible, and if every individual had judgment and good sense, there wouldn't be much reason to have any government. So a government, you see, is a substitute for judgment and responsibility. The more government you have, why, the heavier criticism it is of a people's initiative, judgment and responsibility.

You're operating in a political area which says, "The man in Whitehall knows best, " you see, that type of philosophy. Or you should have the commissar within call at any moment to know whether or not you dare talk to your neighbor across the back fence, you see, as they have in Russia. This type of philosophy rather dims out initiative and rather dims out judgment and rather ruins one's sense of responsibility. And that's a poor thing – extremely poor thing.

So when we – when we have an absence of this, you see, when you have an absence of restrictions, in a business or social or scientific group, and yet the people involved with that group are individually politically involved with a system which denies them responsibility and judgment, don't you see, they start taking it out on you to some degree. So you get a telex saying "What is the meaning – what is the meaning of this policy letter which says students should be trained to become auditors and left on course until they are auditors, but what is 'off course'?" I knew that would be asked, you see. And well, "off course" is anybody who's gone

for two weeks, you see. And that just served then as a wide-open invitation to introduce all manner of arbitrariness. We promptly got an invitation for more arbitrariness. "Please give us more arbitrariness."

Well, I sometimes almost explode under situations like this and I say, "All right, what have we got a D of T for?" See, "What's he doing?"

First place, I certainly should never be expected to lay down a regulation on students who blow. What? Lay a regulation down on... Because – why? Why? God's sakes! Somebody has just goofed, man! Somebody has just missed all the withholds in the book, don't you see? And then some D of T didn't get that shepherd's crook of old, and reach, snare and yank. Well, all of this is to me quite self – evident. And I – wow! See? Wow! And – you've – I'm sure have heard me protest, somebody – I say, "Well all you do is, you just ask the guy – you just ask the guy how he's doing; how he's getting on, you know? Just ask the guy, and so forth, and that's sufficient."

And somebody always comes up, and says, "What words do you use?" You know? It leaves me speechless! See. "What words do you use?"

I don't know. And I'm sucker enough occasionally to say, "Well, say 'How are you doing?'" [laughter] And, see, and after that, wow! You've had it.

You go by and somebody's running the session, and he says – and it's running like this: And he's saying, "Do birds fly?" or whatever it is, "Do birds fly? How are you doing? Do birds fly? How are you doing? Do birds fly? How are you doing?" And then some people have been known to come around to me afterwards and say, "Look at this horrible thing you have just put out!" See? "Look at this horrible thing you are doing there. Look at that auditor, and look at what that auditor's doing! "

"What's he doing?"

"Well, he's saying, 'Do birds fly? How are you doing? Do birds fly? How are you doing? Do bird.. .'and it doesn't make any sense!"

Well, I have been in the process of stripping off arbitrariness ever since we've been going forward. And to a lot of people anchored down and conditioned to a changing and a senselessly changing world, and so forth, see it as changes. It's strictly not changes; it's a continuous series of omissions. Not omissions on the standpoint of omissions, but things are dropping out all the way along the line. The track of Scientology looks like some old Model T Ford has passed by. The nuts and bolts are strewn all over the highway.

You – to show you what sort of a job I'm doing in this direction – you just pick up a list of bulletins that are for four years ago. And just count the number of nuts and bolts that have been taken off the machine. And look at it that way, not "How many things have been changed?" How many nuts and bolts have been found unnecessary for the explanation and running of this machine? Because we get down to more fundamental actions. We're always working with a more fundamental action. And the more fundamental it is, the less nuts and bolts you need to hold it together. That's for sure.

Now, we've just stripped one out of the rudiments – the beginning rudiments. Get along without it fine. There it is, see. And frankly, if an auditor is having a hard time reading an E-Meter and is throwing the pc out of session, he's frankly better off to say to the pc who can't be put in-session, he's better off to say, "Start of session," you see, and start doing some action that he is doing, but only those actions which require no metering can be done this way. That's an unfortunate fact. In other words, you could say to somebody, "Start of session," you see, and just start doing what you're doing. But unfortunately no metering action can be performed in that type of session.

So you could possibly – you could list goals in that type of session, or you could list items. You couldn't do much of anything else in that type of session. Well, of course it's quite adventurous running a session without any rudiments in, but let's look at the practicalities of the thing. Instead of the rudiments going in, if we're introducing a lot of new arbitraries into the session under the guise of rudiments – you see, a misread here and cleaning a clean there and that sort of thing – if that many arbitraries are being introduced into the session left and right, of course the pc's going to go further and further out of session.

Now, actually, the more actions and the more arbitraries are introduced by the auditor into whatever he is doing, the less he gets done.

Let's take some auditor, he runs along for a very short time and then he decides the pc looks bored and so he runs some O/W, you see. And he runs a few commands of O/W, the pc looks less bored, looks kind of resentful now, and he says, "Well let's go on and list a little while longer now," and looks at the pc and then the pc's sitting there and just about getting interested in listing again, or something like that, and the auditor looks up, and he says, "I think I'd better run some Change of Space on you." And he does. And he thought the pc was getting too introverted. And then he got down toward the end of session, you see – down toward the end of session, and he says, "Well now, you've been outflowing the whole session, and I just had a good idea here, and let's inflow a little while. So I'm going to tell you everything I've been thinking about during the session." See, that's before he ends the session. So he tells him all the criticisms he thought of the pc during the session, see, and then he ends the session.

Now, the odd part of this is that you go over all of these introduced arbitraries and that's all you're going to find hanging up in the session. Isn't that interesting? That is on a raw – meat pc, too. That's not a trained pc, or somebody who's used to being audited or anything. You take your meter and you find all the places where he tends to be stuck in the session he just had, and each one of them will coincide with the introduction of an arbitrary.

Now, Model Session is designed to repetitively introduce an arbitrary so that even the arbitrary runs itself out. We always ask, "Do you have a present time problem?" exactly that same place in the session, don't you see? Well, actually just asking it every session tends to run it out. But how about sessions which have wild variations in them all over the place? Well, they don't run out, that's all. You'll find the only place pcs hang up is on the introduction of an unnecessary arbitrary – unnecessary arbitrary.

Remember, games consist of freedom and barriers. There're a certain number of barriers have to be introduced, or you're not even going to get the pc to sit in the chair long enough to be audited.

For instance, some of you – not after you've been here for a little while – but some of you when you first come here and get audited in the goldfish bowl on rudiments and that sort of thing, would just love the arbitrary of a wall to keep out the sessions to the left and right. See, that would be lovely. Well, barriers have advantages, you see, as well as – frankly, you give people too many barriers and they will do nothing but fight barriers. But remember they can fight barriers to a point where they have no game of any kind – no action of any kind. There are no activities.

Now, your barriers, if kept to a minimum, and if they are stripped down to the point where they are necessary barriers, vital barriers, without which we're not going to have anything at all – if we can strip down toward that minimum, and then not expand it out toward vast numbers of unneeded arbitraries, why we will have a rather effective and efficient session. You see, that session has got to have some arbitraries, see, there's the arbitrary of knowing the English language if you're being audited in English. There's various little arbitraries set up around a session. But we start deleting too many of those arbitraries, we don't have a session, you see. Well similarly, if we add too many arbitraries we don't have a session. Same thing happens. What we're seeking in the form of a session is a rather optimum balance between the freedom of the pc and the arbitraries entered into the session. And if we can get that into a nice, balanced ratio, we're fine.

Now, I told you the other day – the other evening, that a pc got along all right, but that in – unless he was faced with an auditor who was too slavishly following rote or was neglecting it utterly, there would be three conditions. Either the auditor would so slavishly follow rote that nothing would happen, or the auditor had so much freedom that nothing got followed. Now, there's a third Condition where the auditor introduced so many arbitraries that Lord knows what the pc was now in. Any of those three conditions could obtain. We're seeking a happy balance of these conditions.

But the auditor could be far too fixed, too slavish in going ahead and doing what he's doing. Let's look at the type of impasse that an auditor could get into by being absolutely knuckleheaded. This is very important to 3GA. It's not so much a lecture on auditing as it is 3GA, because when you get into anything like 3GA, man, any weakness along the line peaks. It looks like a signboard. Before it looked like about the size of a blade of grass, but now it's one of these big gaudy signboards with a naked girl bathing on it, you know?

And here's your situation. Auditor starts his session, glances at the needle, and it's going *bzzzzzzzzzz!* Well, he says, "Well, I have to get in rudiments one, two and three." So, he asks rudiment one. And the immediate response is, on the needle, throughout the whole enunciation of "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" – rudiment one is goals, the effective rudiment – is *bzzzzzzzz!* [laughter]

So the auditor says, "That read was equivocal." [laughter]

And by God, I think he'd come around after the session and ask me – if he would go this fixedly – ask me to introduce a new arbitrary as to how many times should you ask a

question when you're getting an equivocal read before abandoning it? And expect me to say "five and a half."

You see, he shouldn't have been asking it at all anyhow. That's the whole thing. He should have enough judgment to know damn well that he isn't going to be able to sort anything out on this meter. See, he – you could run into this. This would be very rare, but wow! Well, the best thing to do at a time like that, you see, best thing to do at a time like that would be to lay the meter aside – this is an unusable instrument at this moment – and let's just run some O/W. You see, you do have a solution. Let's treat the thing as the pc must be sick, see, or something like that.

And we run some O/W, and the pc says he feels better now, and – or feels disgusted, or something, we don't care what the pc said, but the pc feels different. That's what we're looking for. Let's put him back on the meter, and if this thing is still going *bzzzzzz*, which it won't be, it'll be doing something else, now. Maybe be totally stuck, or something. We can at least ask him the random rudiment because all dirty needles are basically missed withholds. But let's not be so knuckleheaded as to ask him the random rudiment if it is a random rudiment that he has never been able to answer. You get the idea? He's never been able to answer this particular random rudiment, he always has trouble with it, see. He gets into arguments with this thing, or he gives motivators all the time, well let's be smart enough to run a rudiment which still gets off the missed withhold.

I was into this situation the other night in an auditing session, and I had to phrase, before I was finally finished up – I had to phrase the missed withhold question about five different ways, treated as a rudiment in the middle of the 3GA run, until finally the penny dropped and that was it. And that needle quieted down. But the pc had a missed withhold but I just couldn't get the missed withhold question answered so that the missed withhold came off. You understand? So it was a matter of bad luck. The first four times I asked the missed withhold question – the first four times – obviously were wrong! I got them all answered. What – I got what I asked answered, but they obviously were the wrong missed withhold questions. There was a wrong wording or the wrong phrasing or the wrong something. But let's get the slight difference here.

The old man was in here puppy to the root. He knew if he – in order to go on nailing a goals list, and go on nulling goals, he jolly well had to have a clean needle. So he wasn't saying, "All right, we'll cancel out – we'll GAE the pc." See, we won't do that. Well just sit here, all night if necessary, and slug this needle out of the road till we get it, see. Now, I carefully settled such things as, "Is there anything you have done that people have failed to find out about?" – you couldn't read the needle anyhow – until I got a response from the pc and was able finally to check this out somehow in some haphazard fashion, and – but I wasn't letting go of any missed withholds, you see. Who had missed this withhold? That was the thing. Who had missed the withhold?

And I was cheered up by a little success, as I went along on this, by this interesting phenomenon of a half-a-dial-wide rock slam turning on occasionally, just for a moment. Brr! "No, I don't have any missed withhold," no read on the meter, either, except *bzzzzzz!* So finally, finally I found out it was other people and that they didn't know. It wasn't that they

missed a withhold, see, that was different, yeah. That was different, see. God knows why it was different, but it was! And just other people didn't know. So that was that.

And at that moment, the needle started to sweep, up and down and around. Beautifully readable, and I went on about my business and got us some nulling done, see. But that, you might have said, was a slugfest. I was unwilling to settle for nothing, see. My job was to null a list. First to make the pc feel better, which I had to do – cured a half a dozen chronic somatics and that sort of thing, some mild job, see. Get in there, null a list. How the hell could you null a list with a dirty needle? You couldn't. I tried, thinking it would – you know, it sometimes is just lack of auditing. All right, I got in there, thinking, "Well, we're going to get some auditing here, and the dirty needle will clean up, you know, ha-ha." No. No.

Then all of a sudden I said, "Well, we can't go on with this any further." I went through this kind of a system, and this is – be an interesting system for you and it's quite useful. First ask the pc – now 3GA, you see, has its problems. I should have told you, the problems of 3GA is reading a meter – and ask the pc, "What's going on?" That's number one – first action. This needle is going *bzzz-bzzz-bzzz*. "What's going on?" you say to the pc. *Something like that.* [laughter]

And then you get your middle rudiments in. You didn't do anything with that, see, that's a flop, see, he said, "Oh life is terrible and you're doing awful things to me."

Well, pursuing that particular course is not necessarily conducive to settling a free needle, see. First place, two-way comm may say two-way comm, but it's a one-question proposition, see. You go more than one question and you've had it.

For instance, somebody today should be ashamed. They were in there running the CCHs, and they were saying to the pc, apparently, I hear, "Is there any more that you wish to tell me about that? Is there any more to that? Is there any more about that?" After the pc had originated, you see. That was TR 4. TR 4 took the shape of "Is there anything more to that?" "Would you like to tell me any more about that?" see. "Good TR 4" you know, no Q-and-A, oh, nothing like that, see. In other words, the auditor never gave the character a cheery, "Aye, aye," and we were all set, see. But "Is there any more? Is there any more? Is there any more?" till the poor pc, you see, is bled white and trembling and then goes up in a small bundle of smoke.

Now, this action of two-way comm doesn't work, still got a messy needle. Your next action is get in your middle rudiments; just standard middle rudiments. And you still got a messy needle. It's hard to read through, see. Well now, you'd better roll up your sleeves and put on your judgment boots, because you can't go on, man. Now, you've just cleared "Failed to Reveal," haven't you? Just in that many words, in the middle rudiments, as well as you could clean it. You cleared it off and it didn't affect the dirty needle. Well, that doesn't vary the fact that that dirty needle now must be coming from a missed withhold of some kind or another and you better find out what it is.

Now, there's sixteen versions of a missed withhold question. And there're probably several more that you could ask cats. I'm not going to give you the categories.

What you want to know from the pc is what did he do that was criminal and sinful, that people slipped up on getting wise to, see? Is it you in the session, was it during the day, was it in the last week or so, was it now? What the hell is this thing that the pc is holding on to with all of these ski ropes and so forth that's towing him all over the bay? See? What's he got hold of? That's what you want to know. Because it's a missed withhold of some kind or another. You can count your stars on that.

Now, some pcs will answer up and all of a sudden, terrific cognition, falls off the meter, everything else, the question's hot as a pistol, and so on, "What didn't they know?" see? "Is there anything people didn't know about you today?" See, or something like that, see? Oh, that's hot as a pistol. But for some reason or other, for some reason or other, you ask him, "Is there anything you didn't tell people today that you should have?" Well, there's nothing to that. That's not the question. You got the idea? I mean, peculiar reason the piano only resonates to a very, very tiny shading of meaning.

I ran somebody one time, had she ever done anything to X? Had she ever done anything to X? Had she ever done anything to X? Nothing. Nothing. Nothing. You know, "Didn't wipe the dinner dishes completely dry before putting them on the table." You know, big overts. Big overts. Man, this is colossal, see?

So I got tired of this pat-a-cake, you know, and I said, "Well, have you ever done anything that X didn't find out about?"

"Oh, well, yes. Put down things on the expense account slightly, you know, altered the household budget two cents here and there," and that's about the limpest nowhere I ever saw. I could get no needle reaction, you understand.

And finally I said, "All right. Is there anything you have done that X never knew about at the time?"

And it went *bang!* See?

"Oh, well yes," see, and equivalent of affairs, and you know, bank robbery, and sinking steamers on the high seas, and all of this sort of thing, and it was just that shade of question; that rang the bell. And it came under the heading of "didn't know." See. He didn't know. Well, "found out," that was different. Don't ask me why "found out" is different from "not-know," but to this pc it was that wildly different. And it was that sort of thing that finally settled up this case and got this case firing, got some tone arm action going, and that sort of thing. Case just did not respond to the exact question that one would normally would have thrown.

You'd said, "Since you have been living with X, is there anything that you have failed to reveal?" No reaction. But, "Since you have been living with X, is there anything X didn't know about?" Oh, man! Volcanic action. See, but on the same question, "Is there..." – "Since you've been living with X, is there anything that X didn't find out?" No action at all. You tell me, you see. What you're into there is a very thin shading of semantics. And the pc in an almost childlike daze reactively hides behind some of the thinnest little excuses.

But remember, my job as the auditor was to get the needle cleaned up. That was my job as the auditor. And if everything I was supposed to do, usual, natural and normal that

we're doing today, just as you are doing, didn't finally accomplish this action, then I had to assume that there was some shading of meaning, there was something we just weren't getting at here, man, and start drilling away on it.

There's something I certainly didn't know. Certainly there was something going on here I didn't know about. Now, what's going on can take in the wildest and widest of horizons. Of course, the goal you're trying to prove out may be the very, very wrongest goal you ever heard of on the pc, at which time he'll get very withholdy and his needle will go very dirty, and then you find yourself in the silly, silly position of trying to pull missed withholds from the guy – the missed withhold is something he knows reactively but does not know. It is not his goal.

And he sits right there and he says, "It's my goal," and so forth, and "Yes," they're very happy to have the thing checked out and so on. And, "But what are you doing? yak-yak." And all of a sudden natter-natter and scream-scream, and "I think I'm going to blow course tomorrow because I'm just not ever going to be audited again. Auditing is – I'm finished. There's going to be – no more. I just don't want any more of any kind," you see? And yap-yap-yap, and it doesn't matter what the auditor does, the needle's unreadable, everything's going to hell, yeah, there's a missed withhold there, but the pc doesn't know it, and you couldn't dig it up except by actually checking out a hundred percent the whole problem of goals with this pc, see. That's your answer to the situation.

But it might be – you see, this is where you're hung as an auditor and where you've got to use some judgment – it might be that during the noon hour they were mad at you at the thought that you – they were – see, you already got missed withholds, see. It's the little missed withholds – and they took your lunch kit, see, and threw it on the floor. See, it might be that one, too, see? You get the idea? You see what you're into here?

You're sorting through the human jungle called the reactive mind. And in sorting through that jungle you are fortunate in having the keys, the maps, you know the blazes on the trees, but remember there are conditions here where the same white blaze occurs simultaneously on twenty different types of trees. You've got a missed withhold which is the guy's goal is wrong, but he doesn't know it, and you don't know it, and the thing is reading on an invalidation only, that the lines are wrong or that his goal has already been nulled out early on the list! He knows that reactively, see. It was his goal. There it went. [laughter, laughs]

He doesn't know it! There isn't anything under the sun would tell you that was his goal! You just did a little sloppy piece of metering or something, or maybe your rudiments weren't in at the beginning of session, and the goal just before it, something like this happened: you looked up and sounded rather interested or amused on the goal just before his goal. You get the idea? It was, "to lick pots and pans of old fudge" or something like that, you know, and you looked at this and you sort of – you know, and he says, "What the hell is he doing that for?" you know? [laughter] And the meter's inoperative for the next couple of goals. And the time he wakes up on down the line someplace, he says, "I wonder what page we're on. What page are we on?" you know, reactively sort of, "What page are we on? What..." He's sort of reactively listening for "to catch catfish" and it doesn't come up, see?

Sometimes he'll want to look through the goals list, you know? "X!" See, he'll just see that, down deep someplace. And after that it's chop-chop-chop, *nyat-nyat-nyat*, yap-yap-yap.

Now, he doesn't know what happened, you don't know what happened, you've got a dirty needle, and you go ahead slavishly trying to clear, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" see. "What have you done?" you are saying, see? "What have you done that I haven't found out about?" He hasn't done a thing! [laughter] And it can't of course be cleared. You missed his goal. Of course you don't find that out till next month, or something like that, see, when the data does you no good whatsoever.

Well, there are several trees have the same white blaze. There is no substitute for good metering, there's no substitute for being alert all the way along the line, and there's also no substitute for using your ruddy 'ead once in a while. See, I can give you – I can – I can fill your arms full of charts and stuff your pockets full of good compasses, and things like this, and give you little playing records of witty sayings for the session and ways to open the pet-cock and drain the oil out of the pc. Give you all sorts – give you lube charts of his mental machinery. But please, I think you're asking too much, too much, you see, to absolve you of any sense of any kind whatsoever. And that I've always steadfastly refused to do. Even if my goal were – and it isn't – to overwhump you, I wouldn't.

Here's the point. We're already along a line, you see, of your doing what Ron says, you see. We're already along that line fine, very heavily. And that became necessary through such randomness that nobody in the world was getting audited, don't you see? But that came into being there, all right. Now, let's not push that forward through to the final hilt of saying, "Thou must never have any initiative." Let's be worse than that. Let's say, that – let's not cook up things of "This is a sin and blasphemy since one is having an idea," see. Let's not get that corny, see. We're not – these aren't the days of Buddha.

Here's the final word on the thing. Yes, there is a way. And frankly, if you put your very best efforts to it, and work like mad, with the sweat held – you have to have rain gutters across above your eyebrows to channel the sweat off – for years and years and years, you would eventually, possibly, have come up with just about what we've got. Because it's been continuously monitored, not by my inventions, but by my observations, both of human behavior, the human mind, and the activities of people doing things with these items.

Now, I'll probably have to run some of that out as invalidation later. But anyhow – of me! But the point, the point I'm making here, is you get too slavish an adherence and you will commit as grave a sin as introducing too many arbitraries and too many barriers. Or introducing none in some wild burst of imagined freedom, and your pc practically spins in.

Now, I'm not trying to give you a distrust of what you're doing. I'm merely saying that in 3GA, you're confronting a pc. You've got a pc in front of you, you're auditing the pc who is in front of you. Now, there are various exact, textbook reasons why this pc misacts the way he does. These have been ferreted out, and someday you'll come to the knowledge that these are.

You'll know that definitely. And now let's come to a further action, and we don't use our good sense in handling of this situation, believe me, you'll get no auditing done. You see, there are various directions you can go, and one of them is too fixed a fixedness, and you can become a complete idiot this way. Just completely idiotic.

We say to the pc, "Start of session." See, well that's fine, we're getting him all ready, and he's going into session and so forth. He keeps vomiting, you see, but we're not paying attention to that. And we say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" you know, and he vomits a bit more, and so forth. [laughter]

And we get very upset and cross with the pc because he won't hold still long enough to see if he's willing to talk to us about our difficulties. You get what I mean? You see it's just stupid.

All right, similarly, pc sits down, looks at us very gloweringly, and we say, "Well I shouldn't inquire too deeply into this pc's past because he looks dangerous." Now, the best thing to do with this pc is to just open up the session, not do any rudiments because they do contain this withhold question, and let's keep out of all the trouble we can keep into, and now let's go into an auditing session, and let's omit Prepchecking on this pc, because we really want to get 3GA done, you see? Well, that's way too wide. At that moment you would have had it.

In the first place, the pc isn't in-session, isn't going to give us any data, isn't going to as-is anything; it's all going up in a balloon, and you're operating across continuous piling up missed withholds, and you're lucky if you can get out of it with your life, man! You get the idea?

All right, but then, let's have this other situation – have this other situation, see. That's total freedom, the one I just gave you. And let's get the other situation of where just to make sure he's in-session, let's put in fifteen or twenty extra beginning rudiments. Let's – we know that his mother has violently opposed to his having processing. So every session before we get into the body of the session, let's ask him a rudiment about how his mother is.

Even the rawest-meat pc would begin to realize that a bunch of arbitraries were going here. Who wouldn't? But the pc wouldn't look good. Just the pc would look worse and worse, and get worse and worse, because man, he's being run into practically every present time problem he ever heard of, don't you see, before he is brought to the body of the session. He just can't quite concentrate by the time he gets to the body of the session. So you wouldn't get anything done either.

You can also startle pcs. You can decide that we should run several extra middle rudiments. See, middle rudiments are working all right, they're cleaning up things when they're used. Let's run in several extra middle rudiments. We found out that the pc has a tendency to repress a cough. So, irrespective of the pc's coughing, well, let's introduce a middle rudiment, asking specifically, after we say "careful of," that "Have you suppressed a cough in this session?" See, let's get that going, and let's get several others going, and let's have some fancy curves in here of some kind or another. And finally the whole body of the session is taken up with middle rudiments, you know? Because you never seem to be able to clear, "Have you suppressed – in this session have you suppressed a cough?" That's the one that's giving us trouble, you see? Because the guy says, "*K-Humm...*," you see, and you say, "That read." [laughter]

Just doesn't ever seem to clean up. And we find out when we're auditing him on the full – the whole track that he has a button called "cough," and you fin – you'd find out it's

funny, every time you say "cough" to him he'll cough, you know. Cough-cough, cough-cough. It's very interesting. Very amusing. We find out he's also coughing as a thetan, which is very interesting. We never seem to get that one in, but we tried. Too many wild variables.

Now, it's amongst this tangled brier patch that we walk in order to get somebody's list of goals and get somebody's list done on the goal that is found, and so on, it's our job to get the auditing done. Now, the best way to get it done is the Model Session you've got right here, according to various findings. And your middle ruds are pretty good. But I can, and am going to, slightly change their sequence to give you just a little more of the stuff you're asking for, don't you see? Just slightly change that. I have no reason to publish it at the moment. But it's just all in the interest of let's make it nicely – let's get it good and patterned, and then we're not upsetting the pc by giving him something unexpected every two minutes, and let's get it nice and patterned, and let's adhere to that pattern, and let's do a minimum of rudiments and a maximum of auditing in any session. But let's not do such a minimum of rudiments that we have the pc out of session while we're doing the auditing. Do you see the nice balance there? Well, that is only furnished by an auditor's judgment.

There is no substitute for an auditor taking responsibility for his pc. There is no substitute whatsoever for an auditor using his initiative. And there's also no substitute of any kind for an auditor, basically, getting results – there's no substitute for that. And if I could invent something that you would say to a pc, and wouldn't require any barriers of any kind whatsoever, and you just said "Boojum boojum boojum" three times to the pc like that, and the pc was instantly cleared, and you didn't even have to say it in a sudden tone of voice or anything else, you could say one word "Boojum" and the next word "Boojum," it wouldn't matter, and so forth, why you'd be all set. But unfortunately this small fact stands in your road of that: is pcs don't go Clear when you say "Boojum boojum boojum" to them. It takes a Model Session, it takes very accurate reading of the meter, and it takes a very set pattern that has been piloted through with vast ardour, and is a rather narrow road, actually. At the same time I think a narrow road can be followed so as to pitch over the edge of the nearest cliff, you see. And it can also be followed rather easily and comfortably. But even a mule has to have some judgment to go up one.

It's bad judgment to introduce too many arbitraries, it's bad judgment to put in too much freedom, and it's also very bad judgment to be so damn fixed to what you're doing that you never look up and find what has to be done in the session, see? Your auditing actually becomes a happy mean amongst those things. And if you do that well, why you'll really get there. You'll really make Clears.

We've got several people coming up to Clear this minute. And isn't it interesting that the people who are coming up toward Clear and so forth are being audited by the auditors who do the best Model Session and best reading of the meters. I don't think it's any coincidence at all. It'll inevitably be that way.

But I'm also saying that in those sessions where people are going in that direction and coming up to Clear, there must have been a little judgment sitting there in the auditor's chair. Do you follow that?

All right. So there is the razor edge we walk. And that razor edge of course spells success.

Thank you.

PREPCHECKING WITH MID RUD BUTTONS

A lecture given on
26 July 1962

Well, now, we still I think – what date do we still have?

Audience: Twenty-sixth.

Oh, you're still here on the 26th! Hey! Twenty-sixth July AD 12, second lecture. Saint Hill Briefing Course. The subject of this lecture is *prrrrrrrrepchecking. Prrrepchecking.*

It goes without saying that everything that you are working on – I refuse to leave any errors in it just to appear right.

In other words that's a peculiarity I have and you'll just have to put up with it. Most scientists get enamored with an idea and they have so few – [laughter, laughs] they spend the rest of their lives trying to prove it. And were they to change their minds concerning this, they would of course lose in repute. I don't consider that repute is more important than getting the job done.

I don't care what you think of my repute, I'm going to go on being honest. When I find something wrong, why, I jolly well reserve the right to say so. And when I have been wrong I have uniformly been the first to tell you. When something can be improved and make the job easier for you I don't care what it invalidates, I'm going to tell you.

Now, there's a certain amount of effort spent in the direction of trying to force me over into the other position. Every once in a while I get blamed for not having invented Scientology in the last lifetime. Somebody comes along and says, "Well, why on earth didn't you tell us about missed withholds back in 1952?" You see?

All right, if I had known about missed withholds in 1952 I would have told you. It's as simple as that.

You see, don't ever assume that I am dealing you data off a stacked deck which has been in existence for Lord knows when. Although this data existed at one time or another on the track – and I don't mean the whole body of the data – the various data and postulates were made up to remedy and solve things as people went along the track, packaging it up in one piece and so forth, just – well, let me put it this way – hasn't been customary.

And a thetan got the way he is because of the introductions of arbitraries and when you find out you are dealing with a few more arbitraries than you have to, well, the thing to do is to throw them away. That's the proper thing to do. You say, "There's more arbitraries than we need so let's dispense with them." And any time I can get two procedures to do a job that was formerly being done by fifty, well I for sure will give you the two procedures.

And if I can find two jobs that could be done with one procedure, I'll sure throw one of those procedures away. That's the only sensible way to look at it. And I've just found a way to use middle rudiments and make them double in brass and get the job done much better in Prepchecking which is quite remarkable. And this is very embarrassing because I have just gotten out two policy letters giving you canned Prepchecks! All right, if I had wanted to appear the big man and "I'm always right," you know, *right*, right, exclamation point, right, and so forth, I would of course have to suppress this data because data which is slightly more complicated was just released at the beginning of the week. That would be good for my reputation but it's sure hard as hell on you as an auditor and a pc, you see. So I don't subscribe to that policy.

Now, the middle rudiments were carefully sorted out of a tremendous number of buttons which could have been used. Now oddly enough you could add another fifteen or twenty buttons with the greatest of ease and have your middle rudiments maybe twenty-three or twenty-four items long. And what you'd do – this is probably the way the session would go – in any two-hour session, you'd get in your beginning rudiments; you would ask one Prepcheck question and then, to check the thing, you'd spend the remainder of the body of the session and then, if the original Prepcheck question that you asked in the session were found to be alive, you wouldn't have any time left, of course, to clean it, so you'd have to leave it that way, so that you can get into your end rudiments.

This doesn't appear to me to be very efficient. So I've carefully taken out all the stuff we knew and so forth, and believe me a tremendous amounts of stuff have accumulated as far as data is concerned. You know this research line is only something on the order of about, I think it's about thirty-two years old right now and the most concentrated part of the area is about fifteen years; and to rack up this much data and cover this much territory in a measly fifteen years, particularly regarded from a whole track viewpoint, is not only incredible, it's impossible.

There's been a certain amount of rush on it and so forth, but basically it's just working on it that has been important and working on it without any pitch. You see there's no pitch. I am not working for the Intergalactic Survey, you see, or something like that: "Come to Earth to civilize the natives," you know or something like that. That arbitrary we can delete.

That doesn't mean that I am not connected with the Intergalactic government, you see. But they don't know about it either yet! [laughs, laughter]

I have my name, rank and serial number just like other people. But that's very funny: hardly anybody can ever clear – "Have you ever worked under an assumed name?" Clang! "Yeah, what?" And I have to answer, you see, and I keep giving this thing – I keep giving this thing – I keep giving this thing – and it always gets cleared any time I get that Prepcheck

question. Very, very funny. People wonder why it doesn't clear. Well, it doesn't clear because it is true! It goes on and on and on and on and on, you see? It's present time.

Now, we look over this situation and we had all this bushel basket load of buttons in the human mind. You've seen them, a lot of principal ones in the Chart of Attitudes, a lot of other areas of data and so forth. There's various buttons that you can push and frankly although they were announced and given to you very softly and very quietly, the middle rudiments are an assembly and a stripdown of buttons based on this fact: They consist of – when you add the word *suggest*, which is used in your Prepchecks – they consist of just those things which can keep one of the others from reading and which, if present, can keep a goal or item from reading. That is the whole assembly.

Well, this makes them pretty powerful buttons.

Let's take a look at them. There's *Suppress*. Now if you got all the suppress off the case, nearly everything would blow, don't you see? If Suppress is alive, of course you don't get a read on the remainder. So just as a rule and law you've got to run Suppress before you add in another series of anything. That's the law, that's the rule. You've got to put in Suppress. By getting off suppress then you will get a read on the remainder.

Now Suggest could be translated – and sometimes, by the way, has to be – as is-ness. That's evaluation out of your Auditor's Code. That's evaluation. That says something is – that's the is-ness of things.

Now it is a very powerful button because you say something is and although it wasn't reading before, it will now read. The auditor says, "That is still alive," and oddly enough he can possibly make a pc wonder about it, you see, and the pc jams on it and says, "That couldn't be still alive," to himself, don't you see, and it would create a little ridge there and it'll just read on the meter and read on the meter and read on the meter. See? So evaluation can make something read. And that is contained in the most – its nearest cousin in the English language that anybody can understand in the form of Suggest.

Now the next point would be Invalidate. And invalidation, if present, if a goal is invalidated, it will now read as *the* goal. It'll make an item read which wouldn't otherwise read. When you take the invalidation off, the item no longer reads which is very peculiar.

Now you've got suppress, of course, on top of an invalidate, keeps the invalidation from showing up.

Now "Failed to reveal" is off the line because it gives you the dirty needle. That is – that is that little minute rock slam that is always a "Failed to reveal" so that gives you a particular and peculiar needle read.

The item "Careful of" is to a marked degree another Suppress. But it has this characteristic: After the person has been having something done for a little while that is a little bit offbeat, they can hang up in the thing if they have become too careful of something or other. And they could also make something read in quite the reverse by not suppressing. "Careful of," that gives you an opposite flow.

So you get your – you get your middle rudiments, in short, as being something which are capable of making a goal or item read if present.

Now that Suggest, moving that Suggest in there, which you will find in your Prepcheck, is actually not as current or as constant as you might think. It – you wouldn't use it in every middle rudiment that came by because you can pick it up at all one fell swoop. Mostly based on this fact: that auditors seldom suggest anything, but they might seem to some place or another, so you pick it up on a Prepcheck basis rather than a middle rud basis, every time you go by.

You actually then have in essence five middle rudiment buttons that could be used.

Now, the way you would arrange these buttons, if you wanted the optimum service out of these buttons on – for a Prepcheck purpose, which I am about to give you because I am going to show you how to use just the middle rudiments to perform a whole Prepcheck, which is a very interesting little advance here.

You would say, "Suppress," and then you would say, "Suggest," you see, and then you would say, "Careful of," and then "Invalidate" and "Failed to reveal."

Do you follow how those things are played together?

Of course, the one which is most important and can blow the session up in bits and pieces we put at the end to occur when everything else has been beautifully swamped up. And we actually put Suppress in twice by putting its opposite in, you see, careful of.

So you'd have – you'd have these arranged in that particular fashion as being very powerful. You'd have Suppress, Suggest, you would then have Careful of and Invalidate and then Failed to reveal. All right, in that order you would have two cracks at suppression.

Now that would be very interesting if these buttons could be used for the bulk of Prepchecking. Wouldn't it?

Well, if they are that strong a series of buttons, why, they must have some value. Last night I sat down and looked at a pc – it was very late and I'd had a lot of auditing that hadn't recommended itself to me one way or the other. I was already violating the Auditor's Code, one of the only times I get a chance to audit, way after ten, man. You have to be good to audit after ten. Had the pc sort of gummed up and said, "What am I going to do here?" And said, "Well, the best thing I can do with something like this is form some Zeros here before I get on about my business, form up some Zeros." I was thinking – Zeros? Why the hell should I form any Zeros? I know the pc has not been feeling very well for an exact period of time. Let's just throw the middle ruds in as Zero questions.

Man! Man, I've seen assists in my time but that was about the wildest I've seen in some while. That was just about the best Zeros I ever saw. So after the session I said, "What the ruddy bleeding hell happened here? Almost blew the roof off," you know. And I said, "Well, of course, you idiot!" – I seldom call myself an idiot, except – but sometimes do. You've carefully got together the most powerful buttons that you can possibly give, because they're the only things that can make a goal read or not read or an item read or not read, and you summed these things together in the middle rudiments, then you don't move them over

into Prepchecking, well what can you expect will happen if you move them over into Prepchecking? Well, of course they are the main buttons that are sitting there. *Crash!* All hell's going to break loose if you prepcheck these things against a period of time. Quite interesting.

So I sat down and wrote this down for you. This would just be a sample action. This would be a sample action. This would be a Prepcheck, guaranteed to do something very interesting with a pc. This is more complicated than it need to be. I'm just giving you an idea of what you could do with this, see. This is fun. Just for you. "When did you decide to come to Saint Hill?" You ask this guy, see. You ask this student, "When did you decide to..." Well, he finally picks it out of the ether and you get the thing confirmed on the meter and so forth and you get the date! You write the date down in your auditor's report. Then you ask him, "Just before – whatever the date was, see – what happened?"

In other words you discover an area of overts which is the prior confusion to the date. Got the idea? An area of overts.

And then date the beginning of that prior Confusion. We're moving it back a little earlier. Date the beginning of the prior Confusion. And now, just for the hell of it, in case he's skidded and missed, why let's select an arbitrary date a month earlier and let that be our date by which we head these questions. You know, your Prepcheck question has got to have a time limiter. This all starts to get very, very amusing and very interesting indeed, because you've moved back to a specific date now. You've got the beginning of the prior confusion before he made this decision, now we're going to move back a month earlier just in case he slipped and didn't forget the original overt, you know – didn't remember the original overt, so we're going to take that as the arbitrary date and then we're going to do this with it: All we're going to do is frame an expanded mid rud series of questions. We're going to flatten each one repetitively and then we are going to go over this two or three times. Going to frame the questions like this: Let us say – it wouldn't be, but let us say it was June 1st, 1955. Wouldn't be, but let's just say that was the date. Your Prepcheck question would be, "Since June 1st, 1955 is there anything you have suppressed?"

Well now, if you don't think that isn't going to keep your pc running for a while you're mistaken. And we're just going to run this repetitive, see, just totally repetitive. "Since June 1st, 1955 is there anything you have suppressed? Thank you." "Since June 1st, 1955 is there anything you have suppressed? Thank you." "Since June 1st, 1955..." – you don't have to answer these just so I am not missing any withholds on you. [laughs] "Since June 1st 1955, is there anything you have suppressed?" See? And finally the pc says, "Huh! No, that's – that's all. That's it, that's the lot!" And you say, "Thank you. I'll check that on the meter."

Understand this is done terribly formally, you see. Very formal auditing. You are not interjecting comments or running Two-way Comm. Nothing. Because it's very easy. It's almost automatic.

You get it over here and say, "All right. Going to check that on the meter. Since June 1st, 1955 is there anything you have suppressed? That reads. That. That. That. That."

"Oh, yes, well that's – that's my mother..." so forth, and so forth. You just lay the meter aside, "Since June 1st, 1955 is there anything you have suppressed? Since June 1st, 1955

is there anything you have suppressed?" And you go on and on and on. Oh, honest, you're going – you're gonna – you're gonna get yourself some – a bucket of answers, man!

In the first place the pc is perfectly willing to tell you things they have suppressed. In fact they practically springboard off as he remembers them. See? This is auditing with bed-springs under it. *Boong, bing, boong!* That's dandy. Oddly enough a lot of somatics come off at this time. Now, what I thought would happen when I was doing this, is that everything might restimulate. But it didn't. The somatics came off with the suppressions. A lot of them.

All right. Well, let's say the pc has come to a point of saying, "No," and let's say that we have asked the pc, "I will check this on the meter. Since June 1st, 1955 is there anything you have suppressed?" And let's say that we have read the meter correctly and that it was clean. Now, clean is awfully relative in this case. Man, this is relative. But it didn't show on the meter and the pc isn't thinking of any answers, and as far as he is concerned, as far as you're concerned, that's clean. All right, fine, fine, fine, fine. That sounds great.

All right. Without doing anything else extraordinary or doing anything we simply swing into the second question, "Since June 1st, 1955 is there anything you have suggested?"

Now the funny part of it is that you will quiver on this, if you will redecide perhaps, to run this as decided, or something like that, but that is not the meaning of it, the meaning of the thing is evaluated, don't you see? But suggested is very mild, isn't it?

"Yes, I've suggested to my father that he go to hell and I've suggested to Mamie that she buy a new hat, and I've suggested that we separate." You get the idea? "I've suggested that it's better that they blow the world up," you know, these first little things. It's very mild. It's not any overts to amount to anything at all.

Well, we follow the same repetitive on and on this, and we don't care if it runs shortly or longly, we are going to run it to a point where both the pc and the meter agree utterly that that's it. That's clean. That's good. All right. That's fine. We drop that. Everything's running along fine. It'll probably be the second or the third Prep-check session when it is done, but – this is actually a twenty-five-hour intensive probabilities, quite possibly, because my question last night was, "In the past two weeks..." And it ran and ran and ran.

All right. So we go on and on, and now we get into this sort of a situation. We want to know now, of course, some more suppressions. So we say, since June 1st, 1955 is there anything you have been careful of? Isn't that mild and innocent, man? That's mild and innocent. Of course all this time why, given that you are reading the meter and getting your rudiments in every session, and that sort of thing, and not goofing anywhere along the line, your pc's ARC is building up, building up, building up, building up with the auditor. He'll be able to blow things better and all that sort of thing.

So we flatten that one. Since June 1st, 1955 is there anything that you've been careful of? And of course we get the remaining suppressions off of this thing. And then we let the pc have it right in the eyes, see?

Got that all beautifully flat and so we say – got it on the meter and everything – everything's clean, "Since June 1st, 1955 is there anything you have invalidated?"

Well, that's a nice quiet sort of word, isn't it? Invalidated. Anybody'd answer that. *Pow!* You know, now you are going to get some somatics he didn't dream of, you know, here and there, and this and that, various things, cognitions, that sort of thing going to come up. We run that thing on down, pc says it's flat and the meter says it's flat, and because we know by this time how to read our meter we know it's flat. And we got that one all set, and all squared away and pc is feeling fine.

And now we say, "Since June 1st, 1955 is there anything you have failed to reveal?"

Well, what's very interesting about this is you of course during the sessions as you went along will probably have had to use your random rudiment now and then, or something like that, you might have had this to boost along, but this will come as a totally natural action to your pc by this time. Failed to reveal, that's very innocent, that's very calm, that's very nice and he'll just walk on through and unload withholds left and right. Hardly noticing that he does so because it seems so easy and natural and everything will go fine.

Now, the possibility is, certainly if that becomes flat at that time we could actually skip the whole thing and not do anything further about it – don't overlook that possibility – providing we don't do this idiocy, of check the mid ruds on the period. Do a fast check of the mid ruds on the period. Let's just cut our throats right there. See?

"Since June 1st, 1955 is there anything you have suppressed, suggested, been careful of, failed to reveal?" You know? Ugh. Let's just miss all the rest of the withholds. See. If you just left it at that, went through each one of these things once, you'd have practically a different pc sitting in front of you, providing it was done in Model Session and you were reading the meter and you had your rudiments in, see.

This would be quite interesting, this would be highly informative. You say well, you couldn't possibly have gotten the bottom of every chain. Well, here's what I found out, and the only reason I'm releasing the data, is because you are taking them up in this particular sequence and because these are very odd little buttons to be taking up and they appear to be very innocent, and that sort of thing, they clear away an awful lot of track without worrying about fundamentals and basics. And that, by omitting the withhold system, we left ourselves wide open. Don't you see? Some guy just wouldn't clear up on this subject, because we never had any method by which to get the earliest on the chain, don't you see?

But this doesn't matter, whether you get the earliest on the chain or not. Because these buttons are hot enough, apparently, to wash out whatever is going on without you finding a big missed withhold sitting in your lap and that sort of thing. But you could – this is for the purposes of the establishment of a system here – you could now start in all over again. If you were running an intensive and you had lots of time or if the pc had given it a very shallow pass, you start in all over again and you could get it from the beginning to the end.

In other words, you do the whole cycle of those middle rudiments. Probably take you another session or two or three to get that all the way through again, but you'd pick up some deeper fundamentals along the line.

However, I wish to caution you to this effect: that is cleaning a clean. You've already said that that's all that he has suppressed and that sort of thing. You'd only get into trouble with this if you weren't able to read a meter or you left one of them muddied up.

Now, a couple of times on TV demonstrations here I've seen a Prepcheck question left unflat as though it were not very important or something of the sort. Well, let me tell you, man, that – exclamation point – important. Don't ever leave a Prepcheck question unflat whatever else you do! That's – the Catholic church has sins of blasphemy and other types of sins for which they burn people and armies shoot men for cowardice in battle. I think they shoot them now for being brave in battle – but anyhow, armies shoot people for desertion – when they are headed by Eisenhower.

Every group has its sins, see, but we don't have many sins, we don't pay attention to many sins, but there is a sin, really, is leaving a Prepcheck question unflat, because it amounts to a sinful situation. You've got somebody all upset and without knowing what is wrong he gets blowy and he is liable to leave Scientology and deny himself auditing. See? It's important. It's important.

All sorts of wild things can happen by just leaving one Sec Check question unflat. The darnedest thing you ever heard of. I've never seen so much commotion!

God, I've had telex machines going wildly in all directions and everything else, just on that one basis. So, we'll put that down as a sin.

And you're teaching an Academy student sometime – his is not to reason why – he can't seem to pass the missed withhold bulletin or something like that, just tell him it is a sin.

Now, that's quite interesting as a clean-up little intensive for a Prepcheck area. Quite interesting. If that were run on you you would be quite amazed at some of the results and things that would come off.

Now, I have just given you a method of discovering a date, by taking a decision which somebody has obviously made. I'll give you an obvious decision – the fellow has gotten married a couple of years ago. We don't do a Problems Intensive to find the key problem on the track before we audit him, if we haven't done that we are not going to spend any time doing that, something like that. You can arbitrarily pick up some obvious decision the person has made. What's the most obvious decision with this guy? Well, he must have decided to get married. Of course the girl is probably of two opinions about that, but he must have decided this. Therefore just pick on it. And decide that if he made a decision of this character, why, there must have been a prior Confusion ahead of it. And you will always be right. Oddly enough you will always be right.

Now, if you just back up the time a month arbitrarily before the prior Confusion that you've spotted, of course you've included any little additional activities that might have occurred that he has kind of forgotten about. So you sort of have a basis to the prior Confusion. Just a method of doing it.

Now, you can also run this, wildly enough, on a – this basis – I'll tell you the basis you can't run it on in a minute, but you run on this basis, "In this lifetime – ." Now let's really shoot the moon – let's settle in for a fifty-hour intensive, just like that. See? "In this lifetime,

is there anything you have suppressed?" Yeah, we're settling in for the long haul here! See? Gosh you'll get to the end of the first question, you see, about three or four sessions later. See?

Well, that's fine. That's fine. And you just follow exactly the same action, except you don't have to establish any arbitrary prior Confusion, don't you see.

There is one but don't try to establish it. [laughter, laughs]

And you just carry on exactly in that fashion. You first clear up, of course – always the same sequence: Suppress and then Suggest and then Careful of and then Invalidate and then Failed to reveal. The magic five. And you're going to get all kinds of wild things coming up. Oddly enough, if you attacked it in that particular way, you would get withholds off pcs more or less easily and voluntarily. You wouldn't have to be slugging for it very hard, don't you see?

Now, there's only one caution on this, I talked to you a little earlier this evening. Follow the rules. Follow them right straight down the middle of the path, so forth, but don't be an idiot.

Failed to reveal communicates nothing to this pc, let us say. Just kind of fish around on a question before we go overboard on the thing. See? Failed to reveal means nothing to them, it doesn't mean an overt, it doesn't mean anything else. Failed to reveal, well, reveal, he's never undressed in public, and this is what reveal means to him, see. So his answer is "Nothing. I've never failed to reveal anything," see? Nothing. He's got it all backwards and somehow or another can't realize that when he answers that way means he's always undressed in public. [laughter] He just doesn't seem to untangle this thing.

So you'd have to, at this point, why, any of those points you'd have to be smart enough to stay on the exact meaning, but within the intelligence of the pc.

Give you an example, you're auditing a little kid, you know. You've got to translate the word around, and sometimes you can make a wild mistake. It doesn't mean the same thing at all. But you've got to use the words in the meaning that will communicate to the pc.

So you might run that one, "Since early in this lifetime is there anything you've done that people didn't find out about at the time?" See? It's what you are trying to get. See, he says, "Well, I was audited last year at the HASI, see, I was audited last year and I gave them all of my overts. So therefore there is nothing I have failed to reveal." If you don't think you don't sometimes get this answer, you ought to read some auditor's reports sometimes. That's pretty wild. And sure enough, the auditor pulled a lot of them, so it's now unanswerable you see, as a question. "But people didn't find out at the time." Oh, at the time, they didn't find out about it. "Well, they didn't find out about it at the time. Yes, they didn't, you know. It's true. Oh, there were quite a few of those! Oh, that's what you mean!" Big cognition.

Well, you can run that thing but the only error you are going to get into in handling this little system I'm giving you here of using the middle rudiments doubling them in brass, the only error you'll make is failing to get a communication established here. And... "Invalidated." Boy, he does not understand that, man.

Of course an invalidation, you should know, is not-is and is the not-is axiom. And so you realize that translates into maybe, "tried to make nothing of". So it's "In this lifetime is there anything you've tried to make nothing of?" See. It's almost a direct translation. In fact, it's possibly a little directer than "Invalidate." That communicates.

So it goes by this rule, that if you find the pc is unable to answer or give you many, don't blame it on the pc's unwillingness to give up withholds or something, or the caginess of the pc; blame it on the communication. The communication is not occurring. See? You've got to make the communication so it does bite. It'll be the offbeat of that communication which stomps this thing. Naturally you go to all trouble of finding out what each one of these words means and translates well to the pc. You've got a new-worded set of middle rudiments, haven't you, to use on the pc. They might sound very strange but they are communicating to the pc. Don't you see? See, that's what it is. So anyway, if you were to do that and do just that, the bank unstacks in its natural sequence, which is always desirable in Sec Checking and Prepchecking. And you have just about the easiest job in the world which is doing a Repetitive Prepcheck. It becomes just as easy as can be.

Now, I'm not recommending that your Prepcheck assignment be immediately transferred over to this. See? That what you are doing in Prepchecking immediately be transferred over into this activity and so on. You've got the last two pages of the Joburg 6A. These are specialist actions which of course have to be checkable and so forth. It's mainly done as class work and to sweeten up the tempers of your fellow students, that's why it is, and don't let them accumulate a lot of auditing overts and that sort of thing.

But if you get assigned to a long stretch of Prepchecking and so on and you've completed your assignment, there is some more auditing that you can do in this particular line, or if you are assigned to Prepchecking and you have already completed your requirements on the thing, that's what I would do. I wouldn't go into any arbitrary form. Arbitrary forms have their value. They particularly have value in instruction because you can check and find out what the person did. I'd use more this type of approach.

Now I'll show you another way this could be used and combined and made up.

Let's take the old style Problems Intensive the way it was finally canned up and released with its 0 and P sections and sort out, by assessment, the chief problem, by assessment, that's a self-determined decision the person has made. Of course, that's immediately preceded by a problem and that's immediately preceded by a prior Confusion. And by assessment of the decisions, self-determined decisions the person has made, by assessment, discover the most charged decision in this lifetime.

Now this would appear absolutely magical to a raw-meat pc and would stand a psycho-anal-yst on his ear.

What you do is just take an assessment of these self-determined decisions, date the problem, date the prior Confusion, and remember now, there's one thing everybody has missed consistently and continually in the Problems Intensive, that just drives them completely astray and makes Problems Intensive unworkable. We mean the prior Confusion to that decision. And we are talking about a period of time as little as five minutes and as great as a week or two. And we are not talking about three years before.

Auditor after auditor, I have watched them, I have read their reports and I absolutely groan. They come in from Central Orgs and that sort of thing, and I groan on this thing. They take periods of three to five years before the self-determined decision. No, that is not a prior Confusion, that's not the prior Confusion that is meant.

The prior Confusion that is meant takes place from five minutes to a couple of weeks. It's right there! And if you ask the pc, you've got this terrifically charged self-determined decision and you ask the pc for the prior Confusion. You see, it happened when he was twenty-seven and it was a decision – it was a decision to go to work for the Bide-a-Wee Soap Company. This thing is absolutely dynamite! I mean you'd get it on the meter and you've been going down this list, and it goes *pow!* See? To go to work for the Bide-a-Wee Soap Company.

We ask the prior Confusion and the pc says, "Well, it was my mother washing my ears when I was a little boy." And the auditor says, "Well, all right." [laughter] "What were – who were the people who were present during that period?"

"Well, there was myself and my mother." And the auditor then runs overts against self, you see, to solve the whole thing. No, that is not the way you do it. I thought I had written it down plainly but apparently I missed there. Because a prior Confusion means the just prior Confusion. It could be within five minutes of the decision. But the pc will slide off of this and go anyplace else rather than face the thing. You've got to scramble him right in there.

You'd be surprised what's left on a Problems Intensive! What gets left, you know? What never gets touched! The whole prior Confusion never gets touched, you know. There's a murder and a bank robbery, see, that just happened the last Saturday before the fact. All there. That's all clean. You say, "Well is there any prior Confusion to that?" Oh, it falls off the pin. "Well, what was the prior Confusion to that?"

"Well, when my mother was washing my ears when I was a little boy. An auditor and I took that all up."

No! No, no, no, no! See? It's *just* prior! So if you think of a *just* prior Confusion, all will be beautifully resolved.

Your actions on putting one of these things together are elementary actions. You want the self-determined decision, you don't want an other-determined decision. Like sometimes marriage and so forth is not a self-determined decision. You want something he decided. Decisions he made. And you ask most pcs this and they sometimes start off very sloppily and give you other-determined answers. See?

You want self-determined changes in your life, is what you need, that you decided, you see, and if you say, "Self-determined changes in your life that you yourself decided to change on," you can kind of get it across, you know, across.

And the pc says to you, "Well, I was ill and they changed me to the hospital." And you just leave your pencil in the air and you say to the pc, "All right, that's fine. Now, thank you very much. Now, I'll repeat the auditing question, now. I want you to answer this question. This is the question." You know. Until you finally get, all of a sudden, "Oh, you mean things I decided? Oh well, that's different."

Changes in his life. Changes in his life, and so on, because sometimes it has to take a little while to dawn on the pc that he himself has effected any change in his life. When you first address him on this subject, he thinks of himself as a pawn, who was moved from one end of the board to the other. [laughter] He never thinks that he himself pushed himself around. So you sometimes have to dig a little bit before you get these things.

And you get those written down, and you make a nice list, each one, and that self-determined change, see, it's got to be very short. Very, very short. You shorthand it.

"Well, my wife and I, why, we owned a motel and we had been around the desert for quite a while and we-we-we-we've had – we had this service station first in Waco, see, and then – then we owned this motel. We owned this motel. And I went up to Montana for a little while and saw a friend of mine up there. He's a goat hunter and I saw him for a long time and actually I brought him back down and he made a couple of insulting remarks about this motel, and that sort of thing, but that was after I went to Los Angeles. And I finally found a buyer for the motel and we – we decided to go to San Francisco."

And honest to God you will find this sometimes on the auditing report. The whole story. Honest, you'll find the whole thing. I've seen some of them and – I haven't written that hard enough, see. It's various – you know...

"Decided to go to San Francisco," you see. June 1928. Decided to go to San Francisco, June 1928. That's all you want.

You're going to have to read those things back and you've got no time. "And that was the place where we – Waco, you know. And we had the petrol station in Waco and then I went up to Montana and there's a fellow up there shooting goats..." You know, you haven't got time to read all that!

It's – totally practical consideration – I'm not making fun of you. Actually, I thought I had originally stressed this madly. And you should see some of the old records that we have around here on that; they are quite ludicrous. We've corrected it and after that they get so they can really do it. But some of the first efforts have to be carefully explained to them that it had to be in two or three words with a date following it, you see, and you still get this short story, and they keep running out of forms, you know. [laughs]

Let me tell you the liability of putting down an other-determined change. All you do is assess the list of engrams.

They must be self-determined changes. You must not have on that list any other-determined change or you are liable to find yourself assessing an engram.

"Well, the doctor decided I had to go to the mountains for my health," and the auditor writes down "Gone to the mountains for health, October 1956." He comes along and he's assessing wildly here and God! "This October – mountains for health, October 1956." Boy, he just falls off the pin you know. You can – you can hear the air being split as the needle falls. Boy, that's it, you know, that's it. Now let's look for the prior Confusion to this area. We've got that straight. It has to be within the last week or so before that.

All right, that's fine. "All right. What's the personnel in this confusion?"

"Well, there was the lorry driver, and the three children that were riding in back..." Back of what? You know? We got a car smash, you see, and he spent the next several days in the hospital between life and death and we are running the beginning of a beautiful engram and this system, I assure you, does not handle engrams. So watch it!

There can be moments of pain and that sort of upset in there and this system will get you out of them more easily than other systems, and you mustn't avoid an area just because there was an accident in it or something like that. As long as you are assessing *self-determined* decisions to change you don't run into this difficulty and you get a proper assessment. You go on the line. But the pc has to sort this out for a while. Sometimes he really goes around in circles.

Yeah, he'll tell you about the doctor ordering him to the mountains, and you just hold your pencil up, give him TR 4 on it.

Say, "Oh, doctor ordered you to the mountains? Thank you. Good. Yeah. Fine. Good. All right. Now let's have a self-determined change that I just asked for. Let's have this self-determined change. Self-determined change that you made yourself!" [laughter]

"Oh, Oh. Oh! Oh! My mother took me out of prep school."

You say, "Good. Thank you, thank you, that's fine." Like that and so forth. "Now, I'll repeat the question here. I'll repeat the question, what I want is a self-determined change that you did yourself, on your own initiative." [laughter]

"Oh! Oh! Oh! Oh! I've got that, I've got that. Well, my father and mother moved to another town when I was young."

Don't commit suicide. Just keep at it until you've got this thing grooved in. Lay down the pencil and say, "Now look, what I want from you is times when you yourself, you, you, you yourself, decided on a change in life. Now, for instance churches, or you decided to, you know, shift something in your religion or something like that. That's what I want! That's what I want. You got that?" He's got that now. You pick up your pencil again and you sit there and look at him alertly. All right. And you'll probably get them!

And then you get a list of that and then you make sure that every one is a self-determined change. Don't keep challenging the pc each time he gives you one. He says, "I decided..." That's good enough.

You go down that list, you assess that thing out, you take the one with the greatest fall. Or assess it by elimination. Oddly enough they will assess by elimination. Just like the Prehav Scale. But you want to watch it because they will assess all the way out if you don't grab the last one just as it disappears! Don't sit there like an idiot saying, "Which one was the one that went out last?"

You've got two, you see, and you are going between these two and you go from one to the other and keep making marks and you go back and read that one and you say, "Well, it must have been the other one, but that's gone, too, so which one did you have?"

And do your assessment, take that thing, now move back, find out if there was anything happened just before that and then move it back about a month to be safe and take that

as your arbitrary date. It's an arbitrary date that is made to include a distance as close to that as a month. And that'll include anything that happened in that period. And everything will be dandy. But if you permit that date to go back several years for the prior confusion you will miss it wildly, and you'll get the pc all wound up in a circle.

You want that area that just happened, because let me tell you, his decision was just preceded by the recognition that he had an awful problem to which the decision is a solution. The decision is always a solution to a problem. And just before he had this awful problem, well, he was in there committing overts and people were missing withholds with both fists! He had both feet into life up to the neck, if that's the hottest one that comes up.

But you mustn't go back any great time period from that. Don't go back years. Take that as your date and give it the works here just as I have been giving you here. Do those middle rud-Prepcheck type of thing. Let's say it turned up to September the 2nd, 1951. So you'd say, "Since September 2nd, 51 is there anything you have suppressed?" On and on and on and on and on!

Now, you get sometimes thrown by this type of action. I might tell you at this time, that I'm interested in this and interested in Prepchecking in an effort to upgrade the therapeutic value of Prepchecking. I'm quite interested in doing that. To make Prepchecking more meaningful, to make it do more for a case and what I'm giving you, I should have probably given you a better preliminary on the thing, but what I'm giving you actually makes Prepchecking pretty beefy. If it is well done the things that you can do with this will, I think, astonish even you. When you have already had results on this, I think, you will be quite astonished.

You get somebody, you only got a twenty-five-hour intensive on this person and that sort of thing, you'd be unhappy to prepcheck this person perhaps and try something desperate if it was all the money the poor bloke had and you didn't think you'd get very far with your Prepchecking and so forth. No, if you had a little experience with this particular type of mid ruds type Prepchecking, why you'd feel comfortable about sitting there and giving it to him, because man, some things are going to fly off he never heard the likes of. And also, because you've achieved sufficiently high result, the possibility of your getting a dirty needle after this is quite slight. Your auditor altitude, you see, has taken a rocket ride to Venus. See? You're amongst the stars as far as this guy's concerned.

Well, it's all real to him, that's the main thing that happens. It's all quite real. Because of course, he isn't going to tell you anything that he doesn't think he has. And you don't fish for any data, you don't push him around, you don't try to get any overts off particularly. You wind up – make sure when you finish all this that you get your middle rudiment in, that you haven't missed any withholds on him because that could be catastrophic, but that's a middle rudiment type action. Fast check, see?

And your guys are going to wind up at the end of this line, or the lady involved, and I think you will find you'll be quite happy with what you have done and actually you've done something rather relaxed about the whole thing.

Now, in handling – in handling Prepchecking in general, you would perhaps feel shy of doing it if you weren't going to get a result which was a desirable result to the pc. Well, I

think you'd find this – let us take an example here: Mrs. Jones has just been delivered of a nineteen-pound bouncing boy and has a slight postpartum psychosis and you think the best thing to do is to run out the birth engram. No, I can tell you that the best thing to do would be this middle ruds Prepcheck, predated on some prior Confusion Prior to that, not taking the birth as a date, but letting your date fall so that the birth is included in the period.

You are not targeting at it. You are auditing her a month and a half after the date of the delivery. Well, you fish back and find out a little bit more and talk to her about her life in that period and just take it at two months. That includes that period. And I think you'd be astonished to find the somatics fly off, without winding the pc stuck in the incident! You see? It has value, man!

This amounts to a PT problem, don't you see? It's just happened! You don't get it out of the way, why, you're going to have a mess on your hands. That gives the auditor another weapon too. And how successful it is is totally dependent upon the quality of your meter reading, and the degree the pc is in-session and the excellence with which you clean off those questions one after the other as you – I mean clean them off when you test them. I think you'd wind up at the other end of the line with a very happy pc.

Because a pc, asked permissively in this fashion, won't pull themselves deeper into the pit than they think they can go at any given moment, and you've got that interesting rule that is given, I think in Book Three of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, that the mind has a self-protective mechanism. You don't tend to overthrow that.

Now, this was necessary at this time since we have so many techniques that will overthrow the balance of the mind. We could run into somebody today like a – that's one of the reasons you want to – "Well, my God! When auditing in the old days I never had this many ARC breaks from the pc just putting in rudiments and that sort of thing. Ah, must be my auditing is deteriorated." No. You've got a stepped-up Model Session, don't you see? The potential of ARC is fantastic! If you don't learn how to drive this car right – it's like a Ferrari or a Cooper Special! Man, that thing is going to go off the curves! See? You are driving a racing car. You might as well make up your mind to it. See? This thing has got power and it has got speed. If you want to go back and drive a Mercedes-Benz 1898 model, why you won't get anywhere near the amount of ARC breaks and upsets from a pc. You won't get the results either! You get the difference of what you're learning right now?

Well, similarly this is gunned-up Prepchecking. But there was a – necessary at this time to have a relatively permissive system, which didn't overthrow the balance of the mind.

All right, let's take an extreme example of this. This girl, never under God's green earth ever dared go near the time she was thrown into the institution and electric shocked within an inch of her life. She begs you not to go anywhere near this! Well, that's one thing she won't talk about. If you guarantee not to talk about this in any way, shape or form, she'll be perfectly happy to be audited. Select a period two months ahead of it, run it!

I think, if you audit well, you'll be on the safe side. But if you don't audit it well and find yourself with the feeling that you have just shot off the edge of the Grand Canyon within a racing car and it is turning over and over and over in empty space, don't say I didn't warn you!

The thing to do is, of course, go back to giving a Touch Assist. [laughs] Can't miss a meter read with a Touch Assist, it has that advantage.

You know, there's some guy in practice someplace in the Middle West of the United States right now who does nothing but Touch Assists, has never been trained as an auditor and has a roaringly successful practice! So we mustn't, we mustn't sneer at these little things. But I just give you the word of warning. See? You put a 500-horsepower supercharged engine in an aluminum tubular-framed hull and it takes some neat driving! That's all. The driving is neat. And if you notice on such a car, there are a number of curves in the road. I'll just point out one little thing to you, that there are a number of curves in the road, and therefore you cannot go on the average of not missing many! You are allowed just one curve. And then they bury you. That's pretty near the way it is.

Okay. You think that might do you some good?

Audience: Yes!

All right. Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.

Good night.

ROUTINE 3GA DATA ON GOALS, PART I

A lecture given on
7 August 1962

Well, I should be much better off now after a week's layoff here, should be much better off indeed. And just worse than ever. That's what I get for taking vacations.

All right, this is what, 7 Aug., AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

You are very lucky to hear this lecture, extremely fortunate. In fact, if I didn't give you this lecture you'd all be in the *zoup*. It's one of them kind of lectures.

And this has to do with goals, 3GA, data and Materials concerning. Now, this is not a lecture of a complete embrasive rundown on everything there is to know about clearing, but I'm going to give you some fast ones on the subject of HCOB Aug. 1, and HCOB Aug. 1, Issue II – the drills. And it's ROUTINE 3GA, GOALS, NULLING BY MID RUDS, and the nulling drills that go along with it.

Now, this material is taken care of pretty well in the bulletin. There is nothing particularly that one would alter in these bulletins – gives you quite a bit of data. I'm going to duplicate some of that data and I'm also going to give you a lot more tips and an amplification of the material. A lot to be known about this.

First thing you will want to know is, what if you find a wrong goal on somebody, and their head swells up five times the size and they get palpitations of the platina. What happens? What do you do? That's the first thing you want to know, because you'll do it. Sooner or later this will happen, even to you.

Most of the data on this, by the way, is subjective. Got a good subjective reality on this, and a good objective reality on this.

For instance, somebody came to see me today from far off on which a goal had been found wrong, and had been listed vociferously with considerable enthusiasm by one who is now amongst you, but who was not then a Saint Hill student – so he can be forgiven, possibly. He's not amongst you at the present moment. I won't identify him any further. [laughter] And I said, "Well, that's the way it is, wrong goal," and sent her down to ask Reg, out of the magnanimity of his heart, if he would not check out these goals.

Now, of course, he thought he was checking a goal out, and she thought so, too, but in actual fact I sent her down to get patched up because the way you correct ... There are two ways of correcting a wrong goal. One is to check out the wrong goal that was found – or any wrong goal that was found – within an inch of your life. In other words really check that thing out. Now, of course, it ceases to fire, it ceases to read, it ceases. But it must cease with all somatics and sensations and with all misemotion. When you have got everything off of it there is nothing left on it. Got it?

In other words by prepchecking – this is very valuable data – by prepchecking out the goal that was found wrong, you shuck off the consequences of having listed it. Interesting isn't it? Marvelous. You should have such luck. But that's the way that one is.

Find a wrong goal on somebody, and with vast enthusiasm list it for five or six or eighteen-thousand items, you see. And the person puts on two hundred and fifty pounds of weight, and a few other minor things like this occurring. Their eyeballs keep leaking blood and palpitations have begun in the heart, and gastronomic upsets are occurring as the order of the day, and medicos have been called in, morticians, and so forth, and have made a diagnosis of plumbosis of the platina, and they must operate inconsequentially. Why, that's what you do – you just prepcheck the living daylights out of the goal that was wrong and found, no matter how much it was listed.

At first it won't read. You can't – won't get much out of it. You get all the suppression off of it, and you get the reads on it and the suppressions off of it, and the reads back on it and the reads off of it, and so forth, and you go on and on and on – and you finally get rid of this thing. But you may need a few more little buttons to go along with your mid ruds. And I will give you a list of those buttons. To make a very thoroughgoing checkout of anything, you may find these buttons of some use. On the goals check HCOB, "Mistake been made" is added to the little list. That's the short Instructor's check. Well, please add, "Has a mistake been made?" on to the question that must be cleared there. Now, that's for the short form.

Now, add that – this is for a longer form – "Mistake been made? Protested? Asserted?" You've now got the bulk of it. "Confusion about?" and "Ignored – Been ignored?" You've just about got everything that is significant that will even produce a shadow of a side read on the other things, you see.

The basic things which make a wrong goal read are, of course, Suppress – that doesn't make it read, that prevents the invalidations from reading – Invalidate, Suggest – of course that's Evaluate, that's also Assert and Mistake. Now, those are the things which give you a clean tick. The Suppress, of course, pulls off the suppression and the errors now read. The errors on the goal don't read till you get all the suppress off. Now let's look at it and we realize invalidation can give it a tick just like a goals tick, except it doesn't look like a goals tick if you get to be an old veteran and seen a lot of them.

Now, a goals tick is a rapidly inspired input with a fast decay. It goes *phew*. It fires fast off the beginning and slows down rapidly. Whereas these ticks are just ticks. They go *thud, thud, thud*, and they're of equal speed more or less, but they can be mistaken very easily.

And of course if a goal has charge on it, then it can be invalidated, you see, and the invalidated picks up the charge, you see. But it still looks like an invalidation. But that invalida-

tion has charge – not because of the invalidation but because there was charge on the goal, you understand? You've got a question of transferred charge. You've got charge on the goal, but the goal doesn't read, but the charge transfers over if the goal is invalidated. Now, Invalidated reads. The charge transfers over to Suggest, Evaluate, Assert.

Suggest is the best of those phrases, but you can also say Evaluated, you can say Assert, make it meaningful. The Mistake, a mistake calls for sort of a ridge because it's a special kind of an invalidation.

It comes down to the fact that a goal reads on the two oldest lines of the Auditor's Code – evaluation and invalidation. But you see, either one of these have different ways you could describe it. Now, you'll get a tick out of those things. It looks like a goal, it goes *tick, tick, tick*. Of course if your needle is rising rapidly the tick is – just slows the rise – or it'll just stop the rise so it looks like a halt. But actually they're a throw-down. They fire over here from left to right, and the usual tick – something like that – if the needle were quite still, well, it'd be about anything from a sixteenth of an inch to a half an inch, from left to right in the direction marked "fall" on a Mark IV E-Meter. It's – be a sixteenth of an inch to a half an inch.

And a goal read that is clean and clear is very remarkable. It looks like a small rocket taking off that slows down rapidly. It doesn't look like these other things, but you'll get used to that by and by.

Every once in a while on nulling a goals list, by the way, you'll see this phenomenon. It isn't the goal, but you'll see a goal tick – a real goal tick. You get it clean, everything is fine and you've been saying it – you've said it a couple of times before and taken invalidations off of it and so forth and you get it all clean and you get down there and you say, "To be a tiger," and *pow*. And you say, "Boy, we've really got something here," you know. You know, make it like that... At that point make enough excitement to throw the pc out of session, you see. And you say, you say, "To be a tiger." It doesn't read anymore, you see. Check it all over again. If you ever get one to fire, for God's sakes check it over again. Check it all over again. "To be a tiger." It's dead, it'll never fire again. R.I.P. You've taken it off the goals chain, see. It read like the goal once.

Now, that's – the goal charge transfers over to a secondary goal which merely fires once, as it frees itself from the main goal chain. But that charge, while it remains on a secondary – not the goal but a close cousin – can transfer over to an invalidation or an evaluation, you see. You get substitutes, got a series of substitutes here, see. So you pick off the invalidations and evaluations, and then you pick off the charge off the secondary goals on the list, and then you hit the goal and the goal goes *pow!* – and it goes like that every time – *pow, pow, pow*.

Now, of course if somebody invalidates it, it ceases to go *pow* until the eval – invalidation is picked up. Somebody evaluates for the pc. It ceases to fire until, of course, that evaluation is picked up. You can always get this thing to fire again however – which is quite remarkable – until it has been listed completely out. And when it's listed completely out, you've got a free needle.

All right. It's a series of substitutions. In other words, the charge goes from here to there. It isn't that evaluation is going to ruin the pc – it's merely going to ruin the goal read. And you'd think it would ruin the pc if you saw some of the somatics that can occur because of it. But the whole force of it is derived from the goal itself, see. The whole force and charge of a goals list is derived from *the* goal.

For instance, if you haven't got *the* goal on the list, the list will be hotter than a pistol even if it's five thousand goals long. You can't cool it off, that's all. It just won't cool off until you've got the goal on it. And when it goes complete, fish-flabby cold as a list, you've got the goal on it someplace.

It isn't the number of items quantitatively that is entirely responsible for discharging the goals list. It's monitored by whether or not the goal is on the list yet, and it will stay charged up till you get it on. There's a couple of ways of making sure of this, but I'm getting ahead of my story.

Now, that charge there transfers over to the secondary goals and then that transfers over to evaluations and invalidations and charges this thing up.

When you've gotten a wrong goal then, you have simply added to the charge residual every time you listed one more item – because you're not only evaluating for the pc, you are saying, "This is your goal – to have a pie face," or something like this – and it's not, you see. And at the same time you are invalidating the actual goal – whatever it was. So these two things are happening simultaneously, and the more you list the more this thing charges up! And this can get gruesome!

If you ever were adventurous enough to list two or three thousand wrong items on each one of the four lines – well, it's almost a case for the mortician. It's horrible! I couldn't overemphasize the thing. The pc would just be walking around in circles. Usually there is abundant sensation, the pc's getting dizzier and dizzier. The pc will start passing out if you go too far. Pc just goes blah, you know – be walking down the hall and go bang, see. I mean actually pass out. A fainting sensation and that sort of thing goes along with it, and there's all kinds of these wild things, see.

Nothing to worry about because long before the pc got into this state, an auditor would start saying, "What's going on here?" you know. But they will think they are in bad enough state if they've only had a few items listed on a wrong goal. You can list four on a wrong goal and start picking up sen.

If you find a goal on the pc, you haven't checked it out yet, and the pc says, "Oh, gee – whiz, I've got my goal," you know – adding another assert to it, you see. "I've got my goal." Nice suggest, you know. "Yeah, that's fine."

He leaves the session and he goes home and he sits down and he says, "Let's see, who would want to be a pie face?" you know. "Who would want to be a pie face? Oh, well, yeah, pie man, yeah that's good, and who would oppose being a pie face? People who didn't have one, and who would not retard pie facing? I don't know if I've got that right or not."

They'll do it! You'll see somebody do it. Somebody go out of session right after you found their goal. You haven't had a chance to check the thing out – found it right at the end of

the session. They'll come back in. They've done some experimenting on the thing and they'll be going, *wog – wog – wog*, you know – if it's the wrong goal. See if it's not the right one, they'll really catch it.

So this is something you must know a great deal about. Don't think of it on the basis that, "Oh well, this all applies, you see, providing I ... None of this applies, I'll just check every goal out that comes along, you see, and I'll check them all out and I'll be very careful, and then none of these things will happen to any pc I audit."

Who are you kiddin'? Just who are you kiddin'? First place you don't know if it's the right goal. You don't know if it's the right goal until you've listed two or three hundred items on it. Then is the first time you'd lay your paw on a stack of Bibles, put *Dianetics: The Modern Science Of Mental Health* on top of it to make it a fact, and swear it was the right goal, see. See, that's the only time you'd really know, because one of the tests is: Does the goal, when listed, turn on somatics on lines 1, you see, and 3. And does the goal turn on dizziness and sensation and emotion and what we generally call and refer to as "sen" on lines 2 and 4.

Now, if the goal, while you are busily listing it – on line 1 turns on dizziness and on line 2 turns on somatics – man, you've got it backwards! That's all – it's just backwards. You have been misfortunate enough, you should have gotten up and given a session that day. Why did you have to get up and give a session that day? Why didn't you have an appointment elsewhere? Because you found the oppgoal.

Now, frankly there are four goals that you can find. I'll make you secure, make you confident, make you happy and going about your business without ever a care. There are four goals: There's the goal for line 1, the goal for line 2, the goal for line 3, and the goal for line 4. *The* goal is the goal for line 1. That's the pc's goal. But the opposition goal of course is really another goal – and although it phrases out beautifully if you just say, "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" you see. That will work out and it's all fine. There is – actually, you are listing another goal there. There's really another goal sitting right there. See? It'll be something or other, "To preserve our piscatorial friends," or something like this, you see. Opposition to catching catfish! It's because there's another goal sitting there. And as far as retarding goals are concerned, on lines 3 and 4, there are two other goals there, too – and you know they will all fire. They'll all fire. Witness 3D, old Routine 3D. You can find 4 goals in a row that will all fire.

Now, the pc's goal is the one you want, and that is the one which fits on line 1, and that is the one that gives somatics, and that ordinarily is the one you check out. But beware one of these terribly long goals lists. If they are terribly long then the pc is listing all four goals on the same list. He's listing his's and theirs's, and his allies and his covert enemies – and he's listing them all on the same list.

He's saying, "To catch catfish. To protect and preserve our piscatorial friends," will occur consecutive. He will list 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, sometimes as nice as you please, you understand? He doesn't know whether he's himself, or his worst enemy, or what, you see. The GPM is so snarled up that just picking out anything out of it, he doesn't know whether it's friend or foe. And as you are running down a goals list he'll say, "That one made me feel dizzy." You've picked up an opposition goal. That goal is either a line 2 or a line 4 goal. "Got

hmmm," he said – or, "I feel so despairing whenever you say that goal." A line 2 and a line 4. Sensation is emotion. "Goodness, I am so frightened whenever you say that." Line 2, line 4 you see – sensation, emotion. There's only one thing you want on line 1 – 1 and 3 – of course, is good, solid, honest pain.

Now, somebody's going to come along and tell you sometime that it is a somatic. Of course a somatic covers pain and sensation, and that a somatic is a somatic, and they'll say they have pains – when as a matter of fact they mean they have pressures.

You don't get confused about this. You have to make this very definitive. You say they have a pressure on the side, so they tell you they have a somatic, and then you think they said a pain. You ask them, "Well, was it a pain?"

And they will say, "Yes it's a heavy pressure." But they maybe not say, "It's a heavy pressure." See, they – "Oh yes, I have a pain in my side." They mean it's some kind of a pressure, don't you see. So you have to describe what you mean by pain.

"Well, does it feel the same way if you took a knife and pushed it into your side and twisted it around a bit? It would be painful." "Oh no, nothing like that," you'll hear a pc every once in a while, you know. "If you stuck a pin through your finger is that the way it would feel?"

"Oh well, no, nothing like that. There's just a little solid pressure there," something like that, you know. Because pain is pain. There is no substitute. Pain – it hurts. It isn't uncomfortable – it hurts! And that's what we mean by "pain".

Now, the real goal gives pain on line 1, and a little pain on line 3. Line 3 sometimes mixes it up with pain and sensation, see, because it's a harder closure, see. Because line 3 of course, is opposing the opposition, so it gets the sensation of the opposition, and so forth. It can get more mixed up, see. So it's not a reliable test.

And line 4 – since line 4 is simply a covert opposition of some kind or another – sometimes has some pain mixed up in it as well as sensation. Whereas it's basically and ordinarily sensation on line 4, it sometimes can get a little pain mixed up into it. The guy gets a feeling of heavy pressure with a little *zzst* that goes down the front of it that hurts, see. Well, it's a mix-up, don't you see.

So therefore, lines 3 and 4 on listing are not reliable as indicators at all and shouldn't be taken to heart – unless down toward the end of the line the guy insists on getting sensation all the time and forever, don't you see – sensation is continuous, and that sort of thing – on line 3 for instance. Well, that would be very unusual. It should become more and more predominately painful when anything occurs there. So it comes back to the sole indicators, which are lines 1 and 2. And line 1 has got to have pain in it – period. Must not have sen in it.

But when you first start to patch up a goal that has been misrun, you're liable to get some sen coming off of it or something like that because it's been too invalidated and then it will come into pain, don't you see? You might get a little sen off of line 1 before you got any pain off of line 1, but don't count on it.

And line 2 shouldn't have any pain in it at all, but occasionally on running items down the line the pc gets his items mixed up. The items that should be on list 2 are occurring on list 1 and vice versa.

You say, "Who or what would try to catch catfish?" Or "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" Let's get the proper goals here. And you say, "Who or what would want to catch catfish?"

And he says, "A fish and game warden." You say, "Well good, thank you. Who or what –" you know, don't challenge the pc's answer – and you'd say, "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" And he says, "A catfish fisherman." It all seems sensible to him.

Well, you recognize what is happening there. The closure is so tight, the pc is all mixed up and he's liable to get some sensation and some pain misplaced on these lines once in a while. But your standard, run of the mill action is pain, and that is the test by which you guide by. That is one of the basic tests. As you go running down the line you say, "Who or what would want to catch catfish?"

"Ouch."

"Who or what would not – would oppose catching catfish?"

"Mmmmmm, ohohohoh," see. Why are you swimming, auditor? "Who or what would retard the opposition to catching catfish?" And it's... "Mmmm, ouch!" see.

And "Who or what would pull you back from catching catfish?" would be "Mmmm, ick." That's the way these things fit. You get it? (However the wording of the lines goes.)

Now, finding the goal originally – if you are doing a very good job, an excellent job, if you are right there, right in there pitching – in other words if your Model Session and your auditor presence is good, and if by some accident you can read the E – Meter, what's going to happen? Every goal you find on the pc's goals list that has any sensation or pain in it by reason of being touched and read on the list will be clean as a whistle by the time you leave it.

We're going down the list, we're going down the list, *pocketa – pocketa – pocketa – pocketa*, see, and we've got this goal "To be a waterbuck," see. And we've got this goal "To be a waterbuck," and the guy goes "*whaag*," and so forth.

And one of the things you're not doing right now that you certainly had better do – two things:

A goal that actually bangs all by itself, you put a circle around the X. See? Cross it out, but put a circle around it – because you could use that data various ways. In other words, that means it fired all by itself when I got it all cleaned up. When I got it all cleaned up it fired all by itself – and then went null, of course – but it did fire all by itself. Put a circle around the X. That's just for future reference, and you can very often use that.

And get the pc to tell you when he has pn and when he has sen, and put it down.

Now, those two things you really ought to do.

I used the fact of what goals were rock slamming the other day to plot out what the pc had overts on to run O/W on to turn off a dirty needle, and it's now off. That's pretty slippery,

isn't it? I expect you to do that as a matter of routine action, but I just – I found there were about four or five goals that rock slammed. I went down through the line and I figured out, by asking a few little test questions of the pc, what the pc had overts on that was giving him a dirty needle all the time, and just ran O/W on that. And bang – that was the end of the rock slamming needle. Quite interesting. Pc had to be pretty well in-session before that could have occurred.

But there was the use, see, of notations on a goals list. Let us say a rather unusual expedient, but this was also rather unusual to have a half-a-dial rock slam, see. I had to get it off in order to get anyplace. So I just decided to take it all off in a batch, and I made this test. Took the – took about five goals that had rock slammed and I had noted down on the borders. After they went out I'd noted that when I hit these goals they rock slammed, added them up and said it must be to this thing, asked a couple of questions, checked it out, ran O/W on that and that was the end of the dirty needle. It was just an experimental action, but it worked beautifully.

And this other one, of course, you can figure out which way the pc is going – and you can figure out whether you've got a goal or not by going back and looking at those circled X's. Just look at them, and they had pn, circled X – "pn" and then X with a circle on it. It banged all by itself – goals line, see. After we cleaned it all up, it had one bang in it, and it had pain on it.

Now, we see what kind of a goal that was. It's a hunting-type goal – "I want to get at men, men, men," you know, something like that – goal something like that see – hunting-type goal. Outflowing, hunting-type goal, see.

The next one that stayed in madly, "I want to shove it down their throats and make it stick!" – pn, circle. And the goal we had found is "To kill them all, damn them – to kill them all," you see.

And there's one in here, "To be a sweet and peaceful child." It fired once, but it had "sen" after it. Ah, we see where this pc is built, don't we? We can do an analysis of it and it safeguards us from listing an opposition goal as the pc's goal.

Obviously "To kill them all, damn them, to kill them all," – right in keeping with the rest of the goals that produced pain and stayed in – pc's goal, see. Of course we don't know that for sure after we've listed it for a while, but we can pretty well guarantee it on that spot check. See the use of that?

Audience: Mm – hm.

Yeah, you've got to be slippery. You've got to outguess the pc. If left to his own devices, you understand, the pc would give you the wrong goal, the opposition goal – would insist that you check it out. I never saw the like of it. PCs will sit there and they'll pick some favorite goal, you know – "To wear tall hats in court," you know. They think, "My, that's a nice goal!" you know. For some reason or other, they're enamored of this goal. Do you know that twenty-five percent of the pcs will try to do this, but your Model Session is so rigged today that they can't. If you didn't have Model Session the way it was today, twenty-five percent of your pcs would. They'd lift their finger every time you saw that. "To wear tall hats in

court." They can get it pretty well timed, too. They know at what point to lift their finger off to give you an instant read, you see. [laughter]

Another one is to go into a convulsion. They sell you the goal by going into a convulsion. You know I just never will take a goal that will throw a pc into a convulsion anymore. I just won't.

Mary Sue has a system. She says, "Sit back there and don't you move. Now, I'm going to read the goal." It's a very effective system, too, and she can check the thing out.

But you get pcs going into a writhing convulsion or something every time you read the goal "To put out the devil's eyes," you see. And they love that goal – and they'll actually knowingly go into a convulsion, knowing you can't check out the goal. They are selling that goal, man. They'll just sell that goal and sell that goal. *Wow!*

Well, people commit suicide. We just had a notable example tonight.* Any one of you girls could have done very well with that mock-up that knocked itself off in Hollywood in the last day or so. I'm sure that she would have thought that was quite nice. Here she is going and knocking herself off, you know. The body, herself, see. She didn't have any use for it, why didn't she put an ad in the paper? [laughter]

Well, she's probably crying in some maternity ward right now – and somebody will be saying, "Well give her a sedative." [laughter] Yeah. But they will, they'll just commit suicide, just like that. Got everything to live for – there's the auditor, good auditor, ready to audit him, everything else and then they have got to sell you this corny goal.

They get very anxious, you know – they've got to have a goal, they've got to have the goal, they've got to have the goal! *Hehh!* They've just got to have one regardless – any old goal. So, ping! – off goes the finger! Ping! – off goes the finger. Ping! – off goes the finger. Convulsions and so forth. You'd be amazed what we've seen around here on that. It's absolutely fantastic. It's twenty-five percent of the pcs. That's no small percentage, and they'll do it! And an auditor who will buy a pc's goal is not only a fool, he's practically a murderer.

And yet, man, the sales talk you will get. Why down at the car agency they don't know 'arf. "Well, it's always been my goal, to catch catfish. It always has been my goal. I, you know, studied fishing when I was in college," and so forth, "but I couldn't pass any of the courses." See they've learned all of the rules on which goals are goals. "I was never any good at it. It's always been some – it's always given me a terrible headache every time I go down by the river banks," you know.

And look at all the other similar goals in there! Look at the other similar goals to this, and so forth. "To be a bank teller" – you see, similar goal. Sales talk, sales talk, sales talk, sales talk. It's when it gets that hot you have to pull this Suggest as Assert – when you are checking them out. And you get a marvelous parade of these goals going by.

Well, anyway – you've got to get the pc's right goal, and you can't be overwhelmed by a bunch of wrong goals. And one of the little incidental tests is: You tell the pc, "Every time you feel dizzy or faint, or something like that, you tell me."

* Editor's note: LRH alludes to Marilyn Monroe who committed suicide on August 5th, 1962.

And you've got to tell him that every few goals. He'll forget it, you know.

You've got to ask him, and you ask him if he's had any pains or sensations, you see, and then tell him, "Well, when you get any, you want to speak right up and tell me," you see. He'll keep forgetting it. They eventually will groove in so they will tell you. But you can mark those down, and then by comparing that to the very few goals that stay in – on nulling by mid ruds – you can sort the pc's goal out and know whether you are running the right goal or not before you start listing it. All right, that's a sorting technique.

Now, this is what I wanted to tell you – that you mustn't go *by* one of those goals and leave a somatic on it, whether it's pain or sensation. You mustn't, mustn't do that! In other words you say to this person, "To catch catfish," and he has a horrible pain in his mouth. And he says, "dit." Doesn't say anything to you about it, and you clean off the suppressions and the invalidations, the suggestions, the fails to reveal and the mistakes, and hit it, ask the suppression. You don't see anything on there.

Now, listen there's another test. If you are very alert, the pc has been telling you when he had pains and if there is anything remaining of that pain, you've got a goal behind you which is hung up. And after a while the goals list gets jammy.

Now, what I am telling you is this – that goals nulling by mid ruds turns out to be a *fantastically* therapeutic action. It isn't just sitting there grinding away. Now, if you know this other fact, the pc just comes up shining – if you know this other fact – that you mustn't leave sensation or pain of any kind on the pc when you leave the goal. If that goal turned it on, you've got to get all the invalidations and everything else off of it.

It isn't really as vigorous as it sounds. It only takes you a few minutes to do this. I mean, you just do it, just in the normal course of human events, or inhuman events. Just straight drill. But one of the things that you should make sure of is if a pain came on when you read that goal, *that all of those somatics are gone at the time you leave it*. The somatic, you might say, goes slightly deeper than the meter, so you've got to check. Now, you get to listening to this pc – he says, "To catch catfish," he gets a pain in his mouth.

And you get the invalidations, and you get the suggestions, the failures to reveal and mistakes – just normal, just like you are doing it – you don't have to push for anything else off of this thing. You read it and get the suppressions, and it doesn't read. He's still got a pain down here in his stomach somewhere.

So if a pain came on, you go back and you find out there's a little piece, little, tiny, old piece of an invalidation stuck in there that you didn't get off.

See you didn't ask the invalidation question again. See, you thought you got invalidations cleaned up, but remember you took some other things off. Then when you – invalidation was still a tiny little bit hot. In the normal course of finding a goal it wouldn't be enough to destroy a goal perhaps or keep a goal from reading – but it's enough to keep the somatic in.

So don't go so careful you drive your pc berserk and only get six done in three hours of auditing, but just be careful that when sensations and somatics come on, that you keep taking off your suppressions, invalidations, suggestions, failures to reveal and mistakes. And if they don't all come off, get curious about this, you know. Use another word like asserted,

evaluate, you know, it's almost like a final checkout, only you don't go into a big Prepcheck. You'd be surprised what facility you can develop just to knock off that last little sticking piece, you see.

Well, you can go by one of these things like this, and you say, "To catch catfish," and the pc goes "mmmp." That's it, that's it. You say, "Has this goal been suppressed?" And you don't get much of a response on it. And you go on, and pc had a somatic at the beginning of this goal. Well, if you're having trouble cleaning this, ask him the kingpin question: "Any somatics been suppressed on this goal?"

Because what happened is you said, "To catch catfish" and the pc put on every brake in the bank on the somatics. And somehow or another it doesn't cross in his mind. And if you didn't know this, you would go right on down the line, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, and you'd leave that goal hung, and the accumulated hanging up of four or five such goals then leaves the pc rather uncomfortable by session end. And he shouldn't be uncomfortable by session end!

If you do goals nulling by mid ruds properly, your pc is just as smooth as silk – much better at the end of a session than at the beginning.

Now, if you don't do this – and one other factor added, which is the reassurance factor – if you don't do this, your pc is going to get nervy, anxious, upset. Only one other thing can make him that upset, and that's to go by his goal and not find it. *Ooohh* God! You remember Henny Penny and the sky was falling, you know? That was *thyeh!* That's purely a fairy tale compared to a pc whose goal has been passed on the list! His goal was "To catch catfish," and it's back there now about three goals, and he suddenly starts waking up. "Are you sure you can read the E-Meter? Yes, well, I have quite a pain in my side here. Why don't you hear what I am telling you? The room is much too hot."

Here we go, you know, you can't keep the session together, you can't keep anything, it'd just go to pieces. You pull missed withholds, you pull more missed withholds. It doesn't do any good – the missed withhold is the goal. It gives all the responses with exclamation point of missed withholds. All of them occur right at that point, except he might not wake up for a half a page, see. If he'd just wake up that instant that you tried to leave it, or something like that, but they don't. It goes by, and when it's well by, the pc says, "Hey, where are we going? Where are we going?" He gets a set of Dunlop tires, you know, puts skid marks on the auditing track about a hundred and fifty yards long. He isn't going anyplace.

Poor auditor. And by the way, this is complicated by the fact that pcs can also act that way *without* their goal, but not quite so much. It's a matter of degree if you are leaving somatics on the goals as you go by. Then the pc starts getting nervy.

You went by one, "To be a tiger," and he went "*Ooohh*." Then you went on to the next one, "To eat waterbuck." He's still going "*Ooohh*." He never got out of the tiger deal, see. He's still there; he's still got sensation on this thing.

If you picked up – now hear this real well – if you picked up all the invalidation that you would normally get in a session – not backtrack or anything – all the invalidation, all of the suggestion, all of the "failed to reveal," and all the "mistake been made," and all the sup-

press – if those things were all picked up – no somatic or sensation would be left on any goal contacted.

Now, add that in to the other side of this which is, if a goal has been found that is a wrong goal, even though it has been listed, and upset the pc, God help us, if you take all of the suppressions, invalidations, fails to reveal, you see, and mistakes off of that wrong goal, your pc will come back to battery. Get them all off. Man, you really have to get in there and sweat. It isn't that it takes a long time to do, it's just that it takes an accurate look over. You have to get them all off; why, the pc will come right back to battery.

There he was with two feet in the grave and both of his hands on banana peels, and he'll come right back out – and he'll come right back out. It's quite remarkable.

Now, if a pc has had several wrong goals found on him, one after the other, take them in sequence. Take every goal that has been found on you. Not found and proved out, see? Every goal that has been found on you, like goals that have been suspected and goals that you had to have checked out the next day but they didn't check out. You get what I mean now by every goal found on the pc? Whether found and proved, or just, you know, just found. And you can even add those he was "absolutely sure were his goal," see. And just make a list of those things – just write them all down in order of sequence as they happened, see. Clean up each one with nulling by mid ruds. Pc will feel wonderful. There will be no liability to having found wrong goals. That's very well worth knowing, isn't it? That's patch-up.

Now, that doesn't mean that you can do a careless job of goals finding or a careless job of listing just because you can patch it up, because the patch-up is never quite as good as the original article. It's something like a rebuilt – a rebuilt typewriter, don't you see, or a rehabilitated girl. They are never quite the same, sleek condition as the original article, but it permits you to go on and find the right one without any consequences. Got the idea?

You – well you see it yourself. You list five thousand items on a wrong goal, and wow! Well, there actually would be no reason whatsoever to take the time necessary, you see, to erase every single, slightest thing they had ever done or said in listing.

You'd clean the goal up is what you'd do, clean it up so it's slick as a whistle and you can't get it to fire, you can't get any of the other things to fire and you can't get a couple of others to fire as I just gave them to you. Can't get anything to move now and it all appears fairly clean. That's good enough – now you can go on and find yourself a new goal.

Don't say the pc won't – he won't feel bad about it, but he'll look a little seedy around the edges if you've gone that far. You understand? Don't expect him to come out clear and shining. If I left you the idea that they would come out into a cleared state, then we would have a new method of clearing. You just find a wrong goal on the pc, list it and then clean it up. [laughter] No, there is no substitute for doing it right in the first place.

Your actions here in doing that – I want you to know this real well – in doing these drills on this bulletin of August 1st, you've got two things that if you want to keep a pc really shining you must do: is polish up any goal that has been found, or is being found, or anything else. In other words get the sensation, somatics off any goal as you go down the list, see. Or if you are picking up a pc who has had the wrong goal found on him, then get every wrong goal

that was found on the pc and clean all those things up, see. Cleaning up the goals – that all comes under the heading of it. And if you go down the nulling list, and you go on down the nulling list, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, on through – clean up every one you go by.

Don't say, "Oh well, to wrap peppermint candy around lampposts in Chicago, there's no sense in cleaning that up. Obviously isn't the pc's goal, *ha-ha-ha-ha-ha*," you know. "To wrap peppermint candy around the lamppost in Chicago. Thank you. Has that goal been suppressed? Thank you, thank you very much." Next goal, you know.

You'll find yourself doing that sometime late at night. No, be alert. Even though it's a PT thing, there might have been a nice somatic on it, or there might have been some sensation on it that might be in. What the hell is he doing putting down a present time goal like that if it isn't on the goals chain. Don't you see?

Clean it up just as carefully as you would clean up – as though it were the right goal. Now, you treat every one of these goals of course then – just in summation of that – treat every single one of these goals as though it is *the* goal. They are all *the* goal. The moment you get onto them, it is *the* goal until proven otherwise.

And the other one is the reassurance factor. And that is the other thing. That isn't necessarily the two main things in auditing these things but these are the two things that will get you in most trouble. By omitting the reassurance factor. You've never heard of it before; it's time you did. A pc needs some pats on the back when he's going over the jumps on this. "Heeeyyy, wh – wh – where – where – where's his goal, you know, where is it, you know?" And he thinks of terrible situations and the horrible things that are going to happen, you know, and the terrible awfulnesses of it all if he doesn't find his goal, or supposing it's behind him. Worry, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry – see.

Well, you best counter this with reassurance. Do a perfect job of auditing, but don't sit there like a wooden image with never a pat on the back for the pc. Tell him once in a while, "Well take it easy. I'm cleaning each one up. Now, as a matter of fact, I overclean and that is the reason why you are a little bit upset. I sometimes clean a clean on you just to make sure. That – that's all right, I'm just – everything is going along fine, and you are doing fine. We've got a long way to go now. You just keep telling me when you have somatics, and you sit there comfortably, and when you get dizziness or sensation you tell me, too. Everything's going to be fine." Got the idea?

You make that pervade your goals-finding sessions and by keeping them all clean as you go by them and reassuring the pc – not falsely, it's perfectly factual – he'll be all right. Why, you'll have much easier, much happier sessions. Those are the two primary things.

Now, there are several secondary things to all these things, and there are other things of importance on this, and I actually haven't really begun to fire on the subject of goals listing so we'll have to continue into the second lecture.

Thank you.

Thank you. Take a break.

Routine 3GA Data On Goals

Part II

A lecture given on
7 August 1962

Thank you.

Well this is lecture two, 7 Aug., AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and we're going on with goals, Routine 3GA, how you do it. Let's start more cohesively and coherently and more abundantly at the beginning of the concisity.

You get the pc to do a goals list.

Now, I told you there was another remedy for a lost goal. You know, you found the wrong goal and everything has gone to hell. To make the pc feel better, just get him to list some goals. Now you can keep that as a stable datum. The pc feels bad because of any 3GA, get him to list some goals, see.

Now, that's a stable datum. No matter what else you do, also get him to list some goals. In other words if you clean up the wrong goal that was found, get the pc to list some goals. How many? Well, until he looks better. Well, in session? Not necessarily.

Now, you'll find out that you'll be tossing this off as an auditor back in your own bailiwick or organization quite often and you will learn rather rapidly that this is a way of pulling somebody out of the soup while you are sitting there with a telephone in each hand, you see, and a preclear on the couch and one in the chair, see. And at that moment a fourth party walks in the door, you see and says, "Oh, I'm in terrible trouble. Last night my wife threw me out and everything is going to hell in a balloon and when can you give me some auditing?" You see?

And you say, "Well..." The best thing to say, "Well, just as soon as you've got another 250 goals listed." And they say, "Oh, I couldn't think of that." Well, you just say, "*Do it. Do it. Do it.*" You know, "*Do it.*" You know, "Two hundred and fifty goals. *Do it, do it.*" You know, "Get them listed, get them listed. Thank you. Thank you. Don't talk to me again until you have them listed," and so forth. And they'll come back, they'll feel fine.

It's the darnedest therapeutic measure you ever, you ever had to – that. And you'll find out that that is dead right. You'll use this. You might not think now that you would, but you will. You'll find yourself using this. The guy's caving in. You know what you've got to pick up. You've got to pick up his missed withholds. You know this and you know that. And

you've got to get a ten-hour Prepcheck going on his past auditing. And you've got this and you've got that and you've got these other things. But you haven't got time to do it. So just tell him to list some goals. Got it?

It's a panacea. If somebody is dying or something like that, it might not work. They might not be able to write or something like that. But short of that – short of that, it'll handle almost anything.

Now let's expand this just a little bit further.

Listing of goals doesn't depend so much on how many goals as upon how much charge is remaining on the needle. It's not charge on the tone arm. Let's forget everything said in Routine 3 on the subject of moving tone arms. It's moving needle. How much is that needle moving?

The devil with the tone arm because you can make mistakes, the auditor, the environment, other things and when you really start running the mid ruds on every goal, you're going to get tone arm motion which wasn't there when you simply read the goals off. So that test becomes invalidated the moment you move in with nulling by mid ruds. Because nulling by mid ruds is, basically, running rudiments and rudiments is moving the tone arm and it's not the goals moving the tone arm, but how can you tell the difference? You're doing them both at the same time.

Well, so therefore moving tone arm is no longer a test for whether a goals list is complete. But a moving needle is.

Now you're going to want to know when is a goals list complete. And you say to the pc six goals in a row and each one fires a quarter of a dial. That is an incomplete list. You needn't do any more than that. See? Just, "To catch catfish, to run down waterbuck, to shoot game wardens, to have a high hat in court, to be a student and never to have anything to do with Instructors." And just read them off, one right after the other and you'll find out how much do they kick? How much does each one kick? And if they kick more, on an average, than a division – that's one of those little black line to black line, see. It's about – I don't know what that division is. I should measure it some time on a ruler. It's probably three-eighths of an inch, something like that. I don't know what it is. And if they're kicking more than that your goals list is not complete. Any kick that you get on them, if it's more than that, your goals list is not complete.

Now there's something more. If one kicks out of five or something wild like that – you understand this is just a guesstimate, approximation, because it will vary so much, various parts of the list – if one kicks out of the five, why that's enough and that one kick was just that. That's not cleaned up or anything, you see. That's just one three-eighths of an inch kick. That goals list is very nice or the pc is mad as hell at you and the E-Meter is totally inoperative. I think you could tell the latter.

If the pc's even vaguely in-session, why, that read – you read six goals to him and one, two, something like that, kick, just that much, you say, "*Voilà.*"

Now it's "or less" it's not "or more," it is "or less." As long as that needle is kicking a third of a dial, quarter of a dial and is kicking on four or five goals out of six, that list is not complete.

Furthermore, the goal probably isn't on it. Ah-ha-ha. And that would be very important to you. I can see you now, going on and on and on and on and on, nulling down 1500 goals very laboriously and then find out the goal wasn't on it. Well, there's a way to tell whether or not the goal was on it and that's how much charge is on the list. All right.

Now, rock slams don't count.

The rock slam has been the subject of considerable study by me lately. And I learnt a great deal about rock slams and they're all "failed to reveals," but actually "failed to reveal" is insufficiently powerful as an auditing command to pull off one of these big, heavy rock slams. It'll take off one of these little – these little quarter-of-an-inch-wide rock slams that you get, what you call a dirty needle, but when it's slamming half a dial, it's overts and it only comes off with overts. And it's usually overts on the auditor.

When you get a pc sitting down there and then this thing – about every third goal you get a quarter-of-a-dial rock slam, half-a-dial rock slam, something like that, watch it, bud, watch it, because that's overts on the auditor and it's O/W on the auditor that you'll probably find is the most efficacious.

If not on the auditor, then on whom? Well, you better find any goal that rock slams, add them all up and find out on what it is. You can make little hunt and punch tests. You can eventually turn on the dirty needle and the rock slam.

But of course "failed to reveal" makes the thing go. That's quite valid. In mid ruds, just "failed to reveal." This other is an O/W situation. This is readying up the needle and that sort of thing. But if you're reading off a goals list and you're getting this nice little tick and it's going tick and tick and everything is fine. You get one ticking out of ten or something like that – that's dandy. Everything is fine and all of a sudden a half-a-dial-wide rock slam turns on. Had nothing to do with the goals list. Nothing to do with the goals list. It has to do with *overts*. And of course that will compare to the goals list some place or another, but you couldn't care what it compares to. *It is overts*. Of course, the goals list charges up the overt but that's beside the point. And if you don't expect to go the whole session spending 50 percent of your time cleaning up a dirty needle, cleaning up a dirty needle, cleaning up a dirty needle, you had better find out what the hell all these overts are on.

Normally it's you. You see?

You clean them up as overts. You understand that a withhold is in place because it is the – you know, makes the problem with the prior confusion. You see? The overt is the prior confusion and it's the overt which makes this hang up. Now, when you're getting a rock slam, why, it won't come off by pulling the withholds, you understand. There's too much charge on the prior confusion, you see.

So you just keep pulling the roof off of the Niagara Falls, you see. You keep going out there with a dipper, you know, as it goes over the falls and you get some water, a little dipper

full of water and you pull it over on the side and you say, "Well, I'll get this river bailed out eventually. One dipper at a time." See.

No, no. You've got to ask for Niagara Falls before it disappears and then it as-ises nicely. In other words if you can't get rid of a dirty needle on some pc, you'd better right straight back into the prior confusion proposition. In other words, it's just overts and no more nonsense about prior confusion.

The reason why you get a dirty needle, little shivery needle like that, it's a "failed to reveal," you see. One little tiny thing, it's about, oh, an eighth-of-an-inch wide, quarter-of-an-inch wide, something like that. Yes, it – that's all it is. That's just a "failed to reveal." But if you went shopping you would find an overt you see.

There's no reason to go finding overts, however, little buggy stuff like that. It turns on once in a while and turns off again. But, when one is coming on persistently it'll very often be accompanied by a half-a-dial-wide rock slam, which is completely unexplainable. And that half-a-dial-wide rock slam is simply overts in magnitude and it doesn't pull by pulling withholds. You have to get the overt.

A withhold stays in place because it has a prior confusion called the overt, you see? A fellow walks up and shoots the cop and after that he won't talk to people about police.

Well, you can pull all the times when he wouldn't talk to people about police and just find more times when he wouldn't talk to people about police. You get the idea? You eventually have to shop around and find out what's causing this constant and continual hang-up.

Well, you finally get it out of him, he shot a cop. And after that you haven't any trouble with the withhold. You see?

A withhold is always the manifestation which comes after an overt. Any withhold comes after an overt.

So, for that purpose, somebody suggested the other day we ought to call it the overt slam, and it would make more sense to one and all.

But that doesn't count as to whether the goals list is charged or not. That doesn't have anything to do with it. That is simply overts the pc's got which are expressing themselves.

In other words you could have a complete goals list which every once in a while turned into a dial-wide rock slam. It hasn't anything to do with the goals list. It merely has to do with overts. You follow that?

That's very important to you, because otherwise you see, you could get all messed up. You'd say, "Look how charged this list is! Look, I read six goals and I get three down the line and it's just fine and then here is this enormous rock slam that turns on and so forth, and so therefore we'll have to go on listing goals." No, no. Therefore we'll have to go shopping and find out who he's got overts on. You get the difference?

The person by the way would be very, very hard to do a goals assessment on who had that situation. Very hard to do. You'd have to be very slippery. And so you'd better – you'd better do a little more Prepchecking and get those overts off. Find out where they are and they

usually are on the auditor. After all, it's when the auditor's auditing them that they turn on, isn't it? Well, it proves itself, doesn't it?

When he's not on an E-Meter he doesn't rock slam.

You can prove things to a pc like that. Get them to own up.

All right. Now, supposing you had somebody list 850 goals. You just walked up to them and you said, "Oh, you're going to have some 3GA. That's fine. Swell. I'm going to audit you. That – that's good. That's good. Well, you'd better be getting your goals list in order." And they say, "Urp" or "Ulp" or "Yes" or something. You just keep on giving them the auditing command, you see? Out of session. You just want them to get to 850 *goals*.

Your first auditing action is to test it. Just keep kicking them in the head until you've got 850 goals. There's no reason to look at it or do anything about it until you've got 850 goals. And there's no real reason to spend any auditing time on the pc until you've got 850 goals.

This is just in the interests of saving auditing time. And you'll find out they will fool around and they will go a week or two without adding anything to it and *oooh*, then they can't think of any more and that sort of thing. Well, naturally you could pull the – you could pull the mid ruds on the subject of listing. Clean up the mid ruds on the subject of listing and it'd help them out and they would go on like a bomb. Well, why do that? It's their life and their future. Why be so helpful? Say, "Well, the only thing at stake is your next 200 trillion years. Suit yourself." Usually it's just as good as a Prepcheck in the bag. [laughter] And get your 850 goals on a list.

Specify that it must be on legal paper, that is thirteen by eight as paper normally is. It can be fourfold paper, that is two pages connected at the back. It can be lined or not lined. It is usually best if it is lined, legal. And one column of goals on it only.

And let it be *legible*. But have them do it *legibly* in the first place or have it typed by somebody.

For *God's sakes* don't have the pc *copy it!*

Don't let the pc *copy his list!*

Don't let the pc *read his list!*

Don't let the pc get in front of an *E-Meter* and see *what's live on the list!*

You just tell him to list and if he does anything else you'll have his thetan. You understand? That's quite important. The pc can turn on the wildest mess of somatics and get sicker than a *pup* and be completely unauditible. And you'll say, "Good God, what's happened here?" Oh, nothing. He's just read his list over to see what's on it.

You see? That can happen to a pc. Don't discount it. He's holding in his hand a double-barreled shotgun with both barrels pointing straight at his head. You see?

Pc should not read list over to self. Pc should not copy list. Pc should not go by self to an E-Meter to see if he can find own goal. Confucius say, he better dead. He better dead, man. I've seen a pc just 'op out, around the bend on this, you know. Pretty goofy.

In other words, he's at perfect liberty to write down his goals legibly on a legal sheet of paper so that you can read them. And that's what he is at liberty to do and that's all he's at liberty to do. And that works for any goals list he does. All right, now what do you do?

We've talked a lot about Prepchecking and doing this and that. Yes, it's a very good thing to have a pc very well Prepchecked by the Routine 3GA auditor. Very good. And have listing and goals and things like that cleaned up, as the first action. And as a matter of fact you could do just that, you see, with some pc who wasn't coming to you constantly. You could do a Prepcheck on goals, you see, and then you send him off to do his 850 list. You see? That's a good plan of operation.

All right. He comes back to you and you read the first six goals and it goes *bang!* *Wham!* *Bang!* Eight hundred and fifty goals he's listed and it falls off the pin. As a matter of fact you're in fear of the Mark IV's life, that the pin will do a corkscrew. This list is charged. What do we do now? Well, naturally you could list the pc up to 3,962 goals, couldn't you? But that is rather lengthy. Now, why? One, the goal isn't on the list. That doesn't mean you never null it. But the goal isn't on the list. That's the first thing you know. He's listing all four lines on one list. You see? He's the – he's the mixed-up kid. You see, he's putting them all down consecutive.

So, your first action on doing something like this – it doesn't matter really which – which one of these two actions is first: There's two actions here. But the first action which I would do on this is I'd get him untangled on the subject of which goal belongs where. And I would run the four lists with "your goal" on each list, with, "What goal might you have?" "What goal would oppose your goal?" "What goal would retard opposition to your goal?" and "What goal would pull back your goal?"

Now for sure somebody's going to think that we mean to put his goal in there. No, no. We mean just those wordings. Just that wording. We don't know his goal yet, see?

"My goal? *Ho-ho!* *What? What? Who? What is it?* I don't know what my goal is."

"Well, all right. Answer the question that's ... Yours is not to wonder why I am asking the question, yours is but to furnish me an answer thereunto so I can write it down on this sheet of paper."

He gives you four-listed goals, suddenly. When he's given you about sixty on each list, you throw away three lists and keep one. Keep the first list and put it on his list that he's done. Throw the others away. You care nothing about them. They're probably not even accurately... See?

But the probabilities are in favor of "What goal might you have?" as a list adds sixty goals to his list. Okay? Got that? That straightens his skull out on the subject of what he's listing. You all of a sudden will have some fantastic automaticity roaring off, if you've – if it's gone like this, see.

And listen now, this is a good thing to do in any event. You see? This is nice to do in any event. Don't necessarily keep it to a specialized case. It's very nice because it straightens things kind of out for the pc. He's liable to have some fabulous automaticity roar off.

You say, "What goal would oppose your goal?" and all of a sudden all the bad nasty mean goals that he didn't want, that he was putting down on his list go tearing off. He identifies them that fast as opposition goals and after that you don't have them occur on the list.

Now, don't think this is going to clear him. Don't anybody get the sudden idea, the sudden brilliant – now wait a minute, maybe Ron didn't notice this, but you know, if you continued that on to 4 or 5,000 goals on each list he'd go Clear! Or suddenly his goal would spring out and he would know it himself without any nulling – because it's already been tested. It didn't work. You could list four lines of items, just "Who or what would have your goal?" and that sort of thing, but before you've listed fifteen you'll wish you hadn't – fifteen on each list.

I mean that's – that's a *thaaaagh, bluhhhh*. In other words items listing, thinking that will go to Clear. It won't. That's been tested.

There's another system of taking a whole bunch of terminals "Who or what would have your goal?" See? Get a bunch of terminals and then assess those and find one that sticks in and then find goals for that terminal, see? That's awfully interesting but that hasn't worked either. I'm just telling you what hasn't worked, too. There's been a lot of work in this direction.

Now, what's that do. That discharges the living daylights out of it. That gives him some idea of opposition goals and that sort of thing and it takes a lot of charge off the list in a hurry, see.

All right. Now let's get rid of all of the goals he thinks are goals but which are solutions.

Now, all goals that a pc thinks are goals, except one, are solutions to problems. All goals are solutions to problems except one. And that's postulated and it's not a solution to nothing. And everybody can sit around and regard their navel in contemplation here, trying to figure out how come a pc would have one sitting out in thin air that wasn't a solution to a problem, but I'm sorry but that's just the way the thetans that are here on this track at this time are built! See? That's what they done. See? And until I find some other explanation for it, that's all. They just postulate. That's prime postulate for the universe of self. And it doesn't depend on a solution to any problem. It solves nothing. He just did it. Just out of the goodness of his stupid little cotton-picking heart.

The rest of them, in any GPM – any given cycle or GPM area, are solutions to problems. See?

He gets beaten up by all the boys in the neighborhood, so he has a goal to beat up everybody. You see? That's a solution to a problem. To be able to punish at will. See?

He's been in jail now and then, up and down the track, so he's finally developed a goal "to escape." You see? And then he – this will go off into all kinds of odd panels, like "to escape the consequences of life," you see? "To get other people to escape the consequences of life." "To hate blue uniforms." You see? And they'll all be mixed up with this problem of getting put in jail. They're all solutions.

So the pc, well, he can figure himself crazy as to what is a solution and what isn't a solution, but you'll find that most pcs as they sit there, only accept as a valid goal that thing which they know will solve the problem they have: The chronic present time problem.

Now, we had these last year and they were getting in the road of our goals finding and they do get in the road of goals finding like mad. The guy's got a chronic present time problem. It actually hasn't anything to do with his goals line. It just happens to be a present time problem. Of course it wouldn't be a problem if it was on his goals line. Think that over for a moment. See?

It wouldn't really be a problem, see, so it must be something else, there must be some other thing. Well, he'll sit there and give you a long and involved list of solutions to that problem and call it a goals list and it drives him almost around the bend, see. He keeps – because man, you try and run this something. Try to run this process on somebody, "Solve a..." – "Think up a solution to your problems. Thank you." "Think up a solution to your problems. Thank you." "Think up a solution to your problems. Thank you."

Next thing you know the mass is getting massier and massier. He's wondering what's going on, you know. It brings the masses right in on him. "Think up a solution to your problem." Bum show.

Now a goals list, oddly enough, would be composed of past solutions so that would run them out. So that would be very therapeutic. But the guy who is sitting there with a chronic present time problem... Let us – let us say this fellow has a – has a farm. He has a big farm, see. And the government's gone bankrupt and can't run it for him any more and he's sitting there with cows and horses and sheep and wages to pay and everything and no subsidies.

And he's got this. And he's had this for quite a while. Morning, noon and night he's done nothing but think about this. Do you know what kind of goals he's going to get? "To dispose of sheep at a large profit," "to do lots of work," "to pull off miracles," "to be an economic wizard," "to make things grow better," "to make more production." See? They'll all have to do with his PTP. And you'll just get reams of stuff on PTPs. And this is why you develop these long lists because the person starts thinking up new solutions to PTPs.

So this is the gag: After you've done this four goals, that separates out the sheep from the goats and tells him which is him, to some degree, that smooths that out, takes some charge off the list, pull this other one: "What problem would your goal or might your goal be a solution to?" That is very charming. You make a laboriously written list of these things so you can throw it away. [laughter]

But what problem would your – might your goal be a solution to? Whatever the wording you use. I couldn't care less. But it's what problem would your goal be a solution to? That's what you're trying to find out. You're trying to find out a list of problems.

And the guy says, "*Oooh*, this bird with the farm," he says, "*Oooh*." "To run a farm profitably," "To get my hands paid," "To make things better on the farm," "To produce agricultural machinery without paying for it," "To sell hay at high prices – how to sell hay at high prices in summer," "How to get cows milked for nothing."

And the next thing you know, why, he says, "What problem?"

You can actually sort of run this thing on down. And he'll sort of realize, "*Ha-ha-ha*, this has nothing to do with my goal. I mean that's all different."

So "might" doesn't hang him with having misanswered the auditing question you see, as "would" would.

Get yourself a nice list of problems. How many problems? I don't know. How many has he got? How many thousand? Oh, no. Nothing like that. Dozens is the order of magnitude of this problems list. It's just dozens.

And all of a sudden he'll – he'll suddenly realize that he's been sitting there waiting for a goal to... Now this is what's – this is what's the killer. This is not for getting the goal on the list. This is for getting nulling done. Because your pc is not going to pay any attention to his own goal as it goes by if it doesn't solve his chronic present time problem. He's waiting for a goal to come up that makes farming economically feasible. See what he's doing. He doesn't give each goal as it goes by its proper weight and interest just as a goal. He's waiting for a specialized goal to come up. See? And he turns each one over as regard to his chronic present time problem. "Let's see, would this goal help me run the farm? All right. Well, this couldn't possibly be the goal." And right away goes sort of out of session, you see? He fades out on you. And he's all ...

"To catch catfish," you say. "Ah, no, that wouldn't help run the farm. No. To catch catfish, that isn't it." See? See it's a problem in attention. The guy's attention is so stuck on current track that he just can't hear anything. It's not that you will miss the goal. It just makes it harder to get. Because the pc's sitting there all the time he's waiting for how to make a farm, see? His whole problem, see, is how to make a farm solvent. You read off a list of goals, he hears a list of solutions to his chronic present time problem. He doesn't hear his own goal when it goes by because that's something that's long ago and far, far away and he ain't 'ad nothing to do with it for a long time, you see.

So it has nothing to do with his problems today and it's all invalidated anyway. And there's nothing you can do about it. See?

So this trick is to get his attention centered around for nulling. And that's why you make a list of these problems, you see. What problem might your goal be a solution to? And he'll give you all these wild problems.

Now, you can go on with this too long. You do – start doing three, four-hundred of these problems in a list and your pc's bank is going to start to get kind of gooey, because remember you're going up against the problem and to list problems is therapeutic but to repeat wrong goals and so forth, is not.

See? Because he's more or less inventing these goals. He's guessing at them and so forth. You'll find out that it will run itself out of the zone and area of therapy. Actually your tone arm starts going up kind of stickily. You can kind of follow it on the TA, you see, it starts getting a bit sticky and gummed up. You better come off it. But you've gotten that out of the road. Now you can ask him another question and add to his goals list.

"Now with all of those problems out of the way, supposing those problems were all cared for, what might your goal be?" And list some goals. Get the trick? "Well, just supposing you had all those problems handled that you've given me now, we've got the list here." We're not going to tear it up in front of his face, but, we're going to lay it over here to the side: "Supposing you've had all those cared for now, what would your goal be?"

"Oh, well that's entirely different. Oh, yeah, what would my goal be if all those things were handled? Oh gee, oh God, that would be a ball. You know. It would be marvelous. To dance amongst the daisies, to whistle at blondes," you know. You get some interesting goals that he's had as goals.

In other words, that's just a method of taking a bulldozer, you see, and just shoving first with this four list all the oppgoals off of his list so you haven't got that automaticity to contend with and then shoving his problem solutions that are chronic and current, that are really worrying him, off of the list and now you can continue the list until it's in this kind of shape so it will only give one tick every now and then. And you're not going to go up to 3, 4, 5,000 goals, see?

And all of a sudden the goals you start putting down after you've done these two tricks, see, these goals you get are going to be much more sensible. They'll look more like goals. You know they – "To communicate well," "To have a ball," "To get my own way," anything you could think of.

It will be any usual goal but it won't be, "To turn all the firemen in Chicago into ibexes." That type of goal is never found on a pc as *the* goal, don't you see.

"To run and run and run and turn around sometimes and come back so I can see where I was going when I wasn't there." [laughter] You seldom find that type of goal on a pc. You see?

Whereas you actually, in listing out things, when you start to run to your 2, 3, 4,000 list of goals, you'll get a lot of those things on there and they're just a waste of time.

So that's a way to cut your goals list down. So that sort of handles going on and on and on and on and on.

Now your next action – that's important because some goals lists tend to run awfully long before they are finally discharged and that helps them this way.

Your next action in handling your goals list of course, is to null by mid ruds. Now there's a very good idea to prepcheck before you do a nulling, any old goal that has been found rightly or wrongly or been hinted at or evaluated on the pc. Put those down ahead of the list. Any goal the pc has had. I don't care if it's been prepchecked before, see. You know, he had this goal – he was in a course – he was in a course some place a couple of years ago and he used to set goals for the session all the time and finally he put this down on his list and somebody found it on his list and it was in, you know, that kind of thing and they didn't ever really get it to pan out, but he thought for a long time that was probably his goal. Or something he was terribly fond of as a goal, that didn't pan out and he's been mad at it ever since. Or a goal that was found wrong and listed on him or a goal that was found and not listed or

3D Criss Cross was run on it. You see, any type of goal like that. Get a nice neat little list of them and put them down ahead of the goals list.

I don't care if it's been done before, don't you see, because in the meantime he's still going to have a fondness for those until his actual goal is found. And he's going to think of those once in a while. He's going to invalidate them once in a while and he's going to muck them up once in a while, see. And maybe his goal is "to get myself in a hell of a fine, ruddy mess," you know. You never know.

And he can sure do it with some old half... half-gone goal, see. You put that – just put that in front of the list.

All right. Now, you've got those things. Now clean those up and then start in. There's several ways this could go about, but kind of the way I would favor would be to run a whole prep – get those gone, see, and then just run all the mid ruds or any variation of the mid ruds on your goal, (quote) "Your goal," – (quote) "Your goal." That's a completely different Prep-check. See? It's not "On goals" or anything like that. "Has your goal been suppressed?" You see? You get these things out of the way, these old ones and then let's do a, "Your goal," just to make sure. And it sort of gets the wheels straightened out. They've been going round and round maybe for – oh, for some people they've been going around for months or even years, "What's my goal? What's my goal? What's – what's – I wonder what my goal was?" And they finally go to fortune tellers, take up Ouija boards, anything.

And you just – you not only then get the known ones out of the way, but with this basket, you know, why, you just get all the unknown ones that he hasn't mentioned out of the way, too. Just prepcheck it. Just as though you had it on the list. See?

So you'd have "To catch catfish," "To be a waterbuck," "To run and run and run and knock all the firemen in Chicago into cocked hats," and "your goal."

Get the idea? So that merely becomes part of the goals list, any old found or suspected or hoped-for goal you see, that's been worked over. Then this item, this goal, "Your goal," see, you're handling that in turn with a very careful nulling by mid ruds. See? You make sure that you get it all polished up, see, so that it doesn't bang on anything. And then sail on into his list.

Now, because they've come off against a plot of time from early to late, in other words he's listed these things consecutively, there is an argument, a heavy argument in favor of nulling them that consecutively because you can keep them cleaned up more – earlier. See? The earlier to late. And you null by mid ruds from early to late. See. You've got your list now, now null again from early to late to approximate the cycle of getting these things off.

You could also make a case out of from getting late to early because it possibly would be in the greater number of cases that his goal would be late on the list rather than early on the list; but then we take somebody here the other day, I think, I don't know how early the goal was on the list but it was practically first page.

So that argument against it really isn't valid, and starting from the beginning and going through to the end is the recommended way to do it.

All right. We tear on through that way and we clean each one of them up, as I was telling you about in the first lecture, and your pc should be looking as fine as silk.

Now when do we prepcheck this? Well frankly, if you do this trick, if you do this trick, you don't need to do too much prepchecking. When you've done your beginning rudiments if you will then run ordinary mid ruds before you go into the body of the session, with "Since your last session," see, not "In this session," you see, but "Since your last session." ... "Now, when was your last session?" The fellow says, "Well, it was yesterday afternoon, we finished up at 4:30." You say, "All right. Good. Since your last session is there anything you have suppressed?" See? And do those repetitive, like you do the beginning ruds, you see. Don't do them a fast check, do them repetitive. Because the pc when he's doing goals nulling does mighty silly things. And we've already caught two or three fellows off-base who come in and they went out with the tone arm, you know, the tone arm was sitting there at 2.75 and they come back in with the tone arm at 6.4 and the needle is going *bzzzzz* and they say, "Now, since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding? That is clean, thank you."

They didn't do anything. They read their whole goals list and tried to find it on the meter. No, they haven't done anything, see? *Ha-hah*. Well they're not withholding it. They would have told you if you asked. They've just about thrown their case into a cocked hat, see. And people do silly things while their things are being nulled. And they get anxious and they get upset and they experiment around and they wonder if there isn't some easier way to find a goal. You can expect pcs to do all kinds of things like this. So in nulling sessions if you say, "Since your last session is there anything you have suppressed?" done repetitively. And then do a fast check afterwards. Fast check the mid ruds, see, on the same thing. Now you're sailing because you're not now going to have the interim time between sessions gumming up into suppress and failed to reveal and dirty needles and all of this other kind of thing. In other words you're sailing now and it's well worth doing it. And after you've done it a few times, why it is very easy to do. It's not a very lengthy action. I did one the other evening, I think, in about, I don't know, about seven minutes, it was *whiz, whiz, whiz, whiz, whiz* and it was all clean and everything went along beautifully.

All right, now. That is a very good thing to do for a goals types nulling session, in other words, "Since your last session." Not "In this session," but "Since the last time you were audited," whatever you want to say. That thing is all clean. Now you've got that interim check, you see.

Now, if you only want to go through that once and so forth, you could do your fast check on the session. See. "In this session," *brrrrrrrrr*, see? And that caught anything he mucked up in – while doing the repetitive check, see. And that might clear that up. But that – this is now getting very nice indeed because the pc by this time will practically be crawling through the meter to get onto his nulling. So you can be just so cautious without knocking the pc out of session on the basis of no auditing. See?

The worst auditing there is is no auditing. You know that. That is the worst there is. The worst auditing there is is not an auditor who can't read a meter, who will not do TR 4, who this, who that, who the other thing. The pc's opinion, I don't care if this ruins him, gives

him somatics, puts him sick in bed, I don't care what this does to him – to him, no auditing is worse than any auditing.

That is something for you to remember. Because no auditing sometimes is what lies back of your pc's lack of progress. You're just being *too confoundedly picky*. You're just being *too confoundedly careful*. You're saying, "Well, I know we did a Prepcheck during the last three sessions, that we've been prepchecking 'listing' as a subject. I know we've been doing that, but in actual fact, in actual fact, prepchecking demonstrated there that there was an awful lot of preparatory work to be done. So instead of nulling today, instead of nulling today, why we're going to go back over all of the Prepchecking we did and straighten that out."

Then you wonder why you can't get any rudiments in. No rudiments will go in now. You see? A pc will stand for so much, but sometimes a no-auditing occurs in actual auditing and it's one of your chronic difficulties in auditing, is the pc is getting no auditing.

Now, when you start sailing on a goals list and start nulling on down the line, your own heart is going to be in your throat many times. You will go to goal number 789 and honest to Pete, this thing never ticks. There's hardly any valid... You pick up the suppressions with a tiny slow and – and *ha-ha-ha-hu-huh*. Is the pc in session? Is the pc responding on the meter? What the hell is going on here? See?

Well, possibly a lot of things could be going on there, but I think it's just routine. After you've cleaned up just so many goals the pc stops invalidating them and stops suppressing them and stops doing this and that to them and you don't find much on them. But also a flying needle – it isn't the stuck needle that is the most vicious thing to encounter. It is the flying needle. That is your worst enemy in nulling.

A flying needle. One which is spinning from – let's say your tone arm is gently and gradually rising so that in the space of five minutes will go from 4.5 up to 5. Let's say it takes five minutes to get there. Do you see the relative speed of rise of your needle? Now that constantly rising needle, if rising above a certain speed, is a flying needle and a flying needle is one which is enough to cancel out the invalidations, the suppressions and the goals reads.

In other words, the mechanical inertia of the needle, the actual weight of the needle and the fact that it is flying there, from the right to the left, oh man, to detect a slow out of that thing is heroic. It's almost worth ARC breaking the pc so he'll stick, you know. Just drives you batty.

I mean it's a flying needle. It's just a constant rise. Constant, rapid rise. And it is enough so that if your tick just degenerates into just the slightest slow and if anything is guaranteed to give you myopia as well as nervous prostration, it's one of these fast rising needles.

You're looking for that little slow. And then every once in a while to complicate the thing, pcs that have this sort of thing get a jerky rising needle. And it's going up by fits and starts and you can't tell what is a slowed rise, you see. And what is just needle pattern and so forth.

It's almost worth kicking the pc in the shins to change the needle pattern. See?

You can do various things about this but to attempt to cope with this situation very hard is, of course, no auditing. It's something that you should go through. The one thing you can't go through with is the dirty needle.

The dirty needle – very often the thing is latent which is a read and so forth. When a pc has just so many overts on an auditor, a dirty needle becomes rather chronic. And it slips and it slides with sudden jerks to the left and right and then starts buzzing, don't you see.

And those sudden jerks can have been going on, sort of, before you saw them. Do you get the idea? I mean they're not good and instant. They're not this, they're not that. Now if you take a magnifying glass on this and if you watch it very, very carefully with a magnifying glass, you'll probably be able to detect an instant invalidation or something like that inside a dirty needle.

Now I can do this and go round blinking for a week afterwards from the eyestrain. Actually read a dirty needle and read the vibrations inside a dirty needle in order to clean the thing up. It can be done, but there isn't any reason for you to do it at all, because it's O/W.

It's – now it's more O than W. Now when your pc is *all* the time, *all* the time, *all* the time withholding and they've always got a "failed to reveal" and they've always got a "failed to reveal," it's you that's auditing them, so they must have the overt on you. So let's put it in terms of overts now. Let's make a random rudiment out of overts. "In this session have you committed an overt against me?" or "In this session have you committed an overt?" or something like that.

And you all of a sudden see that dirty needle broaden out into a wider rock slam. And then murder will out. They actually repeat the goal to themselves several times after you do, while you're asking them suppress, in order to make sure or you know they're helpful. They've been doing something, you see. Or they've been talking about how lousy you are out of session or something like this, see. Something – something is going on here. That you can pretty well plan on. Your constant dirty needle if not traceable to the auditor is traceable to somebody else, but basically it would go like this: To the *auditor*, most likely, to *auditors*, you see, to *Scientists*, to *Science*, to something else on a broader perimeter. Sort of about your scale of application of overts.

For instance, somebody could do this. They could be running beautifully, go by a reception desk in a Central Organization, steal a book and after that you wouldn't be able to straighten their needle out. Do you see that? Some auditor that you're auditing could get furiously angry at a pc and refuse to audit the pc and put the pc off and raise hell with the pc, don't you see? (Come under the heading of Scientists. You might as well say, Scientists and pcs there on the list you just jot it down.) And come back into session again: He's got a dirty needle. He's got a rock slam. You can't read this thing, you see.

So just put it down to this: It *is* overts.

Now there's a thing called a missed withhold, isn't there? Well now, just translate the whole lot into missed overts. Dones that they didn't find out about, see. And you've got basically the same situation only we've got the overt side of the situation, you see.

So the missed overt, done, that people didn't find out about and that sort of thing. You've got a lot of phraseology that can go this way.

Now, of course that necessitates running some O/W to clean that up, doesn't it? Now, let me tell you the difficulties with O/W. And one of the reasons why you have so much trouble sec checking and prepchecking people is they don't answer the auditing question.

They answer the auditing question because of... See? They answer the auditing question with something else. You say, "What have you done to your pc?" You finally isolated that pcs are chopping their pcs to ribbons you see. "What have you done to pcs?" This is a field auditor in practice some place or another they come in and you are clearing them. And they answer it this way, "I wonder why the pc acted up so." It's, "What did I do to pcs to make pcs act up?"

You see? That's not the auditing question. It's, "What have you done to pcs?" Not, "What have you done to pcs to make them act up?" And as long – now listen – as long as they answer the question with any additive, it will not clear. Now, that's well worth knowing.

And you'd better write that down very strong, because where O/W doesn't work, the pc is not answering the auditing question. And if you don't have a reality on this already, some day you're going to get a flaming reality on it. You're going to be utterly shocked at that fantastic, offbeat – you'll have run O/W for fifteen or twenty minutes and the pc is just getting more and more ARC breaky and you can't quite figure what the hell's going on here, you know. You haven't got any tone arm action or something like that. And then lightning will strike. And you will suddenly remember Ron telling you at some time or another that it was because the pc wasn't answering the auditing question.

And you all of a sudden decide to investigate even at the risk of causing further ARC breaks and find out what the pc is answering. And just explore this, just discuss this for a while. All of a sudden – it sometimes takes a pc quite a while to get disentangled from this thing, you know – you'll find out the pc was answering the auditing question with some via or additive, in some fashion that had nothing to do with the auditing question. Like, you're saying, "Now, what have you done to women?" See? The pc gets a dirty needle or a rock slam or so forth every time – every time he has anything to do with women, see, and he comes into session and you – it's all a mess, see.

Of course it's all on his goals line but you haven't got his goal. How the hell are you going to straighten it up? See? Your – your problem is to find his – is find his goal without having found his goal. See? And then you've got a rock slam and a dirty needle and so forth, so you're going to say to him, "All right, what have you done to a woman?" See?

And he's going to say – if you listen carefully there's always something a little bit wrong with the answer. "Well, I've – I've scolded them." That sounds all right to you. See? "What have you done to them?" "I have scolded them."

And you say, "All right. What have you done to a woman?" "What have you withheld from a woman?" Now, what have you done to a woman?" And very shortly they run out of answers. That's one of the phenomena. They run out of answers. They're back to scolded

again. You see? And they just aren't getting any better. Now the index is and the only test you have is it isn't clearing up.

See? You're getting no tone arm action to amount to anything and it isn't clearing up. They aren't getting sweeter-tempered. They're getting worse. So what you can count on is they're asking – they're answering a question that sounds to them like this: You say, "What have you done to a woman?" See? And they answer it, "Why have I been a victim of women for so long? Is it because I have scolded them? Is that why women do me in?" And they're actually running solutions and they get no better. They run solutions to the problem of why they can't get along with women. You got the idea?

It's kind of like they do a little Goals Assessment on themselves. God help them. You see? "Why – why have I...?" "Why have I been the victim of women?" "Why have women chewed me up all the time?" "Why are women always stealing my car?" This is what they're trying to solve, see? They're trying to solve a whole bunch of problems with relationship to women. Not what have they done to women.

And the solution to it is to say, "Now, look, look, the question is done, done, done, done, done, just plain done, done, you see, done, have you got that? Done."

And they say, "Yes. I've been a victim of..."

"No, done, done, see, done to women. Now get the idea of a woman there and you there and you've done something to a woman. Done. Just – just that."

And all of a sudden – you don't harass them this way unless they're getting worse on O/W, you see and you'd better harass them, see. And, "Done to women? I really have never done anything to women. Not really. Oh, hit them once in a while. Well, I guess you could call that an answer. Hit them. If that's doing anything to a woman. But, I guess it is. Hit them. Yes. Hit them. All right. That's an answer. All right, call it an answer. Yeah, that's right. I hit them."

And they sometimes will say to you, "But of course that doesn't have anything to do with my problem." And you have to go over it and you say, "Now look, we're not asking anything about your problem or anything, all we want to know is what you've done to women. Just done."

Oh, this guy will say, "Oh, yes. Oh well, if it comes to that, very often picked them up and dropped them outside of civilization and make them walk, you know. I guess that's doing something to them. Yeah, that is. That's doing something to them. And ignoring them. Mainly ignoring them. Yeah."

You've got a whole bunch of new answers. Now these answers go along. The pc gets cheerful and you get tone arm action.

Whenever you're not getting tone arm action on Security Checking, the pc is trying to solve a problem. Not trying to answer the auditing question. Got it? Either that or there is no answer on it. You know, you're just – you're checking a – you're checking a check list, a Sec Check list of Zero Questions for burglars. You see? And the pc is an editor. You know. It just doesn't match. His burglary is done in other ways.

So the whole situation you see is entirely shifted. You're not getting an answer to the auditing question or it doesn't apply. And you don't get tone arm action. The pc feels no better. The pc feels worse.

All right. That is actually your dirty needle. Now you can pick up some time when he had a dirtier needle; he had a dirty needle in an early session. You can, you know, you can flick, what was the withhold missed on him in that session? Bang! It goes out. And you're not troubled with it, you see. You can do other stunts to get rid of this thing. I'm just telling you what lies underneath these wide rock slams and chronic dirty needles and that sort of thing. And why O/W suddenly raised its head here a few weeks ago after being dormant for so long.

But O/W has that liability – is the auditing question must be answered or the pc will get more nattery and get worse.

All right. And if all those things are done, nulling and looking for a goal and so forth can be done rather easily, very successfully and without too much trouble. The pc's goal is on the list if the list is in the condition I've given you. You see, if it's limp and so forth, why, his goal will be on the list and you will find his goal in spite of, "huhh huhhh," in spite of this, but sometimes you will run into this freak condition, there's a piece of the goals list missing or something wild like this has gone on and you will say, "Oh, no wonder!" or something. But I'd just do the whole list before I started worrying too much about special solutions to the thing. But sometimes you will, you'll have a piece of the goals list gone or something like that.

The pc brought in all the goals list except pages 2, 3 and 4. Ha-ha. After you're nulling at list number 759, why, he says, "You know I found these on the dining room table the other day. They were mixed up in some sandwiches. I wonder if they're important," you see. And his goal is number 4 on page 2. But sometimes you're unlucky and sometimes you're lucky.

Well, all right. Now, I've given you a lot of extra data here on nulling and finding goals and checking goals out and that sort of thing. I hope the data will be of value to you. This has – I've given you very little about listing. I will have to cover that another time.

Thank you very much.

Good night.

TV DEMO: ROUTINE 3GA, NULLING GOALS

An auditing demonstration given on
8 August 1962

LRH: Okay, we're – all we're going to do here – all we're going to do here is do the rudiments, null some goals, straighten out anything that occurs with relationship to the needle and carry on through. Just going to do some 3GA nulling.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

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

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right, here it is. Start of session. Has the session started for you?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. All right, what goals would you like to set for this session?

PC: *Get some nulling done.*

LRH: Okay. What other goal would you like to set?

PC: *Find a goal?*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Perhaps find a goal, maybe.*

LRH: Perhaps find a goal, maybe. Okay. Okay?

PC: *That's all.*

LRH: And that's all. All right. Are there any goals you'd like to set for life or livingness?

PC: *Usual.*

LRH: Usual. All right. Okay. Squeeze the cans. Thank you. All right. Tone arm is sitting here at about 4. Okay. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Do you agree that is clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Very good. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Okay, I'll check that on the meter.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are with-

holding? Okay. I'll check that. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? Do you agree that is clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Okay. Do you have a present time problem?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Okay, I'll check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? Okay, do you agree that is clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Very good. All right. Now, your needle's quite free and clean here. Everything seems to be all right. Now, it was quite a surprise to you, I understand, that you were going to get some goals nulling.

PC: *Yes, uh-huh.*

LRH: You didn't know this.

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right, I'm sorry, I thought I had asked you.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Now, did anything upset you about that particularly?

PC: *Well, a little bit of a rush, you know.*

LRH: Just a bit of a rush, eh?

PC: *That's right. And then, they had that camera turned on there.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I thought that was an overt.*

LRH: It's not on. It's the other camera that's on.

PC: *I know it's not on now.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *But it was on when I sat down.*

LRH: Right.

PC: *And-um- I consider that camera an overt against anyone.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *And-um-hm-that's all.*

LRH: That about it?

PC: *Yeah, that's it.*

LRH: All right. Were you worried about any goals on your list here?

PC: *Well, there's some goals on my list that are my goals that I prefer to remain my goals...*

LRH: I see.

PC: *... but-um-that I certainly want to keep them my goals.*

LRH: Okay, all right.

PC: *Mmmm, I don't consider my life is – uh – public property.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Well, is that going to interfere with that?

PC: *Um, to a degree, perhaps, but ah... Just skip the ones – um – that are my own personal goals.*

LRH: All right. Okay, all right. Now, do you feel better about that?

PC: *Mm-km.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Well, I saw this as a good opportunity to get a few goals nulled on you, hm?

PC: *Mmm .*

LRH: Is that all right?

PC: *Yeah, that's fine.*

LRH: All right, very good.

Well, your tone arm's come down to 3.75. All right, now let's see what we can get here in the way of goals, all right?

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: Now we just – we have just hit a goal here, number 816...

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: ...and it was – had some pain on it and gave a good solid bang.

PC: *Mm.*

LRH: All right, let's see if there aren't some more on this list like that, okay?

PC: *Right, uh-huh, mm.*

LRH: All right?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Okay. Here's the next one: To not have things sadden me. Has anything on that goal been invalidated? Has anything on that goal been suggested? Is there anything on that – all right, what was that? I got a read, a suggested.

PC: *Well, that's more or less in my family as a suggested goal. Everyone considers that very vitally important, to always be happy and never be saddened by anything*

LRH: All right, very good. Thank you. On the goal to not have things sadden me, has anything been suggested? Okay,

there's a tiny slow, is there something more you'd care to say on that?

PC: *Well, let me put it this way, it – actually that wasn't quite true, it's my father's side of the family...*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *... that this was always suggested.*

LRH: All right, thank you. All right?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Has anything on that goal been suggested? Okay, there's still a little bit of a tick, something more there?

PC: *Well, I suggested it, I brought it down, to that degree.*

LRH: Attagirl. All right. On the goal to not have things sadden me, has anything been suggested? Okay. On the goal to not have things sadden me, has anything been suppressed? Okay, have you got a little suppression there? There.

PC: *Um, the only thing I can think of is I'm fond of Russian novels. I like Russian literature but it always saddens me, so it goes against that goal, do you see what I mean?*

LRH: All right, all right. All right, on that goal, has anything been suppressed? Okay, all right, we got a needle kicking up here. Have you done something in this session, are you withholding something? ... Something right there. What is that? There it is.

PC: *Um...*

LRH: There it is, bang, that. There it is.

PC: *I thought of it – actually what it is, I'm not so much sad as sort of a – it's a bit of an – of unkind consideration with regard to the students downstairs, you see.*

LRH: All right, what is it?

PC: *And it's merely that some of them – uh, you know, are – I do not mind them knowing me, you know, really knowing me. Others I do not care to have them know me. I'm sort of selective in whom I wish to – to have my case acquainted to.*

LRH: All right, very good. All right, is there anything else you've done there? No, that's...

PC: *As an overt? Hm.*

LRH: ... appears clean now, all right. Thank you. We'll carry on with this now. All right, on the goal, to not have things sadden me, has anything been suppressed?

PC: *Don't think so.*

LRH: Hmm?

PC: *Don't think so.*

LRH: Don't think so?

PC: *Hm-mm.*

LRH: All right, you're getting a scattery, scattery needle here, you're busy thinking and...

PC: *Hm-mm.*

LRH: Really?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: I wonder if it could be those cans. You know, they did have a short in them.

PC: *Possibly, I don't notice it.*

LRH: You're throwing them around pretty hard.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. I know that chair's uncomfortable but there's nothing you can do with that chair.

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right, would you like me to get you another chair?

PC: *No, no, that's fine. See that...*

LRH: I could get you that captain's chair in there.

PC: *No, I am perfectly comfortable in this chair.*

LRH: You are?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right, very good. All right, let me see if we can't carry on here with this, okay?

PC: *Mm-hmm.*

LRH: On the goal to not have things sadden me, has anything been suppressed? Okay, do you agree that is clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Very good. To not have things sadden me. Okay, that is out.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Okay? The next is, "To recover from" – all right, you got a little bit of an overt there?

PC: *I just wondered what is the next one.*

LRH: Is this upsetting – very upsetting to you that somebody else might hear these goals? They're not bad goals, I see nothing wrong with them.

PC: *I know, I know, but-uf-um...*

LRH: What are you doing, suppressing them, or what?

PC: *Well, I feel – no the only thing I can say on this, I feel that they – are – have little extent to do with me, that they're like me, you see.*

LRH: Right.

PC: *And to that degree I have myself identified with them. And just as I wouldn't loan out my clothing, or something like that, to someone else, so I don't like to – to give my – me, parts of me, out indiscriminately, you see what I mean?*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But I do – I'm not worried about that really.*

LRH: You're not worried about that.

PC: *It seems to me, yeah, since I told you about that, it doesn't seem to be any concern.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It's just that I was wondering, what is this? I couldn't remember it – to recover.*

LRH: All right, they're perfectly good goals, there's nothing wrong. All right?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Here's the next one. To recover from depression. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Thank you. That is out. To recover. Has that goal been suppressed? Thank you. Any stray thought there?

PC: *I just wondered what I thought I was – what I put the goal down in reference to, to recover. From what?*

LRH: All right. Okay. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? All right, there's a little more suppression. There's a tick.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: What is that?

PC: *Um – well it's sort of – um – what I thought there is, is that – um – Mother and family, you know, suppressing recovery as a child merely to the degree that – um – in believing that after an illness or something like that, precautions were always necessary, you see what I mean, so they sort of repress one's recovery and repress the goal to that extent.*

LRH: All right. I see. All right, okay. Thank you. We'll see if that's clean now. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Okay. To recover. Okay. That is out.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: Okay. To be unaffected. Has that – has that goal been suppressed? Okay. That is out. Okay. You had another slam there for a moment. Any overt?

PC: *Mm-mm.*

LRH: Nothing.

PC: *Well, I wondered who it was who went upstairs there, someone walking in the upstairs hall.*

LRH: Oh, you wondered who it was upstairs?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Yeah, bang, bang. Okay. Probably Sang, huh?

PC: *Sang, yeah.*

LRH: All right, okay. To not be tied down. Has that goal been invalidated?

Has anything on that goal been suggested?
There's a slight suggestion.

PC: *Uh – the words in that – um – that's more or less – uh – sort of a – a colloquial type of expression.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *You know.*

LRH: Thank you.

PC: *Suggested by the locale and the people and what have you.*

LRH: All right. Has anything on that goal been suggested? Okay. Equivocal. Has anything on that goal been suggested? There's still a – one – there's still some suggestion on that.

PC: *Possibly my mother – um...*

LRH: Okay. All right. Does that answer the question?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right, very good. On the goal, to not be tied down, has anything been suggested? Okay. That's a bit equivocal. On the goal, to not be tied down, has anything been suggested? Okay, thank you.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: On this goal, is there anything you've failed to reveal?

PC: *Don't think so.*

LRH: All right, thank you. In this session, is there anything you have done? There it is. What are you sitting on there? Are you worried about something?

PC: *Moved my hands, I suppose, you know. I mean...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I've not kept still.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Um – nothing else I can think of.*

LRH: You don't think anything else there, eh?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: But you had moved your hands.

PC: *Yes. I had.*

LRH: All right, thank you.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Now, in this session, have you committed an overt?

PC: *Being – possibly from being – by being late for it, but that's not in the session. But I thought in this session that I was late for the session and I didn't quite know I was going to get – but...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... I thought, well, I was late for it.*

LRH: All right, thank you.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. In this session have you committed an overt?

PC: *Well, having a rock slam turn on, that's an overt.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Okay, we'll get along here and see how we can make this, okay?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. To not be tied down. All right. On this goal's anything you have failed to reveal? Yes. What have you failed to reveal?

PC: *Well, I suppose that – uh – to not be tied down means not to have –*

um – unwanted responsibilities that I don't want.

LRH: Oh I see. All right, thank you. On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? Okay, that's good enough. On this goal has a mistake been made? Okay. Equivocal. On this goal has a mistake been made? Okay. There's a mistake here somewhere.

PC: *Merely to the degree that I don't think it adequately expresses exactly what I was trying to state.*

LRH: All right, thank you. On this goal, has a mistake been made? All right. On this goal, has a mistake been made? Okay. To not be tied down. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Okay, do you agree with that? Got any stray thoughts on this?

PC: *No stray thoughts, really.*

LRH: All right, thank you. That is out. So the next is: To be anything at will. Has anything on that goal been invalidated?

PC: *Yes, I invalidated that "at will," that's that funny thing, sounds – at will.*

LRH: All right. Okay, thank you. Open your eyes. I believe there is a short in those cans.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: It keeps knocking around. I have another set right here.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: The fact that you do not like the larger can... There you are.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Okay. On the goal to be anything at will, has anything been

invalidated? Okay. On the goal to be anything at will, has anything been suppressed? Okay. To be anything at will. Thank you, that is out.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: To get a new body. On this goal has anything been suppressed? Thank you, that is out. What are you thinking so hard?

PC: *Well, I wondered when I had thought I want – when I have had that goal this lifetime or whether it was an in-between lifetime goal, you know, sort of when?*

LRH: All right.

PC: *When is the when?*

LRH: Okay, all right, thank you.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. To know what to do with my next life. On this goal has anything been invalidated? On this goal has anything been suggested? On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? On this goal has a mistake been made? To know what to do with my next life. On this goal has anything been suppressed? Okay. To know what to do with my next life. All right. On this goal has anything been invalidated? Anything, any new thought?

PC: *Well, I don't know what to do with my next life, I mean it's still – uh – a bit unsolved in that I still – h ...*

LRH: All right. Okay. On this goal, has anything been invalidated. That's a little halt there. Anything else?

PC: *Well, it's sort of – I thought to myself then, "Why, it's jumping the gun a bit isn't it?" you know? I haven't – I haven't gotten my goals run out this – you know, for the past so many trillion years,*

and here I am already thinking – uh – plotting for my next actions.

LRH: Okay.

PC: ... *you know what I mean? It's sort of like the cart before the horse.*

LRH: All right. On this goal has anything been invalidated? Equivocal read. Are you thinking of something else very hard?

PC: *Hm-mm.*

LRH: On this goal has anything been invalidated? Okay. On this goal has anything been suggested? On this goal has anything been suggested? All right, a little bit of a rise there, a speeded rise. Anything else?

PC: *Hmmm, I thought that I would – uh – I've suggested to myself that I would like to go to a different planet next life and – uh – I've suggested that I would like to stay away from cold countries and then I've suggested that I would – don't think I would like to have a biological body next life.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *And – uh – those, I made those suggestions.*

LRH: All right, thank you. On this goal has anything been suggested? Okay, any other stray thought on that?

PC: *No, just – uh – I – um – very definitely, in looking at my thought flows, I don't think I want to be on Earth again, I'd like to be someplace else.*

LRH: All right, very good. All right, on this goal is there anything you've failed to reveal? I got something there, possibly it isn't failed to reveal, but.

PC: *Well, the only thing is I haven't revealed to myself where the elsewherenesses are, you know...*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: ... *or where I'd like to go.*

LRH: Okay. On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? Okay, any other thought?

PC: *Well, I thought that – um – I would like to um – avoid the – um – more or less the Anglo-Saxon civilization, you know – in my next life.*

LRH: Yeah, all right.

PC: *But I don't see how one can sort of avoid it if one's on Earth, you see, and I'll always have the idea of Coca-Cola following me, being posted everywhere, in every mud hut throughout the world. That sort of thing.*

LRH: All right, all right. On this goal – on this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? Okay. On this goal has a mistake been made? All right. To know what to do in my next life. On this goal has anything been suppressed? Okay, that is out.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Now, have you had any pain or sensation or anything like that while doing these goals?

PC: *Um, that last one, a bit of sensation.*

LRH: Had sen on it, huh? All right, very good. And it fired once all by itself. Hence the time I spent on it – it had a rocket read...

PC: *Oh, it did.*

LRH: ...for a moment, but it was a little bit of a ragged rocket read but it's all

right. And your TA came down to 3.2 there for a moment. It's gone a little bit up now, all right?

PC: *That's very good.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right, you're doing quite well. That was less withholds than can short.

PC: *Oh, good.*

LRH: So, you can stop worrying about that.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: All right, we're doing all right here. Not the record-breaking speed that we might ordinarily expect but, under the circumstances.

PC: *Under stress...*

LRH: I think it's all right.

PC: *... symptoms of stress.*

LRH: Okay?

PC: *All right. That's all right.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I'm getting some nulled and that's all right and I'm happy.*

LRH: No matter how!

PC: *No matter how slow or how fast or...*

LRH: Okay, honey. Okay, here we go. To recover a zest for life. Has that goal been invalidated? Has anything on that goal been suggested? Equivocal. On that goal has anything been suggested? On that goal is there anything you failed to reveal? On that goal has a mistake been made? Okay.

To recover a zest for life. All right, on that goal – on that goal has anything been suppressed? Okay. To recover a zest for life. All right. Any stray thoughts while we've been doing this?

PC: *Yes, I thought – uh – that it sounds sort of funny, semantically, to recover a – a zest for life. You could take it two ways, you see. A zest for life – that means a zest for all of life.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *You see and then recover a zest meaning recover a – um – an enthusiasm for life. You see what I mean – there's two different things.*

LRH: Yeah, all right, okay. Double-entendre.

PC: *Yes. Hmmm.*

LRH: All right, I'm going to read it again because it fired. It's odd to see two together that fire. All right. To recover a zest for life. Okay, that is out. Any pain or sensation?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. To recover a joy in living. Has that goal been suppressed?

PC: *Suppressed laughing, you know.*

LRH: Hmm?

PC: *Suppressed laughing, you know. It was so funny.*

LRH: All right. Okay. I asked you the wrong question. Has that goal been invalidated?

PC: *Well, yes, laughingly.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Has that goal been invalidated? Is there anything on that goal – is there anything on that goal that's been suggested? Okay. Is

there anything on that goal you've failed to reveal? All right. On that goal has a mistake been made? Okay, any mistake?

PC: *Hm-mm. I don't think so.*

LRH: All right, very good. On that goal has a mistake been made? Okay, I'm just cleaning a clean on you there.

To recover a joy in living. Has that goal been suppressed? Okay, that is out and it fired once. Was there any pain on it or sensation?

PC: *No.*

LRH: There wasn't?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right, thank you.

PC: *You asked that aft – and after the fact I get a pain in my shoulder. After the fact of answering the question, the pain came in my shoulder.*

LRH: It did, huh?

PC: *Yeah. I said no and wham!*

LRH: All right. And here we are, well, you've gotten ten of them...

PC: *Good.*

LRH: ... going, all right. All right, here's the next one: To influence matter with thought. Has that goal been suppressed? To influence matter with thought. Any stray thoughts on that goal?

PC: *Yes, I would rather sort of – um – liking to – um – to even produce matter with thought, too, to create matter with thought, you know.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Okay. To influence matter with thought. Has that goal

been suppressed? Okay, that is out. To influence the body with thought. Has that goal been suppressed? Thank you, that is out.

What did you think of there in the middle of the run?

PC: *I thought, well, I-I've been able to do that to a degree, you know.*

LRH: Oh, you thought you had done that?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right, very good. Thank you. To accomplish all through the mind. Has that goal been suppressed? All right, any thought of suppression there?

PC: *Well, it – um – to suppress thinking – um – all through the mind – sounded funny, I was wondering what, what, what it meant.*

LRH: To accomplish all through the mind.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right, sounded funny so you...

PC: *Yeah, sort of suppressed – wondering what's that...*

LRH: All right, thank you.

PC: *What, what, what?*

LRH: All right. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? All right. To accomplish all through the mind. Okay, that is out. What was your afterthought there?

PC: *I don't know. Didn't – didn't pick anything up. I thought well, it was out, that's all.*

LRH: Oh, you did think that it was out.

PC: *Yeah, yeah, it was out.*

LRH: It registered up on the meter. All right, thank you. Okay. To get out of the realm of thought into the realm of action. All right. Equivocal. To get out of the realm of thought into the realm of action. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? All right. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal?

PC: *Yes, I thought that was the goal before this life.*

LRH: Oh, all right, thank you. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Okay. There might be another...

PC: *It's not that – that is*

LRH: There might be another something there. It didn't read but this is a wiggly needle all of a sudden.

PC: *Well, the only thing I can think is that on that last – uh – the goal I thought to create – to create matter with thought. And perhaps that should – I wanted to add that to my goals list.*

LRH: Oh, you forgot to add that – tell me.

PC: *And I refrained from telling you.*

LRH: Oh, all right. And what is it?

PC: *To create matter through thought.*

LRH: To create matter with...

PC: *With thought is what I mean.*

LRH: ... with thought. Very good. Perfect.

PC: *Yea.*

LRH: All right?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: To get out of the realm of thought into the realm of action. All right. Has anything on that goal been invalidated?

PC: *Well, I didn't make it.*

LRH: All right, thank you.

PC: *And I don't, particularly, at the present moment want to accomplish that goal. That's – uh – that's an in between – this is a before this life goal, do you see that?*

LRH: Oh, thank you.

PC: *I'm not interested in accomplishing it now. I've only put it on my list because it is one I have had.*

LRH: All right. Has anything on that goal been invalidated? Okay. On that goal has anything been suppressed? All right. To get out of the realm of thought into the realm of action. All right. On that goal has anything been suggested? On that goal is there anything you failed to reveal? Something?

PC: *Umm...*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Well, that goes with the – uh – that goal goes with the – the ranch and the – and the cattle and – uh – and – um – and the cowboys and that type of thing. See – uh – I failed to reveal all the paraphernalia that was supposed to – to have accomplished the goal in order for the goal to be attained.*

LRH: Okay. All right. On that goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? Okay, any stray thought there?

PC: *Yes and I thought – uh – and the oil wells – there should have been*

some oil wells thrown in with the cattle and the ranch and the cowboys.

LRH: All right. Okay. On that goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? Okay. How's that seem to you?

PC: *I don't think there is anything else.*

LRH: All right, thank you. On that goal has a mistake been made? Okay. Very good. To get out of the realm of thought into the realm of action. Equivocal. To get out of the realm of thought into the realm of action. All right. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Okay, that is out.

Okay. To have a body that could stand up to the sun. Has that goal been suppressed? Okay, that is out.

To have an outdoor-type body. That is equivocal. To have an outdoor-type body. Has that goal been suppressed? Thank you. Any stray thoughts on that?

PC: *No, I just thought that – um – well, I was thinking that there was a better one – type of body – you know, that can – that they – can withstand all the – um – cold and heat and – and sandstorms and an awful lot of... They – they're a pretty strong biological body type.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I didn't want to look like a better one, mind you, but I wanted a body that would stand up to those factors.*

LRH: All right. To do dashing things. Has that goal been invalidated? Has anything on that goal been suggested? Is there anything on that goal you've failed to reveal? On that goal has a mistake been made? Okay. To do dashing things. Equivocal. To do dashing things. Okay. On that goal has anything been suppressed?

All right. On that goal has anything been invalidated? There's an invalidation.

PC: *Oh, yes. I have a sort of dashing things associated with – um – sort of a time of um – carriages and horses and this sort of thing and one doesn't do dashing things in a mechanical age, you see what I mean.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *Everything is sort of scientific and dry. It's the wrong – I think it's the wrong time for such a goal.*

LRH: All right, thank you. All right. Has that goal – has that goal been invalidated? Okay. Thank you.

Is anything on that goal that you have failed to reveal? Anything you failed to reveal? ...I don't have a reading here, I just have a slam.

PC: *Hmm.*

LRH: I just had one.

PC: *No, I always get a picture of a horse rearing when I think of that, you know.*

LRH: Of a horse running.

PC: *Of a horse rearing.*

LRH: Rearing!

PC: *You see, and sort of riding sidesaddle on a horse with long skirts and – well, I can see the horse is – is this – you know, he's sort of black and there's foam in his mouth and his eyes are wild and rearing and ...*

LRH: Okay. Is that what you failed to reveal?

PC: *Yeah, I ha – always with you – every time you read that, I had this picture about that.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Okay. On the goal to do dashing things is there anything you have failed to reveal? Something else.

PC: *Mmm. I suppose that I feel, too, there's a lot of the dash is taken out of one in our present civilization. There isn't much – there isn't much dash left available to one after one has survived – uh – sort of childhood and – uh – and modern educational system and that sort of thing. It sort of leaves everyone sort of pallid and – and very undashing. Hmmm.*

LRH: Well, all right. Very good.

PC: *Hmmm.*

LRH: Is there anything on that goal you have failed to reveal? Okay, thank you.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: On that goal has a mistake been made? Can you think of any mistake? Stray thought.

PC: *Yes, I think that the goal would have better been "To be dashing" rather than "To do dashing things."*

LRH: You want that goal on your list?

PC: *No, I don't. Hm-mm.*

LRH: All right. Thank you.

On that goal has a mistake been made? Okay, there's still a little something on that.

PC: *Hmmm. Well, one other mistake is what sort of things – what do I mean by, you know, "dashing things"?*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. On that goal has a mistake been made? Okay. To do dashing things. On that goal has anything been suppressed? Okay. Some suppression. What is it?

PC: *Dashing, you see, is that – um – I'm with these high heel shoes, stiletto heel shoes – one can't very well be dashing, you see what I mean. Otherwise you leave heels stuck in – in grates or floors or...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... or you lose your shoes or something. They're dangerous – um – dangerous instruments to go dashing about in.*

LRH: Okay. All right. On that goal has a mistake been made? All right. A little slow there.

PC: *Hmmmm. What I thought there is, I thought we were – um – we were – we were on suppressed, I think. But I thought I answered suppressed.*

LRH: Well, you probably did, honey. I'm very sorry.

PC: *All right. Hmmm.*

LRH: All right. Let me check this anyway.

PC: *All right, fine.*

LRH: On this goal has a mistake been made? Okay. That's all right. On this goal has anything been suppressed? All right. That's clean anyhow.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. I beg your pardon.

PC: *That's all right, no.*

LRH: I think – I'm afraid I got interested in your goal.

PC: *All right, that's okay. It is all yours.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

To do dashing things. All right. Ha! A rocket read!

PC: *Really? What do you know!*

LRH: On that goal has anything been invalidated? A little something there.

PC: *I thought – um – well, I invalidated a little bit to the – to the degree in thinking – um – that would be a nice goal to have. But then I thought, but what a poor time and place in the physical universe to have it. Or try to accomplish it, you see?*

LRH: All right, okay. On that goal has anything been invalidated? Okay. On that goal has anything been suggested? All right. You got a stray thought there? I don't say there is one, but... All right. On that goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? Okay. On that goal has a mistake been made? All right. On that goal has anything been suppressed? All right.

To do dashing things. To do dashing things. To do dashing things. Mmmm – very intriguing. This goal's firing. All right, let's see what we got here.

PC: *All right. It'd be funny if we did get my goal.*

LRH: All right. Let me clear up a couple of random rudiments here, okay? Different rudiments.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: On this goal has anything been asserted? Okay. On this goal has there been a confusion? On this goal has there been a confusion? Okay. On this goal has anything been protested? Equivocal. On this goal has anything been protested?

Okay. Have you got any stray answers to any of these things?

PC: *Uh-uh.*

LRH: All right. On this goal – on this goal has anything been suppressed? Okay. Check that again. On this goal has anything been suppressed? Okay. On this goal has anything been invalidated? On this goal has anything been suggested? Now, what was that fire?

PC: *I sort of heaved an inward sigh. I've sort of been a little bit holding my breath on these questions and I sort of noticed – I'm not actually aware of holding my breath but suddenly I noticed, well, I'm not breathing, so I...*

LRH: Okay. On this goal has anything been suggested? Okay. On this goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right. On this goal has a mistake been made? All right. Any mistake on this?

PC: *Hm-mm.*

LRH: I just got a tiny thing that might have been a speeded rise.

PC: *Um – yes, I thought I'm being very careful to hold my cans, see, now, I don't want any mistake to be made.*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *And – uh – to that degree I'm sort of making a mistake in being so careful.*

LRH: All right, thank you. All right, any stray thoughts here?

PC: *No, the only thing I did think is, is that – my, how interesting it is that I never would have – have thought that goal – you see, it isn't one of my favorite suspected – pc suspected goals, you see. One that – that every – you know pcs have that are their favorite little things. And this*

is totally un – unsuspecting, that it would be firing.

LRH: All right. Okay. Well, let's see how it's doing now. I'm going to read it three times.

All right. To do dashing things. To do dashing things. To do dashing things. All right. On this goal has anything been suppressed? All right. On this goal has anything been invalidated? Suggested? What have you suggested on this goal?

PC: *Well, I suggested to myself then, well, I wonder whether it reacted or didn't react the last time. That's all.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. On this goal has anything been suggested? Okay. On this goal has a mistake been made? Equivocal. On this goal has a mistake been made? There's a little mistake here.

PC: *Hmm.*

LRH: It's there. There. Something's kicking there.

PC: *Well, the only mistake I can think of is I certainly have had – uh – is it – uh – it's the wrong time to be born to have that type of goal. Do you see what I mean? And so the only mistake is me, in this body now. Hmmm.*

LRH: All right. On this goal has a mistake been made? All right, very good. On this goal has any – has anything been suppressed? All right.

To do dashing things. To do dashing things. To do dashing things. To do dashing things. All right. It is clean.

PC: *Oh? Pity.*

LRH: All right. Did you have any pain or sensation on that goal?

PC: *Um – a bit of sensation, I suppose, yes.*

LRH: Was it sensation?

PC: *Mm-hm, sort of – um – a little bit of um – sadness.*

LRH: All right. Sen and a picture?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Sen and a picture.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Well, that's getting interesting, wasn't it?

PC: *Yeah. Oh, shucks. All right.*

LRH: Okay, honey. Here we go. Here's your next goal: To be a bandit leader in Mexico. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Equivocal. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Okay. Any stray thoughts?

PC: *Umm. The only thing I thought of then is that I'm not Mexican, so that makes it difficult to be a leader of bandits in Mexico.*

LRH: All right, okay. Thank you.

Here's the next goal: To never be a circus performer. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Okay, thank you. That is out. Any stray thoughts?

PC: *Oh, I can't stand – I couldn't stand it – I think – um – the circus is a most unglamorous thing. Who would want to be out there and strain one's muscles endlessly the way those poor people do.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *They practice and practice and practice and practice. It takes them five years or something to perfect the – the little old thing of standing on their hands*

and walking on a – on a platform 200 feet off the ground. You see, no – hm-mm.

LRH: Ohhh. All right. Good enough. All right. You'd be interested, by the way, that your TA just came down to 2.7, lowest I've ever seen it.

PC: *Oh, good, very good.*

LRH: All right? Here's the next one, baby: To be a Southern belle. Has anything on that goal been invalidated? Equivocal. Has anything on that goal been invalidated? All right. On that goal has anything been suggested? Yeah, what's the suggestion, if any?

PC: *Um – really that – um – I'm – I'm from the Southwest, you see, so that, I'm not quite – cannot quite classify as a Southern belle. I'm a Southwestern belle. I should have been born in Kentucky or someplace like that.*

LRH: All right. On that goal has anything been suggested? All right. Do you have a thought then?

PC: *Yeah, I thought that the thing that suggested it is – um – winding rivers and – and ah – plantations and weeping willow trees.*

LRH: All right. Okay. On that goal has anything been suggested? Okay. On that goal was there anything you've failed to reveal? On that goal has a mistake been made? On that goal has anything been suppressed? To be a Southern belle. All right. To be a Southern belle. Hmmm. All right. I've marked it out.

All right. Here's your next one: To own a plantation. Has that goal been invalidated? All right, any invalidation there?

PC: *Um, that is invalidated in that I did have a plantation on the track.*

LRH: All right, thank you.

PC: *... but I didn't – but I didn't get a chance to own it too long due to unfortunate circumstances.*

LRH: All right. Okay. On that goal has anything been invalidated? Okay. On that goal has anything been suggested? Okay. On that goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? On that goal has a mistake been made? There's a mistake, what is it?

PC: *That they've cut out a lot of the – they used to do a lot of farming of cotton on the plantations and they used to do a lot of sugar cane growing but that's been cut out now and who would imagine having a plantation – most of – a lot of in the South – a lot of the plantations have been turned mostly into rice paddies and one can't imagine one having rice – a plantation of rice paddies, you see what I mean. That – that should be associated totally with the Chinese and not with the – not with the southern part of the United States.*

LRH: Okay. All right. On the goal to own a plantation has a mistake been made? Another one? Something there?

PC: *I don't see anything other than what I was already referring to – there is a plantation in the old sense of the word and that's impossible in this day and age.*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. On that goal has a mistake been made? Okay. I'm going to check that again. On that goal has a mistake been made? All right. To own a plantation. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Okay. To own a plantation. We're getting random reads around the end of this thing. Is there

anything on this goal you've failed to reveal? I don't say there is.

PC: *Hm-mm.*

LRH: All right. To own – to own a plantation. Now, in this session is there anything you have failed to reveal?

PC: *I don't have that goal now.*

LRH: Oh!

PC: *Hmm.*

LRH: Small thing like that.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right. Okay. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Okay, thank you. Let's check this again. To own a plantation. To own a plantation. Okay. On that goal has anything been suppressed? Okay, thank you. That is out.

To own a ranch in Spain. All right, in this session is there anything you have failed to reveal?

PC: *Yeah, I failed to reveal that was the next goal coming up, that certainly shocked me.*

LRH: Oh, really?

PC: *I thought, "What!"*

LRH: All right. I'll read it again. To own a ranch in Spain. Okay. To own a ranch in Spain. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Okay. Any stray thoughts here?

PC: *Hmm. How about that – um – I'd like to - um - to own a ranch in Spain doesn't quite communicate exactly what it was I was trying to communicate. I was trying to communicate to own a ranch and to raise bulls, see, for bullrings around the world and that sort of thing.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: You want to put that...

PC: *No, no, no I just uh...*

LRH: Well, uh...

PC: *I can't quite express it – to be – I don't know how to say to, you know, to be one of the old families that – of Spain that raised – that raised bulls for a means for generation after generation, you know.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Okay, let's check the thing over now.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: To own a ranch in Spain. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Did you hit suppression or something else?

PC: *No, my only thought there is that – um – um – present day conditions in Spain are not very conducive to humans, sort of, you know?*

LRH: Oh, all right. All right, here we go. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Okay, a trifle bit slow, there might be something else there.

PC: *And I thought the goal was suppressed when I was in Spain and got so sick on my drinking their water.*

LRH: Ohh!

PC: *You see, if I can't drink their water then I certainly shouldn't be there sort of owning a ranch in Spain type of thing.*

LRH: All right, all right. On that goal has anything been suppressed? Okay. Any stray thoughts there at all? All right. To own a ranch in Spain. To own a ranch in Spain. Okay, that is out.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: To ride a donkey sideways. Has anything – has anything on that goal been suppressed? To ride a donkey sideways. All right. Has anything on that goal been invalidated? Is there anything on that goal been suggested? What's the suggestion?

PC: *Well, I suggested it. The only thing is, it's really to ride a donkey sideways under a great big straw hat. And that's it.*

LRH: All right. On that goal has anything been suggested? Okay, anything else?

PC: *Well, I thought it isn't exactly a whole track goal...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *...I suggested to myself.*

LRH: Thank you. On that goal has anything been suggested? Okay. To ride a donkey sideways. All right. Has anything on that goal been invalidated? Equivocal. Anything on that goal been invalidated? All right, anything else there? Invalidation? Perhaps a read, perhaps not.

PC: *No, I don't think so, I can't think of any invalidation.*

LRH: All right, very good.

PC: *I haven't done it, that's invalidating, I mean that makes sense.*

LRH: Okay, I was probably cleaning a clean there, I'm very sorry.

PC: *That's all right, but I haven't accomplished it yet.*

LRH: All right. On that goal has anything been suggested? Okay. On that goal is there anything you've failed to reveal? There's something there.

PC: *Yes, I failed to reveal that this is what I – this is what I wanted to do. I – is – the rest of the story on the donkey is that – that I want to go through all islands in the Mediterranean, you know, going from one island to the next island by, of course, boat, but when I'm on the island is that I want to ride a donkey sideways sitting under a straw hat all over the island and see all along the islands. So, it's more complicated to.*

LRH: All right. All right, I get you now. All right. Okay. On that goal has anything been suggested? There might be another something there.

PC: *Well, I suggested that I don't want to – I didn't want to use modern transportation on these old islands and on some of them that you cannot anyway, there are no sort of roads or hm mm.*

LRH: All right. Very good. On that goal is there something you've failed to reveal? I don't know what that was. On that goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? Okay. On that goal has a mistake been made? Yes?

PC: *Well, yes, it doesn't communicate the – the totality, but that would mean rewording it so long that it wouldn't be a goal anyway.*

LRH: All right. On that goal has a mistake been made? On that goal has anything been invalidated? What's the invalidation?

PC: *That's simply that I haven't done it.*

LRH: All right. Thank you very much. On that goal has anything been invalidated? All right. To ride a donkey sideways. Has that goal been suppressed? Thank you. That is out.

To own vast acres of land. Has that goal been suppressed? Thank you, that is out.

To ride over my land. Has that goal been invalidated? On that goal has anything been suggested? On that goal is there anything you failed to reveal? All right, there might be something there.

PC: *Well, that – um – I have to have the land to ride over, too, you see.*

LRH: All right, all right. On that goal is there anything that you failed to reveal? Okay. On that goal has a mistake been made? All right. Any stray thoughts?

PC: *The only thing I thought there is a strange thing, is that anytime I see lots and lots and lots of land stretching out I always, you know, I always do have some sort of feeling of ownership for it, whether I own it or not, I do own it. I have a feeling of ownership for it.*

LRH: All right, thank you.

To ride over my land. On that goal has anything been suppressed? Thank you. That is out.

To keep all orderly. On that goal has anything been suppressed? Thank you. That is out.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Okay? Here's the next goal: To have someone to talk to. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Check it again. To have someone to talk to. All right. On that goal is there anything you've failed to reveal?

PC: *Hmm – I just wondered what I mean by it. I have – I have failed to reveal it to myself. What do I mean by it.*

LRH: All right, thank you. All right. On that goal is there anything you

have failed to reveal? All right, thank you. To have someone to talk to. Okay. On that goal has anything been suppressed? Okay, that is out.

To find a true friend. Has anything on that goal been invalidated? All right. On that goal has anything been suggested? On that goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? All right, anything you've failed to reveal there?

PC: *No, but knowing how – uh – knowing how people's minds work – their busy little, mean little, nasty little minds .*

LRH: What's that?

PC: *I don't think that – um – I don't think it's possible to – to find a real, true friend.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *You know?*

LRH: Okay. All right. On that goal is there anything you have failed to reveal? Okay. To find a true friend. Has that goal been suppressed? Okay, that is out.

To not have to keep up appearances. Has that goal been suppressed? Check that. Has that goal been suppressed? Okay. To not have to keep up appearances. All right. Any stray thoughts there?

PC: *No, but what I thought is that – um – um – what I thought when I had the goal and that was – uh – wearing blue jeans and sloppy sweaters and that sort of thing and – uh – as a kid and my mother always objected to that.*

LRH: Well, all right.

PC: *And – uh – that's all.*

LRH: Okay. All right. I'm going to check it again. To not have to keep up ap-

pearances. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Okay, that is out.

I am going to null on down to the bottom of this page...

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: ... and then we will end – on through the session, I've got a half a dozen goals here or more. Okay?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right.

To not have to withhold. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? All right. To not have to withhold. Okay, that is out.

To feel and express how I feel. Has anything on that goal been invalidated? Has anything on that goal been suggested? All right, suggestion?

PC: *Well, it sort of sounds suggested that I – that I can't, but I can.*

LRH: All right, very good.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Has anything on that goal been suggested? All right, there's something a little more, just a hair maybe.

PC: *I've sort of forgotten what it is.*

LRH: All right, to feel and express how I feel.

PC: *To feel and to express how I feel. Oh. Doesn't make much sense and I just suggested that.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Has anything on that goal been suggested? All right. To feel and express how I feel. Equivocal. To feel and express how I feel. Okay. That goal is out.

To not have to protect identities. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Okay, a little suppression.

PC: *Yeah, sort of just trying not to be so protective of identities. That would be suppressing the goal to – um – what is it on?*

LRH: To not have to protect identities.

PC: *Well, protecting them. The children and – um...*

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. Thank you.

PC: *... the staff.*

LRH: To not have to protect identities. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? All right. Has anything on that goal been invalidated? Is there anything on that goal you've suggested? On that goal is there anything you've failed to reveal? On that goal has a mistake been made? To not have to protect identities. On that goal has anything been suppressed? All right, what's the suppression? There.

PC: *Hmm. Well, doing so, that suppresses the goal, doesn't it? Doing so that suppresses the goal.*

LRH: All right, thank you. I'll read the goal again. To not have to protect identities. Equivocal. To not have to protect identities. All right. Has anything in this goal been invalidated? Has anything in this goal been suggested? Is there anything in this goal you've failed to reveal? On – what's that? Failed to reveal. Something.

PC: *Well, I suddenly do realize is – that I don't go around protecting my own identity but I certainly do protect other people's identities, you see what I mean?*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Mm-hm, protecting their bodies and other people's identities and that sort of thing.*

LRH: All right. All right. Is there anything in this goal you've failed – anything in this goal you've failed to reveal? Okay. Thank you. On this goal has a mistake been made? Equivocal. On this goal has a mistake been made? Okay, thank you. On this goal has anything been suppressed? Little more suppression.

PC: *Mmm. Well, sort of I wish we'd get over it.*

LRH: Hmm?

PC: *I wish we'd get – um – off this one. I'm – I'm not too fond of this one.*

LRH: All right. Thank you.

PC: *That's all.*

LRH: On this goal has anything been suppressed? There's still a suppression on here.

PC: *Can't think of anything now.*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *I suppose the identity known as a mother always suppresses that with, you know – assuming that identity one would have to suppress that goal.*

LRH: All right, okay. On that goal has anything been suppressed? Ah, thank you. To not have to protect identities. Okay. That is out. Any thoughts you had on that?

PC: *Hmm-mm.*

LRH: All right, thank you. Now, actually I'm going to do just one more goal and that is the end of the line.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Here it is: To have people love me. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? I will check it again. To have people love me. Has anything on that goal been invalidated? Has anything on that goal been suggested? What's that? Suggested.

PC: *Hmmm. Sort of that people love thy neighbors and – and have thy neighbors love thee – type of thing.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That's all.*

LRH: Okay. Has anything on that goal been suggested? Okay. To have people love me. All right. Has anything on that goal been suppressed? Okay, that is out.

All right. Now, is there anything you care to say before we end this nulling session?

PC: *Yes, I thoroughly enjoyed it.*
Hmm.

LRH: Hmmm?

PC: *I enjoyed it.*

LRH: All right. It wasn't quite as bad as it might have been.

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right, let's see where we wound up. We, by the way, had a very interesting tone arm area here. I think we were quite low for a while. It's down at 2.7 again.

PC: *Ohh... Hmmmph.*

LRH: Okay? You have any somatics? Feel all right?

PC: *I feel fine.*

LRH: You do?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Here we go, into the end rudiments. In this session – in this session have you told me any half-truth, untruth or said something only to impress me or tried to damage anyone? All right. In this session is there something you have done? Yes, what is it?

PC: *Um – I have a hard time with these cans. I always feel that – uh – you know...*

LRH: Yeah, they're too big for you.

PC: *... they're too big. And then I always feel that's – that – um – that I'm doing something by holding these cans. I feel it's an overt on the auditor because I – I'm not ever sure that I'm ever keeping my hands still on it, do you see what I mean?*

LRH: All right, okay. Thank you. I'll recheck this question. In this session have you tried to damage anyone? Well, we're still pumping on something. I'll clean this other failed to reveal. All right. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Okay, in this session have you tried to damage anyone? Okay?

PC: *Blacks?*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Did I ever try to damage any? Um...*

LRH: Something there, bang, we just hit on something.

PC: *I thought of me, you know.*

LRH: Well, all right. Is that right?

PC: *Particularly sitting on sombrero – on a – on donkeys under the sun.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Here we go. In this session have you tried to damage anyone? Okay. Any other thoughts on that?

PC: *Hmmm.*

LRH: Something there.

PC: *Well, people. Just people in general and the true friend one. You know I was thinking about people with their mean little minds.*

LRH: That's right.

PC: *Well, I think some people might not have mean little minds, sometimes, possibly.*

LRH: All right, okay.

PC: *There might be someone with some magnificence of mind.*

LRH: All right. In this session have you tried to damage anyone? Okay, do you agree that that is clean?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Very good. In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Do you agree that that is clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you? Equivocal. In this session have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you? Do you agree that that is clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. In this session have you decided anything? Okay. Do you agree that that is clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. In this session have you thought, said or done anything I have failed to find out? Something I have failed to find out?

PC: *Uhmmm.*

LRH: There.

PC: *Yeah, that sometimes this chair was a bit uncomfortable.*

LRH: All right. Thank you.

PC: *Hmm.*

LRH: In this session is there anything I have failed to find out? All right. Do you agree that that is clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. In this session is there anything you feel was misunderstood? Something there – a little bit slowed – or is it the surprise of the question?

PC: *No, I think everything's understood.*

LRH: All right, I'll check it again. In this session is there anything you feel was misunderstood? Equivocal.

PC: *Mmmmm, no, I got it. I feel you understood.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Okay, thank you.

PC: *What misunderstandings have occurred downstairs, heaven knows. But you understood.*

LRH: Okay, I'll check that again here and make sure. In this session is there anything you feel was misunderstood?

All right, do you agree that that is clean?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. In this session was the room all right? All right, do you agree that that is clean?

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Here we go. Squeeze the cans. Well, put them back a little bit more there.

PC: *Oh, sorry.*

LRH: All right. Squeeze the cans. Well, what do you know. All right. Put the cans down. All right, touch – we're going to run a little – just a little bit of Havingness here, just a few commands.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Touch the table.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: Thank you. Touch your right sleeve with your left hand. Thank you. Touch your left sleeve with your right hand. Thank you. Touch that telephone. Thank you. Touch the other telephone. Thank you. Touch the tablecloth. Thank you. Touch that curtain. Thank you. Touch the top of your head. Thank you. Touch my hand. Thank you. All right. Pick up the cans. All right. Give them a squeeze. Thank you. That was the last command.

PC: *Mm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Now – you can set them down – have you made any part of your goals for this session?

PC: *Ah, yes. I've got quite a bit of nulling done. I got two pages done.*

LRH: Yes.

PC: *Good, very good.*

LRH: All right, okay. Perhaps find a goal, maybe?

PC: *Ohhhh, almost, but not quite.*

LRH: Well, all right.

PC: *I'm not upset about it. Got near finding a goal.*

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

PC: *I feel sort of less gruffy.*

LRH: Feel less gruffy?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: All right, very good. Any other?

PC: *Um – tone arm coming down. Tone arm coming down on the...*

LRH: Yeah! Tone arm down, yeah, I realize that.

PC: *... after – after rising up and up on these.*

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: *Mmmmm. That's good. And – um – I feel – uh – relaxed, more relaxed.*

LRH: All right. Good. How's that?

PC: *That's fine.*

LRH: Very good. Now, is there anything you care to ask or say before I end this session?

PC: *Yes, thank you. I really got into – it's just like our sessions – I really got into session.*

LRH: You really got into session.

PC: *I really got into session.*

LRH: All right, very good. All right.

PC: *Magic.*

LRH: You're welcome.

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. Is it all right with you if I end this session now?

PC: *Mmm.*

LRH: All right. Here it is: End of session.

PC: *Thank you.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *It's been lovely auditing.*

LRH: All right, thank you.

CLEARING

A lecture given on

9 August 1962

Thank you. Thank you very much.

What's the date?

Audience: 9th of August.

Ninth of August? What planet? Nine August, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one.

Subject of lecture: Clearing. Series of two lectures here, one of which is clearing in general and the second lecture will be on the specific technology of listing in which you will be very, very interested.

All right. What are you trying to do? Well, you're trying to clear people. Now, that may not be what you're trying to do according to your goal [laughs] but unreactively, you are, of course, quite happy to do just that. Therefore, you should recognize that all processes are subordinate to this final end. There are no processes that compare with those that clear. That is very much the case.

Now, you have to consider that an individual, in order to be clearable, has to be auditable. So that therefore becomes part of clearing to the degree that it is – assists clearing. And if at any time an individual cannot be audited, he of course cannot be cleared. That's awfully plain, isn't it? That's one of these idiotic things: The way to get up the – across the river is to get across the river. You know? But you're going to face this. You're going to face this many times. You're going to have somebody who is unauditably and you're trying to clear them.

Well, what do I mean by unauditably? There's nothing very esoteric about the definition. If the fellow can't talk and can't listen and can't respond, he, of course, is unauditably.

So when we're speaking of unauditably for the subject matter of clearing, we have nothing to do with the old, I think it's Kraepelin, I think the fellow's name was, over in Germany. I think – it really was! [laughter, laughs] I mean – he made up this scale of insanities and I don't know – very Germanic subdivisions of the subdivisions into the subdivisions and all of this sort of thing and this terrific chart. I mean, it's marvelous. They took it over to the United States and they sort of amputated it down and cut out a lot of the steps and then changed the definitions of those, but aside from that alter-is, they're using the same chart.

Now, that's states of sanity. And you frankly don't have anything to do with a state of sanity. Just make up your mind on that, right there. You got nothing to do with it. I know it is an intriguing subject, but consider it one of the lesser para-Scientology subjects that somebody should study sometime for a master's thesis in a University of Scientology somewhere up the track when you can't teach him anything else. You got the idea? See? It's a subordinate subject to Scientology. Yet the whole world tries to force any activity in the field of the mind either into the field of insanity or the field of advertising. [laughter]

Now, our difficulties are multiplied by the fact that the public at large believes that we have a lot to do with sanity whereas – now I'm giving you a technical truth; what we had to say about insanity had to do with difficulties in auditing and other things in the past, you see.

Well, just kind of lay all that aside and just skip it. Assign it to propaganda, necessary statements, efforts to keep organizations and auditors from getting themselves in trouble and, you know.

So we've used this word "insanity" from time to time. We've used this word "sanity" from time to time. But actually we have no business having anything to do with either because there isn't a human being on Earth today who is sane. They're all batty or they wouldn't be here.

It's just – it's one of these definitions that proves itself, you know. You say, "Is this fellow insane?" Well, you can't say he's insane because we don't know what the definition of that is. But is he sane? And we find him in a small factory working someplace at a drill press, you see, and he comes down to the drill press in the morning, at 8:00 in the morning and he goes this way – see? And he does this until 5:30, see. And he does this five days a week. That guy must be crazy! His total horizon is being retired someday by a socialist government which, of course, having drained the population of taxes in the interim, probably won't exist at the time of his retirement. His complications are many, but you couldn't say that he is taking the optimum solution out along the line.

And I'm afraid you could only define sanity. You cannot define insanity. And somebody who is sane could be defined as: a person who resolves problems for the greatest good of the greatest number of dynamics. That's a sane action. We can define that; I think you would agree with that. I'm not shoving it down your throats as the definition of sanity. We don't even have to have it as a technical fact, but I think you'd rather agree with that as sane.

Well, when you look at the actions of human beings and their various tangles and so forth, very few of their problems are solved with that equation. So, which of course, rather debars them from the subject.

So we haven't anything to do with sanity or insanity – nothing. The guy's in a spinbin; that doesn't prove he's sane or insane or anything else. See, it proves nothing. The only thing you're interested in is the auditability of a person. See? The second you've got clearing as an absolute fact – there it is – you're only then interested in the auditability of a person.

So people fall into a gradient scale of auditability which passes out down into a scale of inauditability. And that's what you should really study if you're going to study states of

man and that sort of thing: is are they auditable. Now, that is a very narrow look. That is a very narrow look because it's a technical look.

A person who is not Clear will not resolve things for the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics. Even a first goal Clear won't, ordinarily – and I think you will find it borne out that you get a second goal, third goal and all of a sudden they're starting to really look around and observe things in that their equating and resolving problems and so forth will step up to that degree – will begin to match up to that particular definition, of a proper definition of a solution to a problem for the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics.

But look, I'm talking to you now – not on a basis of propaganda or what I'd like the world to believe or anything else – I'm just talking to you straight from the shoulder what I know. And what I know is this: There is no processing short of clearing that is worth long and arduous hours. See, there is none. Now, that we've got 3GA, we can take a look back along the line and we can see easily how hard we have worked for what tiny gains. Now, that's – those gains were *well worth making*. My God, let's not downgrade this fact. They were well worth making, but the gain we can make in comparison to these things by clearing is something like a matchstick up against the Empire State Building. You see? The comparative values of these things are fantastic in compa... they're hardly – they're not of the same order of magnitude hardly, you see?

You got somebody over his headaches, and he got along better with his family. Fine. Good. Wonderful. Nobody could do it before on this planet. And, therefore our existence has been justified. But look, we all of a sudden have got our hands on a fact here. And this fact is 3GA and I've watched it now. I've kept my eye on this and I just give it to you straight from the shoulder. I mean what we're doing has absolutely – hardly any comparative value with what we've done at all. And the value of actual clearing is so great. And it does so much for the person that to strike for a lesser goal when that other goal of clearing is in your power, of course is an awful waste of time. So we become interested in auditability.

Now, every now and then, there's one or another amongst you I start worrying about, see? That isn't anything that you disturb my dreams or something, but I see how you are doing and how you are not doing, and so forth, and I start worrying. I see your case going awry or something like that. Your Instructors can tell you – all I do is start "push, push" along this line, you know. Well, how can we get him up into 3GA group, you see? And how can we somehow or other cut the corners on this, and how can we press this one forward, and how can we get this person to audit well enough so that he can receive some auditing and, you see, and it's all – it's this kind of action that is taking place, see.

And the difficulty that we face is actually not a technical difficulty that an auditor faces to a pc, see. Here is a little bit of a different difficulty. You are technicians. You are Scientologists. You are scientists. You are people who can do things with the human mind. You practically – this small confine here – practically all the people on Earth who are experts on the subject are confined at this moment in this very small area. See?

All right. The trick is from my viewpoint, to get somebody who can clear somebody else while being cleared, see, that's the stunt. Otherwise nothing else works – not on this planet, you see.

All right. So we're faced with this additional problem, and your judgment on this course is liable to be warped a little bit as to the auditability of somebody because he's not up in the 3GA group, see. There isn't anybody on this course who couldn't be that [snaps fingers] fast in the 3GA group, you see. You walk right straight in the front door and just go straight onto a 3GA group providing there was no requisite they pay for any of the auditing they get by auditing. You see? That there was no requisite. We maybe could have a staff of a half a dozen people and these people are all groomed up, and a student comes in and we audit that student to Clear and then he walks on out the front door and gets lost in the vast multitude, or something like this. You see?

Now, that is not an optimum condition. You may have disagreement with this and you're perfectly welcome to disagree with this because I point it out clearly as simply a point of view. My struggle has not been to clear people. My struggle has been to get people to clear people. You see?

Now, if we can do that, we've got this – we got it licked. We've got this planet licked. We've got the biggest breakthrough that has happened on this planet – ever! There has never been a comparable breakthrough – all right – such as we have in our hands right this minute, because we are doing that very thing and therefore it's a tremendous breakthrough. So don't adjudicate your judgment as to who is clearable on the basis of somebody is in rudiments and havingness section, see? See? Don't go off to that degree. He's in rudiments and havingnesses because he can't audit anybody well enough to receive auditing yet. Got the idea? Or he's working up till he can. We don't have any unauditables here from a standpoint of clearing. Now, does that open your minds up a little bit on this?

Audience: Mm-hm.

There isn't one in the place. Not one.

There's some dirty needles. There are some people that have a little difficulty to stay in-session. And all those things are curable by the very things which you're being taught. That is to say you can give them some rudiments and Havingness sessions and you can give them some Prepchecking sessions and you can pull their overts and there goes their dirty needle; and you can straighten them out and then you can take them right on through and find their goal. Now, that's – that's the truth of the case. Don't you see?

You actually are not being subjected to inauditables cases, and you aren't. Now, getting your point of view, then, straightened out, just on this: How bad off does a person have to be to be unauditables? How bad off is he? Well, it's pretty bad; it's pretty bad. Now, I'll tell you what makes them unauditables: it's how many overts they are secretly committing during the period of auditing. That's a factor.

Now, if you have got somebody so poorly under your thumb as an auditor, see, his control factor in the session is poor, and goes out and goes this ... You don't have them show up for sessions by reason of the fact that they're dead drunk or in court or something like this. Don't you see? There are a lot of things getting in the road of your auditing all the time. You see? Well, that's what makes them unauditables more than anything else. Or he keeps coming into session with a dirty needle. You clean it up today and he comes in tomorrow, and so forth, you see. You just can't...

Now, the person who can be cleaned up and who can somehow be bludgeoned into keeping his snoot clean long enough for you to read his needle, see, all right – that is the lowest level of auditability.

Now, below that level you have the fellow who won't tell you, who will never give any of his overts up, who will not cooperate with you or be frank with you, and from that point on there it all is. I mean, right on down to the fact that he can't talk at all. See? From – for our purposes, the communication level at which auditability ceases is where the person will not talk to the auditor frankly. See?

Now understand, an auditor's got lots of tricks and he can force a lot of people to talk to him. And he can force them under control and dire warnings: "You come in here just one more morning with that many overts the night before and I'll pick up this E-Meter – I won't audit you tomorrow – I'll just pick up this E-Meter and break it over your head. Do you understand? Then you'll owe me for an E-Meter." [laughter] See? "Got the idea? When you go home tonight, walk only on the left side of the street. Don't say a word to your wife. Go to bed quietly. Don't have any fight this morning at breakfast because I'm not going to spend another two hours cleaning up your breakfast quarrel. Now, keep it easy now and we'll have you through the knothole," see.

You know, I mean you could be that tough. But that person that you could do that with that that would work on, you see, he's still in this band of auditability – the person that can be almost bludgeoned into giving up his withholds. Oh, you – auditor has lots of tricks this way: "Well, I'm willing to sit here the rest of the night. There's the read. Where's the overt? I'm willing to sit here the rest of the night until you tell me, but are you?"

Just fold up the E-Meter and sit back in your chair. Yeah, you've got all kinds of forcing tricks, but you see there's a band of people on which this doesn't work. Below that, is only the people that you can't force to give up any overts. You can't force them to be frank with you. You know, just can't make it any way you can possibly think of. Comes in here, needle going: *bang-bang-bang-bang-bang*, *bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang*, *bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang* – and you say, "What have you done?"

"Nothing."

"What crimes have you committed in the last 24 hours?"

"Nothing." Try any trick in the trade. "I haven't done a thing. Oh, I'm telling you the truth. I've *always told you the truth!*" See, now we're getting down.

Now, whether that personality is psychotic or neurotic or badly bent or anything else, we couldn't care less. See, the personality is a fact. See? We don't care what classifications or labels gets assigned to the personality. We can't break through to smooth this case out enough.

Now, it isn't that our meter won't read. You see? That's not actually – that would be on the apparent surface of it, the debarring factor. Of course that makes it impossible, too, but it's actually that this guy's not going to sit still long enough and he's got so many curves on the line that you're never even going to clean up one goal. Look, if you can't get him to talk to you, how are you ever going to get any rudiments in or anything else? You see? Regardless of

whether you were auditing him on a meter or not. If you were to just lay a meter aside and try to audit him up the line on the something or other, you'd just get a pack of lies, and of course, the meter – at the end of the session you'd have to clean everything up at the end of session, you see. It'd be a mess!

So it – that person, you see, goes down into this other category and you're now down into the CCH band. Now, we call him "unauditable" for purposes of clearing, but he is preparable. Almost anybody, if they're not dead and can talk, is preparable – almost anybody. That will be one of the great studies of tomorrow, see – that isn't necessarily you study it today at all. I was doing some work on it a year or two ago. I was thinking, "Well, how do you get a whole institution of people – pull the psychiatrist off their neck – how do you get a whole institution of people to – some of them come through it. You know, I was thinking about, well, it's rest and some food and give them some large objects that they can sit around in courtyards and just look at, you see – good stable data. Other trickery of this particular character, but you see, they can't be audited, but they might be prepared for auditing.

Now, let's take another level of extremity of prepared for auditing. This fellow has a cut artery and is pumping what gallonage he has in gore over the local pavement. Now, he is not at that moment auditable. You see, by the time you had cleared the auditing command, you see, he has no more fluid to pump through the blood system. Now, now there is a comparison between that as an immediate emergency action and preparing somebody so he can be audited, see.

Well, naturally, the thing to do is to put a tourniquet on it and bandage him up somehow or another and square him around and get the emergency off of the situation, and then you can probably audit him – and undoubtedly should, to get a nice clean healing of such a wound. But you're going to find that on a broader sense a lot of human beings come into this category – a lot of them. They're quite a few. There's Betsy Ann who has migraine headaches and who won't talk to the auditor and who doesn't want to listen to anything about Scientology, doesn't want to hear about it, and yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap and is very angry with her husband all the time because – because he goes off with those Scientologists and so forth. And he is interested in that, and he don't – and so forth, and – isn't it terrible, and so forth, and they're a bunch of *raaaaa* and *raauw-raauw*, *raaaruw* and *raauw* and so on – and my migraine headache is killing me! And yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, you see. And finally, the husband comes around to you and says, "Well, look, why can't you audit her?" Well, he's asking you to look down the long road, you know. CCHs or maybe even just rest, you see – something of this sort.

Now, there's some fellow who has had the latest psychiatric operation. They take an ice-cream scoop and go in through a hole in the top of the skull, you see, and empty the gray matter out, and so forth. And he's lost all of his coordination. He can't do anything, and he can't talk, and he can't do this. Well, he's not necessarily a throwaway – not necessarily. You might be able to by CCHs and other drills and – but, even more fundamentally, just by letting him recuperate a bit and so forth, he might get up to a point where he could communicate to you somewhat.

There's a fellow lying in a coma. He's a CCH case. You can generally pull them through that. You see, you got all kinds of these cases down there. They're – you might say, they're not immediately auditable. They are preparable for auditing. Now, don't forget this: that that fellow's going to kick the bucket – the unauditible case – sooner or later and he's going to pick up another body sooner or later, you see, and you catch him up the track somewhere so he's still not all the way gone – providing the technology is still there. See. That's the little question mark on that fact.

Now, I wouldn't spend any more time on any of the unauditible cases – now let's get back to some very factual facts here – spend any more time on an unauditible case than is necessary to put them into a state of finding their goal and listing it out. Now with some case, that's five years – that's five years of rehabilitation, see. A manual operating with weaving or something, you know.

And with somebody else, that's five hours of Prepchecking. See, it's that variable. There is no case that can't be reached except the case that isn't there and will never hear of it. Now, if the case is never there and will never hear of Scientology, yes, he comes into the absolute. That is a theoretical absolute, don't you see? He's way out of sight. See, you're never going to lay your hands on him, but to some degree, others are preparable and some are just auditable. You just sit down and – well, you got a banging needle and you say – use some of your trickery. You say, "Now, let's see, Gracie Ann. What question would be the most nerve-racking question that I could think of, Betsy Ann?"

"Well, am I a virgin?"

"Well, are you a virgin?"

"Oh, of course, yes. *Ha-ha-ha-ha*. Oh, yes, yeah. I sure am."

Now, you really get a rock slam, see. And you say, "All right, Betsy Ann. Now, let's level with it."

"Well, I can't – can't talk to you about it, you know."

Well, you've ended the session. You say, "Well, when you come back to see me tomorrow, I want you to have made up your mind whether or not the withhold which you have there is worth going the next 200 trillion years in misery for."

And she comes back in and you say, "All right now, Betsy Ann. How about this question you didn't want me to ask you?"

"Well," she said, "there's Bill and Joe and Pete and Tom and Dick, so on and so on, and the priest in the village and so forth." [laughter] And the needle quiets down; the needle quiets down. You run a little bit of O/W and the bank stops shifting around, and you say, "All right. Give me a list of your goals." Get the idea? Whatever trickery; whatever duress that is put on her is justified by those means. That's safe. That's it, that's up to you to get the fellow or the girl to talk to you. That's the case. That's the lowest rung of case you probably will be having too much to do with.

Now, if you take somebody who is a habitual drunk, and he goes out and robs service stations every night to pay for his liquor every morning, and he's doing this and he's doing

that, and he's doing something or other and he runs up five overts for every one you pull off, don't you see. His level of responsibility is just horrible. And he can't seem to stay with it, as far as you're concerned – he keeps giving you all kinds of trouble and so forth. Well, please recognize you're dealing with an un-auditable case. Like the case needs a – needs a tremendous amount of therapy of some kind. You probably need a stockade, man, you know, and turn the key on him and let him sit over in the corner under the sorrel brush and think it over for a few days on water. About the time when the DTs are ready to kill him off, say, "Well, it's horrible what a reactive bank can do, you know." Slip it to him. But it doesn't come under the heading so much of auditing.

You can spend fantastic quantities of time preparing a case that is almost un-preparable and your heart will only get broken by that case. See, he's apparently auditable. He actually isn't auditable. You have to make up your mind about this, see. You can't force him into a groove. Oh, the case that can be forced into a groove any way you can do it, is of course auditable, but this fellow can't really be forced into a groove. He can't really be made to go into session as far as you're concerned, and so forth. Recognize that at this particular moment we don't have the tools of therapy necessary to handle such a case which is possibly a stockade and a bottle of water, you know? And if we were to put him in the backyard and chain him to a tree for a few days, even if he's a chronic alcoholic, do you know that neighbors – neighbors being what they are – they'd probably complain. [laughter] Therefore, the littlest good to the fewest number of dynamics.

Frankly, the auditability of people depends in a large measure on the sphere of influence of the Scientologist, see. And when his sphere of influence is big enough that – all of them become auditable. See, here's Grandma and she's going *nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah* at the family and that sort of thing and she's raising hell with them. She holds all the purse strings, tells them they can't do this and all that sort of thing, and so forth. And, well, right now there wouldn't be a thing you could do about it, but in another age you possibly could say, "Grandma, why the hell don't you get off your overts?" you know? And she'd say, "This is a Scientologist talking to me. I had better start singing." You get the idea? That's what reputation will do for you.

Now, not advocating rough stuff or anything like that with regard to such people, I'm just trying to make it clear to you that you've got a wonderful gift in your hands.

And you start spending five years trying to set up an alcoholic simply because his brother has a million gabutnicks, all of the people you could have cleared in five years remain unclear. That's interesting, isn't it? And probably at the end of the game, because your sphere of influence isn't as great as it should have been because you weren't in there creating it, you won't have even cleared this guy's brother, see – not him either. I can see it now.

So you've got your sphere of action that would do the world the most good, is the auditable case – the sphere of the auditable case – who can be audited. Gosh, that goes down pretty far. I could pull some people in off the street that would make you blink on the subject of whether they were auditable or not. And I'd say a person is perfectly auditable; go on and audit.

One day a girl comes in – a girl comes in, walks up to Suzie and she was sitting at the Registrar's desk in Phoenix, Arizona – many, many, many years ago – and says to Suzie something on the order of. "I want Ron to audit me." And Suzie says something or other, something or other and take it in a matter of course, and starts to write the girl's name down, and says, "All right. What's your name?" You know, "I'll at least put her through the formalities here." And the girl said, "Well, what is my name?" I think she even sat there trying to invent some names for herself or trying to guess at it. She didn't have a clue, man – she didn't have a clue. And I think I gave her two sessions – an hour – oh, something like an hour and a half and something like an hour and three-quarters. Life straightened out; she went out and got married. She's still around. Memory came back. Everything's fine. Obviously unauditably: Couldn't think of her name, couldn't talk, couldn't sit still, on the run, didn't know who she was – strictly spinbin stuff, don't you see? But the difference was that she was perfectly willing to answer the auditor's questions. She was still in communication. And although for a while, that needle might have been slamming around on the meter, it calmed down pretty fast, don't you see? So do you get the difference here? She was auditable. Strictly spinbin stuff – you know?

Now, a psychiatrist would have said, "This is a very sick, neurotic girl." Yes, she was. She had a compulsion to turn into a prostitute in order to get even with her parents who were Presbyterians. She had a compulsion to. She was making a good job of it, too. But see, by all the textbooks, this is a spinbin case and by our textbooks she was quite auditable.

Another girl, because she had been in an institution, came in and saw another Registrar one time. She's – had an institutional history long as your arm. The Registrar says, "Well, the person isn't processable – couldn't be. Look at the history, you know: out of this institution, into that institution, and here and there and the other place, and wow!" See? She was even a rather gruesome-looking character. And I said, "Well, I'd – I better see about this." And I didn't audit her, by the way. But I wanted to see whether or not she was auditable. So I had her come in and put mock-ups in various corners of the room, hold them there – various kinds of mock-ups and hold them there stably. And she could mock up anything and put it there, and it would stay there just as it was and move it around. Perfectly in control of her mental pictures. Interesting, huh? Quite auditable. She got audited and away we go.

Another girl comes in: nice family, everything is fine, background beautiful, all polished up, so forth – beautiful parents, very pretty, she's well dressed – she's this, she's that, she's the other thing. *Augggggggggh*. Shouldn't happen to an auditor. She's got one of these automatically shifting banks. She can't sit still one moment or the other, one minute to the next. She can't answer questions. You say, "Did you eat soup for lunch?" And she says, "Hitler's no good, you know." Unauditably without a terrific amount of rest and preparation and everything else and so proved to be.

You see, it isn't what life has labeled them. See. Now, furthermore, it really doesn't much matter how buggy they sound. They could sound awful, awful, awful spinny and still be quite auditable.

The difference, I suppose, is this: The fellow knows he can get better or that there's some hope or he should take a crack at it and the other fellow who was unauditably knows

there isn't any hope and there isn't any reason to take a crack at it and you couldn't get better anyhow, see. I suppose that would be the handiest little rule of thumb by which to judge these two things – just fast like that.

Fellow knows you can't get any better, knows he isn't any better, knows he's absolutely right in life and it's everything that has been done to him. You add all these things in, don't you see. He knows it's everybody else's fault but you can't do anything to him that would ever make anything of it better and so forth. Thinks he's being totally sincere about it – knows that any efforts to help anybody are based on trickery, quackery. I could run you off a whole lot of this stuff, but you've heard this in part or in full many times. Well, you try to get that guy on the E-Meter and try to get him to talk and you can't read the needle and you can't do this, and you can't do that. But on the other hand, you still might be able to straighten him out and change his mind, don't you see. Such a case you'd have to find out. Now, it's you who are the judge of this.

Now, it doesn't matter how buggy they sound to you on some of their ideas. They can come around to you and say, "Throgmagog is going to tip over the Empire State Building at any minute and I worry all the time because I own some stock in American Tel & Tel," and you wonder what the devil this has got to do with anything. Well, some people can have a nutty idea and know it's nutty, and other people have a nutty idea and they don't know it's nutty. [laughter]

Do you understand that, how a person's goal could make them sound utterly batty, whereas they're quite auditable. It's just a goal, see. "To keep buildings from falling down," you see. Let's say that's the person's goal and the person is always found with their hand up against the side of the building keeping buildings from falling down, you know. Police would lock them up. You put them on an E-Meter; they're quite auditable.

So we get down to just this one criterion: Are people auditable? Well, how much preparatory auditing should you do? Well, to make them auditable on goals processes, and that's the full answer. Now, you can sit on somebody's chest that is doing some of the wildest things and still find their goal, but I wouldn't make it any tougher on myself than I had to, because look-a-here, finding a goal is a terrific stress and strain on the pc. Now, nulling by mid ruds makes them much better, makes them feel better, is a much calmer procedure and that sort of thing, but they've got to answer your questions.

And if you had a pc who had sporadically dirty needles and wouldn't communicate with you and that sort of thing and you've tried to do something with, and you get four goals nulled in a three-hour session, you know – *ha-ha-ha-ha-oh*. Next day you get two. You're missing withholds all over the place and so forth. I guarantee you about the third day you'll get none. See, that's – that is hitting it too early. A person is not really sufficiently in-session to have a goals process run on them. See?

These are things which you have to develop a judgment about. I could lay you down a lot of rules of thumb and so forth, but the best way that you'll learn is to do just exactly what you will do, regardless of what I tell you. Here one of these fine days, why, you'll be sitting there and somebody says, "Oh, a Saint Hill graduate. Gee-whiz! Ha-ha. Well, I'll pay you an

awful lot in order to find my goal and I've always wanted to have my goal found," and so forth.

And you say, "Well, I – I guess so. Yes. All right. Fine," and so forth. And you say, "Well, I have to really do a little bit of preparatory..."

"Well, no. I – no. No, the only condition under which I'll be audited is if you find my goal right away without wasting any time on this other stuff, you see, because I'm a really very high-toned person."

And you'll be pulled in. You say you won't, but this will happen to you, all of you, sooner or later. You've got your list of goals and you start down at the top. "To catch..." [very hastily:] "to catch catfish. Ahh, it's null, I – I guess." [laughter] You're in for it, man, because this will get worse, not better, because the pc is never as calm as he is at the beginning. He gets less calm as he goes on. Now, if there's anything wrong with the case at the beginning, it's going to be multiplied before you get to the end. Oh, well. That will be up to you.

But I want to tell you this about clearing: There isn't anything wrong with anybody except he's upped himself a basic purpose of some kind or other for reasons he has not. No – no reason to it. And there it sits and then when this is disobeyed and so on, then it's all blocked off, and then you get a bank developed and then a bunch of other purposes that he doesn't want, get hooked up onto this so he does those; and then pretty soon he doesn't know who he is, and he picks up a body, and here we go, you see. And then he gets all kinds of this-a's and that-a's and the other things and he is indecisional and he is upset about this and he's upset about that. Well now, look. How you going to audit it? Well, how you going to audit it with a lick and a promise little, old, light process?

I'm appalled at our impudence. I am, you know. When I look at the tightrope walk that it takes to get somebody through to Clear, see. When I look at it from a research viewpoint, it's absolutely impossible to have ever found a tightrope. See, you couldn't find that tightrope in all those Grand Canyons for you didn't even know what canyon you were trying to cross, man. And yet it works out very simple and there's really nothing to it. [laughter]

You've got yourself a – you got yourself an action here, like trying to chip away at Mount Rushmore with a small Boy Scout hatchet. And after you've been slugging at it for a few hundred years, you see, why you've made a slight dent – inches deep. Now, there's no doubt but that we could do things nobody else could do. We could bring about a cessation of aches and pains and straighten people out and run grief charges and do all kinds of things. This is all quite remarkable, but when you look at it in comparison, it doesn't compare.

In the first place, almost anything you did to somebody was sooner or later going to cave in again. He either had by some confidence engendered in himself – could get a gradient scale of peeling it off if he wasn't too solidly in the GPM and he could blow clear of that and park that over there someplace and he could live quite happily with it. That was a Clear. At any time this guy had the threat of this thing coming in on him again, see. So he lived just a little bit of a nervy life because he must have known this – instinctively, he must have known something of this. He knew it wasn't all quite gone.

Now, when you start at it – peeling it down from the top, like, "From where could you communicate to a head? Thank you. From where could you communicate to a head?" His goal, by the way, is "never to communicate to anyone," – you have this chance factor floating through all of your processing. This chance factor is there all the time. Lord only knows what it will be. Only you and a complete assessment will be able to tell and it'll be some chance factor. And that factor could be for you or that factor could be agin ya. But in any event, that factor is the monitoring factor of any results that you get.

All right. We get this girl and we say, "How could you help your father? And how could your father help you? And how could you help your father? And how could your father help you?" And we eventually find to our horror that her goal is "to destroy all families." Now, how the devil could we ever have opened that up at all or got anyplace with a lesser process? Weird part of it is that we did. But per hour of processing, there's no comparison like goals processing.

You sit down and you get this person's basic purpose and then you – the bank starts falling apart and all these other things take place and they clear, and you haven't got any bank there to go back on the track or to go up into the future or to be connected with or not connected with and it's gone. Well, that is infinitely desirable, but the change that it makes in an individual is best viewed by you by the amount of havoc a wrong goal, found but not run, can make on a case.

Now, here is your index: Take anybody who has had a wrong goal found. Now understand, not run, see. This person – they had a wrong goal found. And just sit down with a meter, and – don't do an Instructor's check – just handle that goal as you would handle the "to be a tiger" drill, see. See, whatever the goal was – and just clean it that way. And check with your pc and make sure that you clean it until all sensation and pain has gone off of it, see. That, as an additional little action – just make sure there's no more pain left on that thing. Clean it very carefully, just with a drill, with also attention to pain, and you will strangely enough see more case gain than you have seen for some time.

Well, you say, "Look, to the degree it must have caved him in to have found the wrong goal..." No, you're looking in the wrong barrel. That's what I thought the first time and then I finally got my wits wrapped around it and found out what was happening, because it was fantastic. Just that you had found a wrong goal on this person – that must have caved him in. It must have ruined him, because look at all the good it did to clean it up.

No, it's not the finding of the goal. The finding of the goal did a key-in of what was there anyhow. And it could have keyed in at any time and possibly has. But you just pick it up as a found goal, and of course, you clean up the whole goal. In other words, you call his attention to this goal. He's become familiarized with this goal now by its suppressions, invalidations and that sort of thing. He's looked at it and he's confronted it, and to a large degree it's blown and it has no further effect on him, which leads you to one of the wildest Problems Intensives you ever wanted to run. And I don't know that anybody will ever run this Problems Intensive, but they might and it's one of the steps of finding a goal.

You say to a person, "All right. Write me out all the problems that you've had in this lifetime that you want to do something about. Just write me out a list of these, see." He gives

you a list of 60, 70, something like that. And you say, "All right. Now, what decision" (you can call it anything you want to) "would have solved " and you take problem 1, see. What decision would have solved problem 2, see. What decision? What decision? You keep writing down this list of decisions.

Now, you don't date them. They're really goals, you see. You don't date them. And you just go back to the beginning of them and you dust it off lightly with the "to be a tiger" drill, see. "To never drink again," you see, that was one of the things – that the decision would have solved that problem, see. To never drink again. All right.

You say, "To never drink again." You get a read. "Has that decision been invalidated?" You know? Go right on down through your "to be a tiger" drill, don't you see. And clean up that whole lot and, man, that guy will have thought he will have had more processing than a hundred and ninety-nine hours of anything else you could have run on him except goals processing itself. Makes an interesting Problems Intensive, doesn't it?

See, it's just a little chunk of doing a goals list and yet it works out into a complete Problems Intensive. And you'll be utterly flabbergasted at the amount of relief the character will get off this. It'll look completely phenomenal to the person. The reason you possibly won't do this – although this may turn out sooner or later, I shouldn't condemn it in advance – I should announce it to you of what it is. It's just a discovery of how to run a Problems Intensive and I shouldn't further evaluate it because you might be able to do this on somebody and find out mysteriously that they will go into session now and that they become auditable whereas they were only partially auditable before so it might have more value than I have experimented with at this moment.

But I'm just giving you the value of a decision – the value of a goal. Just the value of a goal with the mid ruds cleared on it on the nulling by mid ruds technique gives you more cessation of somatic, more release and advance of case... Look, these aren't even the guy's goals, see – they're nothing. He's given you a list of 60 "What decision was...?" Oh, he's made all these decisions at sometime or another – you just clear them up. Just as-is; nothing fancy about it – pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. Well, how long might it take you? Three-hour session, something like that. The guy's liable to come out at the other end of this session saying, "Wow!" you know and just flying, you know. God! He's no longer an alcoholic and he doesn't beat his wife and, you know, things are marvelous. Gosh!

How did this ever happen to him? Well, that's simply the value of a decision, because what is the reactive bank then, but the basic decision or the basic postulate or the basic purpose which has on top of it then, a concatenation of purposes – all of which are locks on the basic purpose. Every time – this is horrible – but every time he makes a decision, he puts a new lock on the case. Wonderful way to do oneself in, isn't it? And he did it gratuitously to himself, too. Nobody twisted his beams to make him do it. Yeah, he will postulate.

Anyhow, this action might serve very well as a tremendous training drill before somebody did 3GA, but actually it's simpler, unless you had some remarkable difficulty with the pc that made him unauditable. Basically, it is simpler just to get somebody to list 850 goals, straighten out the list at the other end and start nulling. Do you see? That fact has such value

that it makes this other very important discovery kind of null and void. That's an unhappy fact, isn't it, when you get down and look at it.

Make this tremendous thing, you know, you can – we've just made a discovery whereby we snap our fingers to the right and left and say abracadabra and a spaceship appears, you see. Well, that's nothing because it's standing in the shadow of a discovery whereby all we had to do was go *whhhh*, and a planet appeared. It's sort of dwarfed. But there's – there is something that if you wanted to get a reality on the somatic value and other values of cleaning up somebody's goals or decisions – you want to get a reality on just what that will do for a case – you could do that little drill and you've – and *waaaah!* Wow! This is nothing compared to what clearing is going to do, but wow! What would it do? It'll do a lot; do a lot for a case.

Now, possibly it will turn out suddenly to have some interesting value of its own or be – you can expect sooner or later that we may suddenly have alcoholics you do this with or something like that, you know. Something might come up.

But there's clearing, and there isn't any substitute for clearing. And if you can clear people, there's no reason to do anything but clear people, because it makes all that difference.

And it's all right to say well, so-and-so and such-and-such, and we ought to really prepcheck them a lot and we ought to do this and ought to do that, but frankly, if they're auditable, if they've been prepchecked up into auditability, there's certainly no reason to go on prepchecking them.

The person's sitting there and they're being good as a pc and the needle stays clean and well, what more do you want, man? Well, I always say the fellow – that this fellow isn't auditable. I can hear this argument going on someplace, you know. This fellow isn't auditable. Why, he just talks all the time about committing suicide. So he talks about committing suicide. What's that got to do with clearing him? Nothing. He just made the decision too many times and he can't stop deciding it, that's all. He never is going to commit suicide while you're trying to find his goal. He'll be too curious to find out what it is. [laughter]

You see, actually, the out of session behavior of the individual has nothing to do with it. It's only the in-session behavior of the pc in which you're interested. And if that in-session behavior is adequate to clearing – which is running down a goals list and getting his goal and getting him to list the four lines on it and blow it clear – well, there isn't any reason whatsoever why you should do it. There's no reason under the sun because if there's anything wrong with his morality or his ethical level or something like that, it isn't going to straighten out by putting him in jail, but it is going to straighten out by clearing him. So here's the answer to this situation.

I hope to some slight degree I've solved for you perhaps some ethical problems with regard to this matter and cleared your mind up on: Who do you clear?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

Female voice: Yes, very much so.

And when should you start clearing.

Audience: Mm-hm.

What we have in actuality is a technique which is sufficiently powerful and sufficiently big and overwhelming that it actually a bit defies grasp – a bit defies description. It's a little bit hard to realize you're there, you know. It's a little bit hard to realize it's there or it can be done. And you really don't start realizing it until you clear somebody or until you yourself find your goal and suddenly say, "Wo-wo-wa-wa-what's this? What's this? What happened? Ah! Look what we got our paws on now."

But frankly, ever since this has – has been squared away so that the – now that you're finding some goals in nulling by mid ruds, I was waiting until that proved itself out that way – and these other things, there's – the lid's off. There is no limit on the forward road, believe me. There is nothing.

We are at that point of the crossroads for which we have been heading for a long time. And we were right there and we have arrived. It's going to take you a long time to realize it perhaps. It's going to take other people in Scientology a long time to realize it, but to grasp exactly what this means for this planet, takes quite a little bit of looking at – quite a little bit of looking at. Three-quarters of Asia became civilized just because a few guys hoped that somebody might sooner or later be able to do it. Hey! Three-quarters of Asia, just because somebody hoped they could do it. You know they never did it? Well, what are you sitting with now? And what do you suppose is going to happen from here?

That's why I say, it's just a little bit hard to confront this thing. And of course, you're in there. It looks simple to you and so forth. It is. You're learning to audit this and that. It was only last night in a TV demonstration – you saw how easy it was. And looking at all that, well, I invite you just to lift your head just a little bit from the technical fact and look at the broad implication of what has happened here this summer of 1962. It's quite interesting. May you never be the same again.

Okay. Well, I didn't mean to get too serious about the thing, but it – I've been just kind of sitting looking at it lately and saying: well, Ronnie, I – one guy suddenly got the idea it could be done and started operation bootstrap and some other guys came along and they started working on it and so forth. And always in the past we have had the beautiful dream that the Messiah comes down with sandals of gold with a neon sign around his skull [laughter] – and he blows on this silver trumpet, see, and everybody's Clear and that wasn't what happened at all.

There was some guy, who was just a guy, and he started figuring and some other guys started to work on it, and everybody was working on it, and so forth – and it happened. Perhaps it's all out of scheduled from the archangels and perhaps it isn't on the blotter in the Galactic Council but it *is happening*.

And it didn't have to wait for the second coming of who was it – Baal? Or whoever it was. Okay?

Thank you.